

---

EVERYTHING IS WHAT IT IS AND NOT ANOTHER THING:  
A HIERARCHICAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION IN INFORMATIVE,  
PERSUASION AND COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS

GARY ALLEN  
GEORGE DENNIS  
SOUTHEASTERN ILLINOIS COLLEGE

Most forensics coaches have read ballots in which the evaluation doesn't seem to apply to the speech. Most coaches have read ballots that say nothing - the "good job; tough round; 4th" ballot. Most coaches have had to offer explanations to students about the lack of quality or lack of apparent standards in the evaluation of speeches. And most coaches are aware of two inherent problems with judging. First, in many tournaments, judges do not judge the events they coach (they have too many slots). For example, those who coach communication analysis judge interpretation; those who coach interpretation judge extemporaneous. Judges will inevitably bring the criteria of their own coaching event into judgements about other events of which they may be less secure, less current, or less concerned. Over time, this can subtly change the expectations and fundamental approach to an event. Second, hired judges may or may not be qualified to judge. Often they admit that they don't know what to write on a ballot; they do not feel confident about the criteria for judging a given event; and they are usually not directly involved in tournament forensics and would like some direction about what is expected of them as judges. Finally, we want to make the point that all judges are obliged to listen, but some need more direction about what to listen for. It only makes sense that, if all judges had a clearer understanding of the events and the criteria for judging them, there would be more uniformity in judging and more worthwhile evaluations would be written.

To us, the goal seems obvious. Ballots ought to be pedagogically sound. Ballots should contain information that allows the student to make improvements, that provides a basis for the judgement, that gives support for contentions, and that strives to judge students on the basis of the nature of the event and the criteria which apply to that event.

Perhaps that last point needs some clarification. We strongly believe that each tournament event is distinct -- that each calls for special skills and that

each has its own criteria. Further, we would argue that these criteria are hierarchical, and that without an understanding of this hierarchy judges (and students) do not really have a sound idea of the nature of the event. In short, as educators we are concerned with the foundations and demands of each event. It follows that each event should be evaluated on the basis of the hierarchical criteria which make each event fundamentally what it is.

In order to achieve these ends, we will focus upon three events that are of particular concern or interest to us -- Informative, Persuasion, and Communication Analysis. In doing so, we will discuss problems and trends in evaluation that we perceive in each event, and argue for a hierarchical criteria that ought to be the basis for evaluation and judgement. In addition we will present a suggestion for a ballot-form that we believe will help improve the ballots as well as give a boost toward more uniformity of standards.

#### INFORMATIVE

Informative speaking should be distinguished from expository speaking. If a particular tournament event is expository, then what we suggest does not apply; we believe, however, that our suggestions point toward the essential differences between the two events.

We seem to have seen over the past six or seven years certain "trends" which have crept into the evaluation of informative speeches that are neither valid or desirable. Perhaps the most important is that, as a criterion, depth and extent of research does not now seem to be very heavily weighted. The newness of the information, the angle of approach, or the presentation of knowledge at a deeper level or broader extent than might be easily researched or located, do not often appear to be major factors in evaluation. Comments about research are rare on informative ballots. And it seems to us that almost no effort is made to distinguish between primary and secondary research, and little "credit" is given to the student who is able to use both. The result is that informative speeches which exhibit little research beyond that found in a beginning classroom speech may win over speeches showing much more creative research.

Secondly, there seems to be a confusion between significance and uniqueness. A unique topic may or may not be significant; if it isn't, then the criterion of uniqueness should not override significance in another speech. To put it another way, the comment "so what?" is a valid point in distinguishing significance, but "What does it mean to me?" is not. Intellectually considered, if a speech is significant, then it ought to mean something to the judge, and whether or not it attracts the judge emotionally is really not pertinent in a contest situation. (We believe the pull of subjectivity will assert itself anyhow, and whatever effort can be brought to bear against its tug is worthwhile.) Finally, there seems to us to be an unwritten trend toward mandatory humor in informative speeches. We have nothing against humor, but over and over we

listen to speeches in which the humor is obviously applied and strained, and over and over we hear students acknowledge that if the informative speech is not "light" enough, it won't win. In connection with this, but not precisely the same, from our perspective one of the most damaging comments a judge can make is that the speech contains "too much" information, or is guilty of "information overload." If the speech is poorly written, or disorganized, or structurally unsound or illogical, then the fault is in the composition. It is possible, we suppose, for a speech to be overloaded with information, but in 15 years we have never heard a contest speech that contained "too much" information. After all, it is incumbent for the judge to be listening.

Our position then is that, of all speeches, informative speeches should be the most research oriented; that judges should approach evaluating the event with the frame of mind that, if the student shows significance, the judge must weigh the speech intellectually; and that no unwritten criteria (such as humor) should play a role in the final judgement.

The criteria, in hierarchical order, with a suggested point system (25 points) relative to the hierarchy, and with explanation, would be:

#### I. Research (0-6)

- A. A contest quality informative speech should exceed the research expectations of a classroom-level speech.
- B. A contest quality informative speech should probe beyond "popular" magazines (beyond what an extemporaneous speaker could put together from his files in 30 minutes).
- C. A judge should weigh sources and not simply count the number of citations (In informative speeches it is plausible that one primary source would be superior to several "popular magazine" sources).

#### II. Significance (0-6)

- A. The significance of the topic and of the development of the topic should be indicated and supported.
- B. Judges should evaluate intellectually and not emotively ("What does it mean to me?" is not valid because of constraints placed on "real" audience analysis by the nature of contests).
- C. Uniqueness should be a subpoint weighed under significance, but uniqueness must be coupled with significance. Significance and uniqueness are not competing criteria. A unique topic that raises the question "so what?" does not meet the test of significance.

#### III. Organization and Support (0-5)

- A. The speech should be clearly focused, but students should not be bound to simplistic, formulaic introductions. (Too often judges listen only for a 1, 2, 3, and comments like "Tell me specifically what you are doing" appear on ballots simply because the student "broke" the formula).
- B. The speech should be easy to follow by a judge actively listening to the

performance.

- C. Supporting material and examples should be used effectively.
- D. There should be a sense of balance among the divisions of the speech.

#### IV. Performance (0-4)

- A. The oral performance should be without distraction.
- B. The speaker should be poised, animated, direct and exhibit projection and eye contact.
- C. Posture, gestures and movement should be constructive and natural.
- D. The vocal performance should be audible, varied, and expressive.
- E. Articulation should be free of defects and utilize an acceptable standard of pronunciation.
- F. Use of visuals ought to be effective and promote meaning.

#### V. Language (0-4)

- A. The speech should be written in oral language, but not necessarily simplistic language.
- B. Language usage ought to be accurate, specific, varied and appropriate.
- C. Use of images, tropes, wit or other devices, should be appropriate to the topic of the speech.
- D. In general, informative speeches should demonstrate sound speechwriting that reflects the criteria of the event.

#### PERSUASION

One of the major problems in persuasive speaking is a lack of clarity in the nature of the event. For some judges, persuasion equals a problem-solution speech; for others, it does not. We take the position that persuasion as a contest event may include any of several formats. Too often, it seems, judges will insist that the speech must offer solutions that they personally can undertake. The comment, "What can I do about it?" appears quite frequently; we are opposed to this as a necessary criterion. First, it restricts topic selection and promotes the use of "trendy" topics. (This is why, we feel, rather insignificant topics are often selected above more significant ones.) Secondly, this criterion fosters "phony" solutions. And finally, this criterion fosters "phony" organizational patterns. (We hear a lot of comment about "cookie-cutter" rhetorical criticism, but in fact, we hear more "cookie-cutter" problem-solution patterns in persuasion than we do formulaic application in criticism.)

For us, the structure should fit the demands of the topic. It is probably true that the majority of topics that can be handled by students within the time constraints happen to fall in the problem-solution format. We also feel that the problem-solution format is educationally valuable as a teaching device, and one of the very best ways to teach argument. However, our position is that persuasion as an event can and ought to include argument, problem-solution, stimulation, speech to convince, or even speeches of inspiration. Persuasion should be allowed the freedom given debate in this respect, and student

creativity should be encouraged. All we demand is that the structure of the speech promote its persuasive power.

Another problem with persuasive evaluation rests with what appears to be an unwritten requirement that persuasion contains some overt emotive element. Some very important argumentative topics do not require tears. No matter how sound the value system, students begin to feel obligated to "find the bodies" in a persuasive speech. We believe that students should be able to deal philosophically with a value system and that applied pathos should be discarded as a criterion. In fact, if pathos is not inherent in the topic, it may be a fault to simply "throw it in."

Topic selection is an important criterion which we feel is not valued highly enough. To be blunt, we believe there are too many rereads in persuasion. Basically the student should be encouraged to find fresh topics, fresh perspectives, or fresh solutions.

Finally, we take a position that categorically denies that audience analysis should be a criterion for evaluation. We realize that in the teaching of persuasion, audience analysis is a crucial element; yet in a forensics tournament the persuasive speaker is absolutely unable to adapt the speech to the audience that will judge it. And, while students can modify delivery to individual judges, other constraints inherent in contest speaking preclude virtually any content changes. Therefore, contest persuasion should be recognized as unique and some other factor besides audience analysis must destroy the persuasive power of the speech.

The criteria we suggest, in hierarchical order, with a suggested point system (25 points) relative to the hierarchy, and with explanations, would be:

#### I. Significance of Topic (0-6)

A. Significance should be measurable by some value system, such as:

1. The human condition (illness, death, crime rate, etc.)
2. The cost in economic terms, or
3. Ethical considerations established within speech.

(All value systems should receive fair hearing.)

B. Claims of significance should be weighed against support for those claims.

#### II. Evidence and Reasoning (0-6)

A. The speaker should have sufficient evidence to support the claims.

B. The evidence ought to be applied toward the claims and be logically relevant.

C. Arguments should be both sound and valid.

#### III. Performance Effectiveness (0-5)

A. Pathos and ethos should emerge from the quality of the material and from the speaker's sincerity. (The speech should not be "staged" nor should

pathos be applied.)

B. The speaker should exhibit sound non-verbal performance skills (poise, projection, eye contact, gestures, etc.)

C. The voice should be audible and varied in rate, free of defects in articulation or other distractions.

D. The performance as a whole should be expressive of the logical and emotional meanings of the speech.

#### IV. Organization (0-4)

A. The lines of argument should be easily followed by an actively listening judge.

B. The organizational pattern should be effective for the topic. Judges should not judge on the basis of how they would have handled the topic.

C. The organization should reflect in a consistent way the intent of the speech (that is, problem-solution, convince, inspire, argue, etc.)

#### V. Language (0-4)

A. The speech should use clear, accurate, specific oral language.

B. The standard of usage should be appropriate for the topic.

C. The use of figurative language (description, image, visualization, etc.) should be appropriate for the topic and not merely applied.

#### COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS

First, we do not wish to consider the Communication Analysis vs. Rhetorical Criticism issue. As in persuasion, we do not want to be too prescriptive, and so we believe that the event should have the latitude to allow for a variety of approaches -- that is, the speech could be analysis, criticism, or some combination, and that as long as the student can justify the significance of the artifact or the value of the analysis, then the judge should not arbitrarily decide what is legitimate.

We do feel that significance is extremely important as a criterion; for us, there are two major ideas to consider here. First is the analysis itself and second is the heuristic value of the speech - at its most fundamental level, the question is, "Has something been learned?". Far too often we find speeches with rather shallow analysis winning rounds. Often judges are simply unfamiliar with the methodology and therefore seem reluctant to evaluate the analysis itself. Since a major rationale for the event is to teach the student how to develop and utilize critical methodology, then it is important that judges weigh the use of the methodology, its application, the use of specific details and examples, and the establishment of clear and insightful conclusions. The speech should clearly articulate its analysis or critical method and judges should evaluate the use to which the method is put and the way it allows conclusions to be drawn. It is also important for judges to consider the value of those conclusions -- by this we mean whether or not new insights, benefits, appreciations, or awareness is the result of the analysis. We are also

by whom?

concerned here with a trend we perceive in Communications Analysis. There seems to be a changing personality in this event similar to the trend in Informative. That is, more and more we see a move away from specific analysis or criticism toward the display of information for its own sake -- in fact, even a move toward expository-like speeches. Again, some students are beginning to feel that the speech must contain humor or at least be "light" enough to offer some entertainment value to the judge and the audience. We do not feel this should be a consideration in judging.

Connected to this perhaps is the trend toward what we believe to be a serious over-weighting of performance. The National Forensic Journal, Vol. II, No. 2, Fall 1984 article, "A Categorical Content Analysis of Rhetorical Criticism Ballots" by Kevin Dean and William Benoit offers evidence of this trend. They found that comments on delivery were the largest category of all comments on Communication Analysis ballots. In looking at approximately 550 Communication Analysis ballots received by our own team over the last four years, we discovered that performance was apparently the primary criterion for evaluation in more than two-thirds of those ballots. The results of this emphasis upon delivery are stylized performances and "interpreted" delivery of the artifact. We feel delivery skills should be the lowest ranking criterion in this event.

A further problem in evaluation of Communication Analysis is the lack of insistence upon in-depth research, and the acceptance of assertions within the speech. It is important for the student to demonstrate knowledge of both the artifact and the methodology; furthermore, the accuracy of any conclusions reached must be weighted against the support or logic for those conclusions. Even more importantly, the analysis or criticism is all too often to no apparent purpose, and we feel that in this event the student must confront the artifact explicitly. We would concur with John Murphy in his article "Theory & Practice in Communication Analysis" in the Spring, 1988 National Forensics Journal that the student should confront questions of meaning, truth, ethics and other "social" or "pragmatic" issues.

Finally we feel that judges often evaluate on criteria that definitely should not be considerations. Most especially judges should not debate the choice of methodologies. The evaluation of the method is irrelevant in contests. The evaluation should be based on whether the student's choice worked in terms of the results achieved. The student, by age and experience, cannot be expected to know all the various critical methods. (There is no agreement on critical methods by scholars in the field.) If the student provides external and internal support, and if the method is used to gain insights, then the judge should accept it. If the method is clearly misapplied then the judge ought to explain why on the ballot. (Statements like "Bitzer's situational concept is not a method" are not acceptable. The judge ought to explain why the method is

misapplied.) To us, if the judge sees that the student, through the methodology, provides some insights into the artifact, then that is enough.

Finally, if the tournament allows for questions, we do not believe that the demand that the student know virtually everything about the artifact, the occasion, the historical context or extensions of the method, is valid. Yes, the student should be expected to know those things directly pertinent to his specific analysis, but too often the questions become a sort of contest between the judge and the student, and this we believe is unfair.

One final point we would argue is that the hierarchical criteria we suggest is designed for a contest in Communication Analysis. From an academic or scholarly point of view 10 minutes is perhaps not enough time for analysis. Yet we believe Communication Analysis can be valuable. Our criteria, we feel allows for this value to emerge.

The criteria we suggest, in hierarchical order, with a suggested point system (25 points) relative to the hierarchy, and with explanations, would be:

I. Significance (0-6)

- A. The speaker should justify the analysis by some measurable criteria.
- B. The speaker should provide insights, critical judgement, or new perspectives about the artifact.

II. Application of Method to Artifact or Vice-Versa (0-6)

- A. The speaker should explain the selected methodology and indicate why it is being used. (The judge should evaluate effectiveness of usage relative to the student's conclusions but should not argue "I know a better way.")
- B. The speaker should "apply" the method to the artifact in some sort of effective manner. That is, the method should help the student arrive at some insights, and an actively listening judge should be able to understand the application.
- C. If the speech is attempting to validate the method, then the artifact should be utilized in such a way that it clearly gives support for the general theoretical position of the method -- the support should ideally be both quantitative and qualitative.

III. Organization and Structure (0-6)

- A. The organization should be followed easily by an actively listening judge. (The speech need not be "easy" in the sense that it must be shallow or simplistic.)
- B. The nature of communication analysis is such that it requires clear construction - thesis, transitions, lines of analysis and support for conclusions are all crucial.

IV. Internal and External Support for Conclusions (0-5)

- A. The conclusions must reflect the method of analysis.
- B. External support (from research) in the form of governmental decisions, media reports, polls, or success of speaker, should be offered and linked

to the analysis.

C. There should be integration of description and analysis or criticism, and description ought to serve the purpose of the speech.

D. Assertions must be supported by evidence or logical reasoning.

V. Performance (0-2)

A. The speaker's performance should not detract from understanding the speech. (We want to note here that most tournaments allow for manuscript use, yet it is nonetheless true, that comments about memorization are very common. This does not seem fair. Furthermore, of all contest events, performance seems to us to rank lowest as a criteria in this event.)

The hierarchical criteria for which we have argued in Informative, Persuasion and Communication Analysis we believe will promote better evaluation by judges. Our particular point system could be altered for tournaments which use a 100-point system, or the criteria could be simply ranked. However, we would argue strongly for this hierarchy for we believe it clarifies and delineates the true nature of these events. Furthermore, it is, after all, the point system which advances contestants. A hierarchical criteria will allow students to write speeches that reflect their understanding of the event, which ought to be the basis upon which they are evaluated. Such criteria will help hired judges also by providing them with objective standards for judging. Furthermore, such criteria would promote more uniformity of judging and more helpful ballots. Until the forensics community comes to some agreement about criteria for evaluation of tournament events, and until judges have some clarification about judging standards, we fear the practice of evaluation will remain pretty much as it is right now.

INFORMATIVE BALLOTS

We feel that Informative is becoming an event where the emphasis is/has shifting/shifted to a light, expository style and where primary sources and detailed information are often punished rather than rewarded. The following ballots are indicative of our concerns.

I. This student was a national gold medalist in extemporaneous and communications analysis. He was a silver medalist in impromptu, and he failed to "break" his fourth event, informative, by one ranking. His speech was on the importance of an effective communication network in the spread of street gangs in America. The student used only three "magazine" sources. The bulk of his information came from correspondence with the Illinois and California Departments of Corrections. He used studies, compilations and personal interviews.

This ballot ranked the student 3rd.

"Significance of gang communication could have been better clarified. There's quite a bit of information here, but I think you might have cited more

sources. You seem to offer evidence on a number of matters. How was the warden in a position to know? How does this impact on me?"

II. This student also missed breaking by the ranking. 1-3-3 Two ballots reflect the preference for light, shallow speeches.

RANK: 3

"Your technique is showing. You have taken a potential(ly) complex topic and made it more simple - good.

Relax and be conversational. The sentences-words-visuals quite good."

RANK: 3

"Important information, obviously well researched. Rate a bit fast. I'm not sure I could pass a post-speech test. Less detail would have had a more lasting effect. Great conclusion!"

III. This judge in the final round at the national tournament identifies the event as expository, and what he does not say is as important as what he does say. Student was ranked fourth by this judge and received a silver medal.

"Truly a highly technical (underlining was judge's), biological EXPOSITORY, - It is easy to discern that you've done tremendous research. Well organized - well presented - 4th Thanks..."

IV. More of same different year '86 Final round Nationals Speaker managed a gold medal, but this judge ranked 4th.

"You know your material well and have a highly significant, well researched, technical speech.

Vary your pacing more.

I love your cute ending, could have used more of that in speech needed more finality in delivery."

V. This speech was probably our most significant informative of 1987-88. The girl who wrote the speech prefers serious, complex speeches. As a result, in both persuasion and informative she had lots of 1-2-6 tournaments. This ballot is from a final round at an invitational where she ranked 2-2-6 in finals. The judge offers a compilation of our concerns for informative.

"Your information has got to go - your analogy of the Human Body/Earth needs to be dropped - Earth with Aids - come on - was this Gary or George's idea - okay - it might be creative but... (Note: Her introduction was a quotation from a scientist comparing the potential for a systems breakdown on earth with Aids in a human. The student identified the source of the quotation. The judge simply wasn't listening.) Make Biosphere your speech - not just support for the topic - That's where the fun stuff is - Boy - how would you like to be one of the Humans - Maybe you should relate this to Star Trek or The Genesis Project - The visual is good - Biosphere is interesting but not the first half. (Note: the "first half" was an explanation of the scientific community's concerns about toxic overload on the planet that were the impetus for Biosphere II.)

### PERSUASION BALLOTS

These examples of persuasion ballots were selected because each of the speakers was a proven competitor. Example one was the 1987-88 Illinois State Champion, Phi Rho Pi Regional Champion, Phi Rho Pi National Gold Medalist and 1987-88 Interstate Oratory winner. The other examples were all national medalists in the event.

I. The first two examples are representative of a judge ranking a performer against her own earlier performance.

Persuasion Ballot--(Interstate Oratory Winner)

NATIONAL FINAL - Good - Fourth - "Good speech, but you were a little off today weren't you? Delivery was a little flat vs. last time I heard this speech."

"Delivery smooth - you know speech well - Your movements give me the impression that you are programmed to do a particular thing on a particular 'que' - try to naturalize"

The same judge said nothing on his ballot the "last time" he listened to her speech.

REGIONAL FINAL - Same Judge - Second-Superior

"Plutonium"

"Nature"

"Safety"

"Unusual, unknown subject matter."

II. Three ballots from same round indicate another interesting judging trend. Notice the criteria of the two judges ranking this student first especially the specifics of the second judge. Judge two not only recognized the student's strengths but also quite accurately identified her weaknesses. However, rather than dropping her, he "weighed" her against others in round. The judge ranking her fourth gave her little indication of why she was ranked fourth.

JUDGE RANKING: First

"Interesting topic - New and topical

-Well documented and well structured speech- well written with attention getting statements throughout.

-Good strong ending

-Nice job in a hard round"

JUDGE RANKING: First

"NASA/Plutonium/Safety

Great support and set up

Great purpose statement

This is some scary Info.! I just can't believe NASA was actually going to do this -

You used source citations very well - Really boosts your credibility -

You have a great, confident style and voice - you use these very well.

Who is Carl Grossman? What state is Cong. Markie from?

Why don't you give us addresses to write to - come up with a handout with names, addresses & phone #: So we can really take action

- An excellent spch! Congrats

Very close among top 3."

JUDGE RANKING: Fourth

"-I felt your preview set up speech well - Excellent topic - one I found quite alarming

-Work on physical delivery"

III. Our other Interstate entry - Second in State Tournament Same judge that referred to previous performance in National finals with first student - Apparently decision was based on "rhetorical style vs. conversational style" - without supporting examples.

RANK: Fourth - (Regional Finals)

"Good subject

Well documented

Well organized

Try to hold your head still

Smile once in a while

You dropped the end of a sentence

Could you compromise between rhetorical style and conversational style?"

IV. 1987 - Gold medalist at Nationals - Regional Champion Primary criterion in final round at Nationals was "greater sense of personal conviction and involvement." Fortunately, other judges disagreed.

RANK: Fourth - Nationals

"Whew! Powerfully done!

Excellent documentation, development, relation to people in this room. Use gestures at very beginning of speech more. Those above you selected based on greater sense of personal conviction and involvement.

Button jacket before you go to front"

V. This ballot represents one of our greatest complaints. The ego of the judge got involved in the round. This judge was a former public address "star" at a major university. She seldom "weighs" student against others in round and usually debates persuasion speakers. Great competitor - terrible judge.

1986 - Gold medalist at Nationals - Final Round ballot at major invitational. Student ranked 1-2-6 - Finished second

Following is total of ballot ranking student sixth.

"Has anyone ever told you that you sound like Rod Serling. Perhaps it was so creative that I didn't notice it, but you need to have an internal preview. Tell us what main points you are going to cover in the speech. You are really not convincing me of anything."

Same speech, same round

RANK: First - Excerpt - (Not complete ballot)

"Clarity of organization is high point - you are very easy to follow...."

#### COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS BALLOTS

The following examples of Communications Analysis ballots represent many of the judging problems discussed in our position statement.

I. Say nothing ballot --unqualified judge.

FINALS - Invitational Tournament (1-1-4)

Fourth Place Ballot "Excellent content

Good organization

Your gestures are a bit stiff" Same judge - Same Round - Our best C.A. of 1987-88 (2-2-6)

Sixth Place Ballot

"Excellent content

Organization is O.K. - Focus on the images in your speech" (sic)

II. Admittedly unqualified, the judge claims to rank according to "rhetorical principles" without indicating those "principles."

Student - Second most valuable speaker at Phi Rho Pi Nationals in 1987 - Odessa, Texas -

Invitational tournament - Round III, preliminaries -

Student won tournament 1-1-3 in finals.

-This judge ranked third in prelims.

"(student's name) - I don't really feel qualified to judge this event.

However, comments are expected. I find your topic entertaining and your delivery fine. Excellent development of main points - fine transition. In listening to all the other speeches - I ranked according to application of rhetorical principles. The others were easier to follow and and logical - yours was too. But somewhere ranks have to occur."

III. Bad ballots can also be favorable -

Student ranked second in round - 27 Total comments: "Sophisticated Analysis."

IV. Worst ballot of last year-judge's criteria were difficult to identify. Decision seemed to rest on performance skills.

RANK: Fourth in a preliminary round at an invitational tournament. Student was National gold medalist.

"Nice idea for intro. - Delivery is stale, uninspired and dishonest - work at sincere delivery style. I stand ready to be convinced, but your task is immense because of not the analysis alone you chose - but the subject i.e. heroes - That seem to have other factors in play than mere rhetoric.

The problem for you - then - if you chose to do 'heros' (sic) is to spend time - quality time - convincing me that this analysis can indeed happen to 'heros'

- Perhaps if you were sincere instead of declamatory or 'forensic', the sec-

tion mentioned above could be ignored. If I trusted you, I might be convinced even though logic is lacking

As you did your review of what romantic rhetoric is and inferred its connection to North, I become a bit more convinced. Perhaps the analysis would work if you were sincere, took more time, made it less an exercise of rhetorical analysis and more a communication of ideas."

V. These examples characterize personal criteria not included in rules.

Speaker - given THIRD at Nationals-other two rounds-2-2

"Try to avoid having the t.v. camera on while you talk." (Note: The student was explaining the visual impact of the advertisement with the sound off.) "Second and third places were awarded because of use of elaborate electronic aids." (Both second and third place used V.C.R.'s. The judge arbitrarily chose to rank lower because he objected to visuals.) He dropped each a rank for using visuals.

Same student at Nationals - round 2 Nationals -

RANK: 2

Judge questioned criteria without support.

"A real world C.A. that we need to start thinking about. Very Well done! I enjoyed your upbeat approach to C.A. I am not sure the criteria is best to look at ads. I felt more of a personal criteria might be better. Nice job, thank you"

Same student - round 3 Nationals -

RANK: Second

Judge is same one who admitted to being unqualified in another round of C.A. Now, the judge is evaluating on his perception of the understanding of the other competitors.

"I'm not sure the students listening really understood your speech. Set up visuals before round to save time. Delivery skills are extremely effective. You tend to bog down in vocabulary. Interesting topic and speech."

VI. This is a typical preliminary round C.A. ballot.

Student was Regional Gold medalist

This ballot is from an invitational preliminary round.

RANK: Fourth

"You need to be more dramatic in your delivery of the introductory material.

Gestures don't keep your elbows "tied" so tightly to your sides. The gestures seem unduly subdued."

The previous student began research on her C.A. in late June of 1987. The speech went through four complete rewrites. She "broke" it in five of seven tournaments. However, after all that work, she traveled 900 miles to Nationals to get three judges whose criteria of decision were at best "extra-topical" for C.A.