

December 2015

Experiential Learning and the Basic Communication Course: A New Path to Assessing Forensic Learning Outcomes

Ben Walker

Southwest Minnesota State University, benjamin.walker@smsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/speaker-gavel>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Walker, B. (2014). Experiential Learning and the Basic Communication Course: A New Path to Assessing Forensic Learning Outcomes. *Speaker & Gavel*, 51(1), 32-49.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Speaker & Gavel* by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Experiential Learning and the Basic Communication Course: A New Path to Assessing Forensic Learning Outcomes

Benjamin Walker

Introduction

Scholars have often touted the educational benefits of forensics (e.g.: Bar-tanen, 1998; Beasley, 1979; Brownlee, 1979; Ehninger, 1952; Gartell, 1973; Jensen, 2008; McBath, 1975; Millsap, 1998; Schroeder & Schroeder, 1995; Stenger, 1999; Yaremchuk, 1979). Critics, most notably Burnett, Brand, and Meister (2003), have argued forensics is only a competitive game with the idea of education used as a crutch to uphold the activity in the eyes of schools. While attempting to counter critics, many forensic educators have scrambled to find proof of student learning. Besides theoretical approaches to potential learning methods (e.g., Dreibelbis & Gullifor, 1992; Friedley, 1992; Sellnow, Littlefield, & Sellnow, 1992; Swanson, 1992; Zeuschner, 1992), the evidence of student learning in collegiate forensics has been scarce.

Kelly and Richardson (2010) and the 2010 NFA Pedagogy Report represented a new era of forensic assessment by trying to nail down learning objectives for the activity. Kelly (2010) argued, “Higher education is being reshaped by standardized assessment practices, and collegiate forensics must reshape practice accordingly” (p. 131). As the debate rages on about appropriate learning objectives in the community, assessment practices to measure any form of learning still remain missing. Many scholars have called for a better understanding of forensic learning outcomes but have never applied genuine academic learning objectives to forensics (e.g., Church, 1975; Holloway, Keefe, & Cowles, 1989; McMillan & Todd-Mancillas, 1991).

Beyond identifying learning objectives, forensic scholars have had difficulty accurately measuring learning outcomes of the activity. These struggles are reflected in communication studies assessment; Morreale et al., (2011) noted communication educators have trouble providing accurate assessment data due the performative nature of the field. To help answer the call most recently initiated by Kelly and Richardson (2010) and Kelly (2010), this article will identify and explore an appropriate assessment method for forensic learning outcomes, and provide data for use by future forensic educators and scholars.

Literature Review

Assessment

Finding ways to properly assess student learning in forensics is not easy. Morreale et al., (2011) outlined three distinctions that make assessment difficult for communication educators, which also define the struggle of forensic educa-

tors. First, achievement tests or tests of objective or subjective content work well in other disciplines, but not communication. Since communication is generally assessed through performance measures, only communication knowledge is measured through traditional methods such as paper tests and essays. Second, communication assessment is often culturally subjective because of its performative and interactive nature. In determining communication competency, there may be more than one right answer or approach making objective evaluation of student outcomes more difficult. Third, any skills students learn can only be measured in the moment. Educators cannot fully know if students will be competent in the future because of the permeating aspect of communication. As Morreale et al., noted, “The determination of competence in communication will be affected by numerous factors impinging on any interaction at any given time” (p. 260). Labeling students as competent in a communicative skill acts as a temporary assessment under certain conditions that are sure to change in a student’s daily interactions.

Forensic scholars have attempted to implement some sort of formal learning assessment to determine what students are learning (Bartanen, 1994b; Kelly & Richardson, 2010; Richardson & Kelly, 2008). This is a difficult endeavor due to the hurdles Morreale et al., (2011) pointed out, but formal assessment in forensics is something greatly discussed by forensic scholars (e.g., Cronn-Mills & Croucher, 2001; Edwards & Thompson, 2001; Gaskill, 1998; Klosa & DuBois, 2001; Kuster, 1998; Morris, 2005; Paine, 2005; Pelias, 1984; Pratt, 1998).

Without formal assessment tools forensic educators have found no way to properly assess what forensic students have learned through their experience in the activity. Sellnow (1994) and Walker (2011) proposed viewing forensics through the lens of experiential learning, which uses student self-assessment as the primary assessment tool. Citing the work of experiential education scholars, Sellnow argued forensic students learn experientially and pointed out forensics values and fosters a diverse way of knowing.

Mallard and Quintanilla (2007) noted, “As the push in higher education for accountability of what is taught at the university level increases, there has been more focus on student self-assessment as an integral part of learning and critical thinking” (p. 3). Reflective, collaborative self-assessment is where education seems to be moving in colleges and universities as a growing body of evidence suggests self-assessment reflection to have a positive influence on student learning (Agne, 2010; Andrade & Boulay, 2003; Petkov & Petkova, 2006; Reitmeier, Svendsen, & Vrchota, 2004; Ross, Hogaboam-Gray, & Rolheiser, 2002).

Practicing reflective self-assessment in forensics addresses the previously mentioned assessment concerns from Morreale et al. (2011). In forensics, with students subjectively examining their experiences, all inappropriate assessment is eliminated because students can select a reflective method that works best for their learning. Further, while learning assessment is culturally subjective, for an activity such as forensics, this is actually ideal. Forensics itself is its own culture and teams are subcultures inside of that (Kuyper, 2009). What a student finds important to focus on learning in forensics culture can vary from each team and

student. The final unique communication assessment concern is the lack of the instructors knowing if the learning remains long term. In forensics, the assessment happens from the student and for the student, which means the assessor can then accurately measure the long term learning of the experience.

Dewey (1938) and Kolb (1984) both wrote about the importance of self-assessment in determining what a student thinks they've learned. Kolb argued that students experience something, reflect upon it, and then determine how to best go about their lives afterwards. As Wurdinger (2005) noted, "It seems reasonable to include students in the assessment process, for who better knows what they have learned than the students themselves" (p.70)?

Dochy, Segers, and Sluljmsans (1999) revealed student self-assessment to be an effective way to measure student learning outcomes. Kostons, van Gog, and Pass (2012) found self-assessment can significantly increase the amount of knowledge students can gain. Taras (2010) encouraged more educators to try self-assessment with students, explaining how self-assessment is an important factor in supporting and engaging students with learning.

While prevalent in education studies, reflecting on experiences is something that forensic scholars have rarely asked students to do, even though Bartanen (1998) suggested forensics teaches students how to critically reflect effectively. In one of the rare studies that did focus on asking what the students felt like they were learning, Quenette, Larson-Casstelton and Littlefield (2007) had students self-report on the top advantages of forensics, shying away from true assessment of learning.

Klein (1998) argued, "self reflection and self criticism are important for change and growth" (p. 24). Boud (1995) stated a list that defined the parameters for which student self-assessment can be a valid form of measurement of course outcomes in the class. Self-assessment should be in a high-trust situation, have the goal of assessment and not skill building, and be guided by clear criteria. Criteria-referenced self-assessment has been shown to promote achievement (Andrade & Valcheva, 2009). Without stated learning outcomes as criteria, self-assessment in forensics can never be achieved.

Learning Outcomes

The educational benefits of forensics are many and can be debated, however Bartanen (1994a) highlighted four important benefits that forensics provides for students: forensics gives students unique insights into public policy and civic concerns; forensics builds courage and a sense of personal growth and satisfaction; forensics is important for career preparation; forensics is a valuable educational supplement. Bartanen's benefits can act as a framework for understanding the general academic discussion surrounding student education in collegiate forensics.

Initially, Bartanen (1994a) mentioned forensics gives students unique insights into public policy and civic concerns. What forensics does is develop critical thinking in our students' minds which is often applied to civil discourse (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, & Louden, 1997; Carroll, 2007; Colbert & Biggers,

1987). Forensics helps create citizen-leaders (Bartanen, 1998). McMillan and Todd-Mancillas (1991) found forensic students to have increased their critical thinking skills and broadened their understanding of subjects and people. Crawford (2003) argued “competitive speech, far from being expendable, is central to ... preparing students to be functional participants in a democratic society” (p. 19). Students learn how to be civically engaged when they research to speak on current events and advocate for changes in the world. Re (2002) noted forensics makes “young people aware that they are empowered members of a community that extends ... into the real world” (p 4).

Bartanen (1994a) also mentioned forensics builds courage and a sense of individual development. Through experience in forensics, students learn about themselves. Students like awards, but also define success in forensics through personal growth and satisfaction (Brennan, 2011). Forensic students find ways to deal with anxiety that are hard to learn in the traditional classroom (Thompson, 2003) and increase their self-assurance through experience (Hunt & Inch, 1993). When students participate in forensics they grow beyond what they were before. Klopff (1990) noted the value of this in forensics, pointing out how many former forensic students cited their experience as the most valuable and satisfactory in the undergraduate career. Students can take this new found personal satisfaction and use it to help them succeed in all aspects of their life.

Bartanen (1994a) further argued forensics is important for career preparation. Being active on a speech team provides excellent pre-professional development (Colbert & Biggers, 1987; Nadolski, 2005). Minch (2006) pointed out how forensics can help in future occupations: “today’s marketplace values a well-rounded education, critical thinking skills, communication skills and the ability to interact with people effectively” (p. 12), which are all things forensics can teach students. McCrady (2004) argued students who probe deeply into literature are developing higher order thinking skills and extemporaneous and persuasive speaking help understand logic. Employers want students with good communication and critical thinking skills and forensics can help students build those skills. Stenger (1999) even noted forensics serves to prepare students for a career in academics, which many students pursue.

The last benefit Bartanen (1994a) highlighted is forensics is a valuable educational supplement. Bartanen explained students can learn a great deal in forensics and most of it stems from the communication studies curriculum. As Ehninger (1952) pointed out, forensics is a co-curricular activity which has been shown to help students do better on standardized tests (Peters, 2009). Forensic students may learn about interpersonal communication (Friedley, 1992; Schnoor & Green, 1989) as well as small group communication (Zeuschner, 1992) and organizational communication (Swanson, 1992). Furgerson (2012) also argued students can learn advanced research skills from forensics. Further, Millsap (1998) found the skills forensics teaches (oral presentation and debate) are used across the curriculum, enhancing overall student learning. As Klopff (1990) noted, forensics “should be a counterpart of curricular instruction in speech; it is not a mere adjunct to formal speech-class instruction. The [forensic] program should

seek the same general goals that guide class instruction in public speaking, debate, and discussion courses” (p. 5).

Despite these attempts at demonstrating forensic learning outcomes, there is no research in this area that stems directly from the communication curriculum. Furgerson (2012) suggested forensic scholars need to establish learning outcomes “to articulate the connection between forensics and the educational expectations of the institutions which house” forensic programs (p. 92). Without a direct link to specific curriculum-based learning outcomes, any learning that takes place in forensics can only be supported on the theoretical level, thus making it difficult to claim that forensics is co-curricular.

To address this concern, this study will use the Basic Communication Course (BCC) to model learning objectives. The BCC is an umbrella title that encompasses introductory, lower level communication or public speaking courses which instruct students on the essentials of communication studies. The BCC is required or recommended for a large portion of undergraduate students at many universities and colleges; it acts as a primary way of educating students about Communication Studies (Morreale, et al., 1999). The BCC tends to focus on one of two areas: public speaking content or a mix of public speaking and a variety of communication studies areas such as interpersonal and small group communication (Morreale, et al., 2010). Forensics has its roots in the communication studies field and covers many different areas of the discipline, most notably public speaking, making the BCC ideal from which to pull learning outcomes in a study about forensics. Despite this strong link, very little crossover has occurred in forensic and BCC literature, with Dean and Lavasseur (1989) and Zizik (1993) being a few of the rare exceptions.

In order to assess student learning in forensics through BCC learning objectives, the following research questions are proposed:

RQ 1: Do students perceive the experience gained on an intercollegiate forensic team can meet Basic Communication Course learning objectives?

RQ2: How do students learn from the experience gained on an intercollegiate forensic team?

Method

Participants

Participants in the study were recruited through the use of the Individual Events-Listserv (IE-L), which reaches a large portion of the individual events forensic community. Those on the IE-L were requested to pass along the online survey link to interested students currently competing in forensics. The online survey requested active forensic competitors to participate and if they were not active competitors to ignore the survey. All responses were anonymous and completed through an online survey provider.

A total of 58 participants completed the survey. The number of years of previous experience of the participants in collegiate forensics was evenly dis-

tributed: half the participants had one or less years of experience in collegiate forensics, while the other half had two to three years of experience.

Measures

This study was conducted using a survey created from BCC learning objectives collected from a variety of programs across the country. After placing a call for learning objectives/syllabi on the national BCC listserv, which garnered seventeen responses, a content analysis was performed on the input received. Learning objectives were collected from the syllabi and placed into categories to determine which types of objectives were most common. Based on thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) coding, sixteen learning objective categories appeared more frequently, thus making them statistically more significant than any of the remaining learning objectives.

The 16 learning objectives were then crafted into Likert scale prompts (see Appendix A) to help answer RQ1. The prompts were divided into sets of 5, 5, and 6. Each prompt in a set was written in the same formula, with each set having a new format so as to keep the respondents engaged in the survey. The Likert scale was created from the traditional five-point scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree). The survey was created for this study so no reliability tests were available prior to the start of the study. Each Likert scale prompt was followed by another prompt that asked the respondents to elaborate on how their experience in college forensics related to the response. These add-ons (see Appendix A) to each Likert scale prompt were designed to help answer RQ2.

Analysis

To analyze the data and answer RQ1, the Likert scale prompts were organized into categories of frequency and the analysis consisted of frequency, mean, and standard deviation. Tests were performed to determine the reliability of the survey. Grounded theory coding techniques (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) were used to address RQ2, where responses were categorized into similar themes. Each response warranted a unique analysis resulting in a variety of themes for every prompt.

Results

The majority of the respondents found that forensics did indeed offer the opportunities to have the same learning outcomes as the BCC. In delving into the frequency data (see Table 1), the responses indicate that forensic students see the activity as a place where they can learn a variety of communication concepts.

Table 1
Opportunities for BCC Learning Objectives in Collegiate Forensics: Frequency

Prompts	SA	A	N	D	SD
Oral communication	38	14	2	0	4
Research a speech topic	37	11	4	2	4
Outline/organize a speech	37	11	2	4	2
Write a speech	34	11	7	2	4
Deliver a speech	41	9	3	1	4
Small Group Communication	16	10	23	6	3
Interpersonal Communication	25	16	4	8	5
Basic Comm./Public Speaking theory	31	16	4	3	4
Persuasive techniques	30	13	9	0	4
Ethical communication	22	14	12	5	5
Critical thinking	31	15	7	1	4
Listening skills	29	17	6	3	3
Evaluate other speeches	38	11	6	0	3
Audience analysis	26	11	9	7	5
Variety of speeches	35	9	5	3	5
Communication tendencies in self	30	16	8	1	3

Note: The scale used about is a standard Likert Scale with SA= strongly agree, A=agree, N=neutral, D=disagree, SD=strongly disagree.

Standard deviation analysis was within acceptable parameters (Table 2), and the survey itself tested with a strong reliability score of a = .97. The BCC learning outcomes presented in the survey were positively linked to the students' forensic experience. These results pertaining to RQ1 suggest students do perceive the experience gained on an intercollegiate forensic team can meet Basic Communication Course learning objectives.

Table 2
Opportunities for BCC Learning Objectives in Collegiate Forensics: Mean and Standard Deviation

Prompts	Mean	SD
Oral communication	4.41	1.08
Research a speech topic	4.29	1.18
Outline/organize a speech	4.29	1.18
Write a speech	4.19	1.21
Deliver a speech	4.41	1.14
Small Group Communication	3.52	1.16
Interpersonal Communication	3.83	1.35
Basic Comm./Public Speaking theory	4.16	1.20

Persuasive techniques	4.16	1.16
Ethical communication	3.74	1.29
Critical thinking	4.17	1.16
Listening skills	4.14	1.13
Evaluate other speeches	4.40	1.04
Audience analysis	3.79	1.36
Variety of speeches	4.16	1.31
Communication tendencies in self	4.19	1.08

Beyond the numerical data, the open ended question yielded incredibly useful data regarding how forensics offers more advanced or better opportunities to learn than the traditional BCC. Advantages beyond the classroom were highlighted by the participants. Responses indicated collegiate forensics gives students “the opportunity to perform multiple types of speeches.” Compared to what a student can learn in a semester-long course, “There are alot [sic] more speech types then in gernal [sic] coms [sic] 101 class.” One student further expressed the difference between the classroom and forensics: “A Communications class teaches students within a controlled setting in a classroom, but speech not only does that, it also gives real-world experience in communication before large audiences.” Another student elaborated on the impact of learning in forensics:

Forensics really helps teach a speaker how to deliver a speech. In most other public speaking venues, immediacy with the audience is not very important. However, forensics really pushes a student to do this, which is hugely important to being a good speaker. Students also learn how to use appropriate gestures and facial expressions to get their point across.

Plenty of opportunities were important to the respondents, but so too was the time to work on those opportunities. As one student noted:

Forensics teaches you not only how to research but to research the topics that go unnoticed or missed. Particularly in informative and persuasive speaking you have to dig for analysis, stats, and information that is well above the considered levels of most undergraduate courses. Further, your research is continually revised and inspected by anywhere from 4-10 reviewers from multiple institutions each weekend. No other course on any college campus in any University across this country can promise the same thing.

Students explained that forensics offers significant time to explore ideas and “to think critically about the world around them”; something the traditional classroom does not offer. One student noted: “Practice makes perfect. Repeatedly putting yourself [sic] in front of an audience gives us, as competitors, the opportunity to deal with the nerves associated with performing in front of peers. I

have no fear when presenting in class anymore!” Another response echoed that sentiment: “I have learned more by applying [sic] speech skills in a competitive [sic] setting, then I ever did sitting in a classroom. Also you countinue [sic] to practice these skills, and work on professionalism much longer then [sic] in the classroom.”

The responses to the open-ended question reveal students share some learning experiences, but process them differently. It is important to remember when answering RQ2 that every student’s experience is different in forensics, and the way each student learns varies. These results to RQ2 were expected; experiential learning theory predicts student learning processing to be distinct to each student. Students elaborated on unique experiences for similar learning areas, demonstrating that different experiences can help varying students learn about similar communicative concepts.

Observation and reflection was a main theme found in the results. Student comments often declared listening and observing others to be an important learning technique to determine how to be successful in forensics. “Watching opponents was 80% of how I learned to be an effective national competitor,” one student wrote. “Speech is far more about listening and learning than just talking”, wrote another student. Another student explained that observational learning was just as important as direct experience: “You learn through not only experiencing speeches yourself, but also through hearing those around you for examples of what to do, as well as what not to do.” “Whether you mean to or not, you are always watching your fellow forensicators to see what techniques you like and which you don’t”, one student explained. Another student elaborated on assessment through comparison:

There's nothing like watching other people to improve your own skills. Watching good people allows me to adopt certain things while watching bad people allows me to avoid certain things. It took a little time to realize though what was simply neutral. Now everywhere I look I seem to be able to find issues in presentation.

Self-reflection and assessment was also a main theme in student responses. One student commented, “Through coaching and referencing of judges’ critiques I have done plenty of evaluation” of personal communication tendencies. Another student noted that “By performing in collegiate forensics, I have discovered what my weaknesses are when speaking publicly and have been able to work on those ideosyncrasies [sic].” Respondents explained that by evaluating their experiences and observations of others they could apply what was learned to future competitions and communicative relationships.

Discussion

Students rely on forensics being an experiential learning opportunity to have a deeper learning experience than in the classroom. Results from this study showed how many students learned through additional practice and applied ex-

perience in forensics. Looking at the results we can conclude forensics can offer the same learning objectives as the Basic Communication Course. Based on the results, self-assessment in forensics may be a viable assessment tool for forensic educators.

Nevertheless, these results act as a potentially defining argument as to how forensics is indeed educational. Due to the experiential component of the activity, forensic students can learn and grow just as in a traditional classroom setting. Forensic educators should turn to experiential literature to pick up tips on how to best teach their students during the forensic experience. Taking the lead from Sellnow (1994) and Walker (2011), forensic scholars need to research experiential learning in forensics more, and coaches need to integrate self-assessment of learning into their pedagogy to better assist students' in processing a unique forensic experience.

With these results it is also important to note that self-reflection can be an effective form of assessment not just in forensics, but for the classroom as well. Experiential education scholars have heralded this (Dewey, 1938; Jarvis, 2001; Wurdinger, 2005) but further evidence such as this study increase the legitimacy and use of experiential learning techniques. Further, this study can potentially provide a strong tool for the forensic community that is searching for assessment strategies that work (Kelly, 2010; Kelly & Richardson, 2010). Through the use of self-assessment forensic educators can assess student learning and provide assessment data for the activity. Ideally, forensic students would engage in more critical reflections (aided by their coaches) to assess learning. More than van rides or casually talking about the weekend in a coaching appointment, critical reflection needs to be happening in separate sessions as individuals and as groups. These self-reflections can help students navigate their experiences in forensics and demonstrate to researchers what they have learned through their experience.

Further analysis of the results found many forensic students are missing out on key parts of BCC learning. Student responses indicated a higher level of comfort with aspects of public speaking than with other forms of communication, but also noted they were familiar and engaged in other aspects of communication. Students taking the survey seemed to be unaware of the theoretical underpinnings of Small Group Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Listening, Ethics, and general public speaking. Even though many of them acknowledged the application of these things, most of them admitted to not having any formal training and being unaware of the "why" or "how" behind their communicative acts. Future research should explore the depth of knowledge students can acquire through forensic experience. Forensic educators should be wary; if forensic students do not learn the rationale behind forensic practices, than any skill they learn runs the risk of becoming non-transferable to other activities and aspects of their life. While the experience students' have in forensics provides plenty of learning opportunities, it must be paired with guided discussion to help students prepare for and process and learn from those experiences.

However, this presumes that coaches are teaching students about communication theory and the “why” behind forensic practices. Coaches often try to provide rationale for behaviors but because of the strain on time and resources, quality of coaching to novices tends to be about “getting them up to speed” instead of about teaching them about the building blocks of forensics. Until forensic professionals emphasize learning the basics in areas such as Small Group Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Listening, Ethics, and general public speaking theory, making the claim that forensics is pedagogically on par with the BCC can only be done conditionally. All we can say for certain is that forensics offers the opportunity to achieve the same learning outcomes as the BCC due to the experiential nature of the activity. Future researchers should continue to explore self-assessment and other forms of alternative assessment in order to discover the best way to evaluate our students’ learning.

There are some limitations to this study. The call for the syllabi used to create the survey prompts was listed only on the BCC listserv, which may not have reached all BCC instructors. The amount of syllabi received (17) could be expanded to reflect greater diversity among BCC programs. As a result, the learning objectives pulled from these syllabi may be an inaccurate representation of what is taught across the United States.

Fifty-eight (58) students participated in the study, making the total a small sample size. Results may be skewed because of the relatively small participation. Some teams and students may not have been reached when the survey was sent out using a listserv for forensic teams, to which not all teams subscribe. A larger sample size of syllabi and students would be acquired for future research.

Conclusion

As Outzen, Youngvorst, and Cronn-Mills (2013) noted, the future of collegiate forensics “is fraught with potential, both positive and negative” (p. 42). In order to capitalize on the positive potential, the forensic community must embrace educational ideas which can contribute to the benefit of students. Viewing forensics through the lens of experiential learning may offer forensic educators a pedagogical perspective to guide their students and the activity to a better future.

References

- Agne, R. R. (2010). Self-assessment as a dilemmatic communicative practice: Talk among psychics in training. *Southern Communication Journal*, 75(4), 306-327.
- Allen, M., Berkowitz, S., Hunt, S., & Loudon, A. (1997). Measuring the impact of forensics and communication education on critical thinking: A meta-analytic summary. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Andrade, H. G. & Boulay, B. A. (2003). Role of rubric-referenced self-assessment in learning to write. *Journal of Educational Research*, 97(1), 21-34.

- Andrade, H. & Valtcheva, A. (2009). Promoting learning and achievement through self-assessment. *Theory into Practice*, 48(1), 12-19.
- Bartanen, K. M. (1998). The place of the forensics program in the liberal arts college of the twenty-first century: An essay in honor of Larry E. Norton. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84(1), 1-15.
- Bartanen, M. (1994a). *Teaching and directing forensics*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Bartanen, M. D. (1994b). The Forensic Outcomes Assessment project: Can we measure the benefits of forensics to students? *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79(2), 26-27.
- Beasley, M. (1979). The educational values of forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 64(2), 20-22.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Brennan, D. (2011). *Defining success: Examining what it means to be good in forensics* (Unpublished master's thesis). Unpublished master's thesis. Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato, MN.
- Brownlee, D. R. (1979). The educational value of forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 64(2), 18-20.
- Burnett, A., Brand, J., & Meister, M. (2003) Winning as everything: Education as myth in forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 21(1), 12-23.
- Carroll, R. C. (2007). Forensics participation as gifted and talented education. *Rostrum*, 81(6), 34-36.
- Colbert, K. & Biggers, T. (1987). "Why should we support academic debate?" In D. Thomas & J. Hart (Eds.), *Advanced debate* (pp. 2-6). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Crawford, R. (2003). In defense of competitive speech. *Rostrum*, 78(3), 19-21.
- Cronn-Mills, D. & Croucher, S. (2001). Judging the judges: an analysis of ballots in Impromptu and Extemporaneous Speaking. *SpeakerPoints*, 8(2).
- Dean, K. W. & Lavasseur, D. G. (1989). Assessing the needs of academically talented students: A forensics model for the basic public speaking course. *National Forensic Journal*, 7(2), 133-142.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Sluljmsans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(3), 331-350.
- Dreibelbis, G. C., & Gullifor, P. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in mass media. *National Forensic Journal*, 10 (1), 77-82.
- Edwards, J. & Thompson, B. (2001). Judging the judges: A ballot analysis of Communication Analysis and After-Dinner Speaking. *SpeakerPoints*, 8(2).
- Ehninger, D. (1952). Six earmarks of a sound forensics program. *The Speech Teacher*, 7, 237-241.
- Friedley, S.A. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in interpersonal communication. *National Forensic Journal*, 10(1), 51-56.

- Furgerson, J. L. (2012). I need help find it: Understanding the benefits of research skill acquisition in competitive forensics. *Speaker & Gavel*, 49(2), 88-95.
- Gartell, K. B. (1973). Educational forensics: Another viewpoint. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 58(2), 3-6.
- Gaskill, R. (1998). Bad taste: Nothing should be done: Celebrating diversity. *SpeakerPoints*, 5(2).
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Holloway, K., Keefe, C., & Cowles, R. (1989). Who are Pi Kappa Deltans and why do they gravitate to forensics? *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 74(2), 1-12.
- Hunt, S. B. & Inch, E. S. (1993). The top fifty forensics programs in the US: A twenty year retrospective. (Eric Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 357 407).
- Jarvis, P. (2001). *Learning in later life: An introduction for educators and careers*. London: Kogan Page.
- Jensen, S. (2008, August). *An optimum balance of forensic goals balancing competitive and educational ends through forensic honoraries*. Paper presented at the NCD-IE: National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Peoria, IL.
- Kelly, B. (2010). *Founding practice: Examining intercollegiate competition as assessment*. Paper presented at the NDC-IE: National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Bloomington, MN.
- Kelly, B. B. & Richardson, R. (2010). Documenting teaching efficacy: Pedagogical prerogatives, learning outcomes, and the future of forensics as an academic activity. *National Forensic Journal*, 28(2), 170-195.
- Klopf, D. W. (1990). *Coaching & directing forensics*. Lincoln, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kostons, D., van Gog, T., & Paas, F. (2012). Training self-assessment and task-selection skills: A cognitive approach to improving self-regulated learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 22(2), 121-132.
- Kuster, T. (1998). Locating and defining the problems of bad taste in college forensics. *SpeakerPoints*, 5(2).
- Kuyper, C. (2009). *In-roads to out-rounds: An intercultural approach to newcomer integration into the macro-culture of forensics* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato, MN.
- Mallard, J. & Quintanilla, K. (2007). *Does videotaped feedback for speeches impact student learning? Student self-assessment of public speaking*. Presented at the National Communication Association conference. Chicago, IL.
- McBath, J. H. (Ed.). (1975). *Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company.
- McCrary, R. (2004). Forensics, debate and the SAT. *Rostrum*, 79(3), 41-44.

- McMillan, J. K. & Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1991). An assessment of the value of individual events in forensics competition from students' perspectives. *National Forensic Journal*, 9(1), 1-17.
- Millsap, S. (1998). The benefits of forensics across the curriculum: An opportunity to expand the visibility of college forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84(1), 17-25.
- Minch, K. (2006). The value of speech, debate, and theater activities. *Rostrum*, 81(4), 8-13.
- Morreale, S. P., Hanna, M. S., Berko, R. M. & Gibson, J. W. (1999). The basic communication course in U.S. colleges and universities: VI. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 11, 1-36.
- Morreale, S.P., Worley, D.W. & Hugenberg, B. (2010). The basic communication course at two-and four-year U.S. colleges and universities: Study VIII-The 40th Anniversary. *Communication Education*, 59(4), 405-430.
- Morreale, S., Backlund, P., Hay, E. & Moore, M. (2011). Assessment of oral communication: A major review of the historical development and trends in the movement from 1975 to 2009. *Communication Education*, 60(2), 255-278.
- Nadolski, D. J. (2003). *Applying the secrets of CEOs to forensics: Cross application of leadership to the business and forensic worlds* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato, MN.
- Outzen, C. P., Youngvorst, L. J. & Cronn-Mills, D. (2013). The next 50 years of forensics: Acknowledging problems, preparing solutions. *Speaker and Gavel*, 50(2), 33-45.
- Pelias, R. J. (1984). Evaluating interpretation events on the forensic circuit. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 20, 224-230.
- Peters, T. L. (2009). An investigation into the relationship between participation in competitive forensics and standardized test scores. *Rostrum*, 84(2), 37-51.
- Petkov, D. & Petkova, O. (2006). Development of scoring rubrics of IS projects as an assessment tool. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 3, 499-510.
- Pratt, J. W. (1998). Bad taste: Something should be done. *SpeakerPoints*, 5(2).
- Quenette, A.M., Larson-Casstelton, C., and Littlefield, R.S. (2007). Competitors perceived advantages and disadvantages to participation in collegiate individual events. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 92(1), 9-18.
- Re, R. M. (2002). Unique intellectual environment. *Rostrum* 76(8), 4, 80.
- Reitmeier, C. A., Svendsen, L. K., & Vrchota, D. A. (2004). Improving oral communication skills of students in food science courses. *Journal of Food Science Education*, 3, 15-20.
- Richardson, R. & Kelly, B. (2008, August). *Re-examining competition and education in collegiate forensics: Establishing the need for a pedagogical prerogative perspective*. Paper presented at the NDC-IE: National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Peoria, IL.

- Ross, J. A., Hogaboam-Gray, A., & Rolheiser, C. (2002). Student self-evaluation in grade 5-6 mathematics: Effects on problem-solving achievement. *Educational Assessment*, 8(1), 43-59.
- Schnoor, L. & Green, K. (1989). Issues in the relational dynamic of the director/assistant director: Reactions from the respective positions. *National Forensic Journal*, 7(1), 43-51.
- Schroeder, A. B. & Schroeder, P. L. (1995). Educational objectives and forensics: An administrative perception. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 80(4), 13-20.
- Sellnow, D. (1994). Justifying forensic programs to administrators: An experiential education opportunity. *National Forensic Journal*, 11(2), 1-14.
- Sellnow, T., Littlefield, R. & Sellnow, D. (1992). *Evaluating internships and overcoming program concerns and constraints*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Stenger, K. (1999). Forensics as preparation for participation in the academic world. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84(4), 13-23.
- Swanson, D. R. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in organizational communication. *National Forensic Journal*, 10 (1), 65-76.
- Taras, M. (2010). Student self-assessment: Processes and consequences. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(2), 199-209.
- Thompson, B. (2003). *Mental preparation: Reducing anxiety and enhancing performance in the public speaking classroom and forensics* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato, MN.
- Walker, B. (2011). Developing an experiential-service learning approach in collegiate forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 29(1), 6-33.
- Wurdinger, S.D. (2005). *Using experiential learning in the classroom: Practical ideas for all educators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Yaremchuk, W. A. (1979). The educational value of forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 64(2), 16-18.
- Zeuschner, R.B. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in small group communication. *National Forensic Journal*, 10 (1), 57-64.
- Zizik, C. H. (1993). Using forensics as a waiver for the basic speech course. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79(1), 5-7.

Appendix A

ONLINE SURVEY

How many years of collegiate forensics have you competed in before this year? (select 0-3) _____

Please respond to the prompts in a way that most accurately reflects your experience in collegiate forensics. The numbers are based on a five-point Likert item scale:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

“My experience in collegiate forensics has provided opportunities to...”

“...apply effective oral communication.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...research a topic for a speech.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...outline and organize a speech.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...write a speech.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...deliver a speech.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“Collegiate forensics has provided opportunities to...”

“...apply knowledge about Small Group Communication (e.g.; group roles, conflict resolution, teamwork, group think).”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...apply knowledge about Interpersonal Communication (e.g.; self-concept, self-esteem, relationship maintenance, managing self-disclosure, effective listening, managing conflict).”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...apply knowledge about basic Communication and Public Speaking theory (e.g.; verbal and nonverbal communication, process of communication).”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...apply effective persuasive techniques.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...learn about ethical responsibility in communication.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“By participating in collegiate forensics I have...”

“...had the chance to improve my critical thinking about the communication process.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...had the chance to improve my listening skills.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...had the chance to evaluate other’s speeches.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...had the chance to analyze an audience for a speech.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...had the chance to prepare and deliver a variety of different types of speeches.”

1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

“...had the chance to evaluate verbal and nonverbal communication tendencies in myself.”

1

2

3

4

5

Please elaborate on how your experience in college forensics relates to your response.

Benjamin Walker, Southwest Minnesota State University.