

judge. The ballot shows what you are doing right, and what you're doing wrong in the round. They are an integral learning tool of an education-based event." Just as was the case for judges, these comments reflect that competitors are viewing ballots as a means of obtaining valuable ideas for improving their performances.

RECOMMENDATIONS

With these conclusions in mind, there are recommendations that should be made for education in both forensics and the classroom.

Recommendations for Forensics

The high degree of meaning agreement between judges and competitors about ballots suggests that most people involved in forensics are already communicating with one another effectively about perceptions and purposes of ballots. A great deal of research has already been done about how ballots are being written and offers suggestions for effective ballot writing; however, not all judges are aware of these guidelines or follow them when writing ballots. Environmental factors, experience in forensics, and willingness to put effort into judging rounds might influence whether judges include helpful comments on ballots.

For example, in response to the question "What do ballots mean to you," one competitor said, "Sometimes a whole lot... and sometimes nothing at all. They really make you realize the fluctuations in judging styles... and sometimes they make you realize the judge didn't listen to a word you said." Another competitor noted, "Some are great, very helpful, and full of constructive criticism. Others are not so helpful and contain mostly 'fluff'." One competitor further explained, "I consider them suggestions or idea on ways in which the performer can improve. However, it is also important to consider the ballots are a critique given by one person for one specific performance so there are things that I may choose not to pay attention to. Some ballots are worthless. However, telling me 'great job' and giving me 6th does absolutely nothing to improve me as a speaker." As for the likelihood of writing a high-quality ballot, one judge remarked, "It just depends upon a lot of intangibles: the time of day, lack of sleep, caffeine, and/or nicotine withdrawal, the weather, etc. in order to determine what a ballot is and/or does." Clearly, these comments reflect that ballots are not always as helpful as they could be.

The idea that ballots may not be as helpful as they could be suggests that both judges and competitors need to make an effort to be diligent about carefully considering what is written on ballots. This would include reading, thinking about, and implementing the comments and suggestions in one's own performance or including specific comments that offer suggestions for improvement on every ballot that one writes. To assist judges with little or no competitive forensic experience and to remind seasoned judges of the importance of their comments, Ross (1984) suggests that it might be helpful to hold train-

ing sessions or provide guidelines for effective ballot writing at tournaments.

Classroom Recommendations

Because the method for this study was based on a prior study that revealed a lack of shared meaning about grades in the classroom, and because Bartanen (1998) suggests that forensics might provide a model of good pedagogy for liberal arts education, people studying this should consider ways in which tactics used in forensic competition could be incorporated into classroom pedagogies in order to increase the effectiveness of teaching practices and increase the degree of meaning agreement about grades. This study suggests that forensics needs to find ways to have teachers talk to students more about evaluations and expectations. Researchers should consider using multiple assessors, and need to explore ways to incorporate revision and development opportunities into assignments. Some teachers already do these things, but this analysis suggests these ideas should be adopted in more classes.

Limitations

Limitations of this study that should be addressed in future research exist in the sample selection, coding process, and classroom connections.

Sample Selection

Though the sample size was adequate for this study, a larger, more varied sample would have been preferred. Far more competitors than judges responded to the surveys, which is simply a reflection of the ratio of competitors to judges at most forensic tournaments. Though the sample included representatives from numerous schools and states, most of the subjects attend Midwest schools. Additionally, this study was conducted at the first three tournaments of the forensic season and included more first year competitors than seasoned competitors, so many of the subjects might not have been exposed to enough collegiate forensic competition to gain as good an understanding of forensic competition and ballots as might have been the case later in the year.

Coding Process

The differences between some of the categories are very subtle, and some of the categories even overlap a bit, which made it difficult to determine which category some of the responses fit into. Though each coder had detailed descriptions of each category (see Appendix), there was a slight difference in the way each coder interpreted some of the categories and responses, and there were four subjects for whom there was no agreement in the coding about into which category the responses fit best. If this study is replicated, greater detail in category descriptions, sample responses that might fit into each category, and better coder training are recommended.

CLASSROOM CONNECTIONS

Though a comparison of the Goulden and Griffin (1995) study to this one suggests that the application of forensic tactics to classroom pedagogies might be beneficial, no research exists about if or how this might work. Indeed, previous studies have argued for the educational benefits garnered by students who participate in competitive forensics (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, and Loudon, 1997; Bartanen, 1998; Burrows, 1940; Gartell, 1973; McMillan and Todd-Mancillas, 1991; Stenger, 1998; Zeidler and Kirch, 1999). Others have argued that forensic programs serve as a valuable tool for universities by serving as teaching, testing, or research labs (Bartanen, 1998; Douglas, 1972; Gartell, 1973; Milsap, 1998; Thomas, 1976; Worth, 2000; Zeidler and Kirch, 1999). The focus has been on moving ideas from the academic classroom into forensics, but not necessarily on moving ideas from forensics into the classroom, except in terms of the skills that individual students develop and then use in both arenas. Though one can hypothesize ways to incorporate ideas from forensics competition into classroom pedagogies, more research must be done in order to determine whether such tactics will be as effective or beneficial without the element of competition.

REFERENCES

- Allen, M.; Berkowitz, S.; Hunt, S.; and Loudon, A. (1997, November). Education on critical thinking: a meta-analytic summary. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Bartanen, K.M. (1998). The place of the forensics program in the liberal arts college of the twenty-first century. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84, 1-16.
- Bartanen, K. M. (1990). The use of criteria referenced ballots for individual events. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 133-144.
- Burrows, A. H. (1940). Forensic and scholarship. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 25, 33-38.
- Cronn-Mills, D. (1991). Interpreting the oral interpretation judge; content analysis of oral interpretation ballots. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 31-40.
- Cronn-Mills, D. & Croucher, S. (2001). Judging the Judges: An Analysis of Ballots in Impromptu and Extemporaneous Speaking. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Dean, K. W. & Benoit, W. L. (1984). A categorical content analysis of rhetorical criticism ballots. *National Forensic Journal*, 2, 99-108.
- Douglas, D. G. (1972). A need for review: forensics studies in contemporary speech education. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 8, 178-181.
- Gartell, R. B. (1973). Educational forensics: another viewpoint. *The Forensic*, 58, 3-6.
- Goulden, N. R. and Griffin, C. J. G. (1995, April). The meaning of grades based on faculty and student metaphors. *Communication Education*, 44, 110-125.
- Hanson, C.T. (1988a). Judging After-Dinner Speaking: identifying the criteria for evaluation. *National Forensic Journal*, 6, 25-34.
- Hanson, C.T. (1988b). Student beliefs about good and bad judges. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 74, 13-16.
- Jensen, G. (1997, November). Judges as the Centrality of Forensics: An Examination of Norms and Training in Forensics Adjudication. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago.
- Jensen, G. L. (1998, November). The Lessons We Teach: The Critics' Taxonomy for Effective Oral Interpretation. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, New York.
- Jensen, S.L. (1990). A content analysis of public address critiques: in search of uniqueness in evaluative criteria and judging practices. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 145-162.

- McMillan, J.K. and Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1991, Spring). An assessment of the value of individual events in forensics competition from students' perspectives. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 1-17.
- Mills, D. D. (1991, Spring). Interpreting the oral interpretation judge. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 31-40.
- Milsap, 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, 17-26.
- Olsen, C. (1992, Winter). Who needs "Reasons for Decision" on individual events ballots. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 77, 1-4.
- Olsen, C.D. and Wells, M.M. (1998, February). Toward developing reasons for decisions: a content analysis of Individual events ballots. Presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Convention, San Diego.
- Preston, C. T. Jr. (1990, Fall). The impact of written ballot criteria on the frequency and type of ballot comments in collegiate limited preparation speaking events. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 163-178.
- Renz, M. A. (1991, Fall). Strategies for increasing the use of ballots in coaching individual events. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 167-172.
- Ross, D. (1984, Spring). Improving judging skills through the judge workshop. *National Forensic Journal*, 2, 33-40.
- Stenger, K. (1998, Summer). Forensics as preparation for participation in the academic world. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84, 13-23.
- Thomas, D. A. (1976, March). Why have competitive forensics programs? *The Forensic*, 61, 6-8.
- Trimble, F. P. (1994, Winter). Critiquing the critic: toward improving oral interpretation ballots. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79, 10-15.
- Worth, D. S. (2000, November). Exploring the forensics community: the need for stronger basic research. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Seattle, WA.
- Zeidler, T. and Kirch, M. W. (1999, November). So what's wrong with a little competition? A defense of competitive goals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

APPENDIX: Categories for Coding

I and II: Ballots as Feedback: These categories focus on the view that ballots provide information about achievement. The choice of the specific metaphor may emphasize the writer's perception of the nature of the information and the method by which the results were determined. The feedback may be limited to the symbol itself or include the inference of a quality level or comparison level to other students' performances. All are related to the concept of how well the students "did" in the round.

I. Ballots as feedback with no consequences: These categories reflect the view that ballots tell the students about the quality of their performances, but do not imply that the ballots have actual consequences for the student, either in terms of whether they will advance to another level or in terms of whether the student will use the ballots as a means or motivation to change their performance in the future.

A. Measurement: This reflects that the ballot is used as a process or tool to convey measurements of achievement on an objective, scientific scale. Words associated with this might include *measure, ruler, and meter*.

B. Sorting: This reflects that the ballot is used as a process or tool to tell the student how their performance compares to the performances of other competitors in that particular round and uses the concept of sorting the competitors within the round.. Words associated with this might include *compare, categorize, differentiate, and rank*.

C. Judgment: This reflects that the ballot is a process or tool that uses the concept of judging. This is more subjective than a measurement and may be associated with words such as *rating, scale, judging, and critical review*.

II. Ballots as feedback with consequences: Like the metaphors in Category I, these

metaphors are related to the quality or quantity of the performance or work that the student has done, but they also suggest further consequences, whether it is in terms of emotional impact, advancement or non-advancement to another level, and influence the decisions the student makes about his or her performance.

- A. **Gatekeepers:** This reflects that the ballot has a role in what happens to the competitor. The consequences are in the hands of someone other than the student. It will reflect whether a student is accepted, rejected, or retained, and may define ballots as the things that determine whether the students get into finals, qualifies for nationals, etc.
- B. **Emotional Triggers:** This category is based on how the ballots make students feel. It will include expressions that imply, "This is a good thing; it made me feel pleasure," or, "This is a bad thing; it made me feel pain." Rewards and punishments may be included here if they are not identified as motivators. Emotional triggers make students feel happy, sad, angry, encouraged, etc., but do not inspire further change in action.
- C. **Personal Decision Factors:** This category is made up of metaphors that show ballots as being instrumental in a student's policy decisions such as which topics they choose, specific gestures or blocking, and how they write their speech. However, the ballots do not actually motivate students to make changes once they receive the ballot.
- D. **Motivators:** Metaphors and descriptors of ballots as motivators will show that ballots are viewed as a source of meaningful information about work or achievement and imply that the information has some type of emotional impact on the student. They are something that motivates action or changes. These metaphors will include descriptions of ballots as suggestions for improvement or change, reasons to make changes, ideas to help students learn, constructive criticism, and vehicles for growth and development. This may include rewards and punishments if they reflect information about the quality of the performance or work.

III. Ballots as symbols: Ballots are symbols that are not directly related to the quality or quantity of work or achievement. They have no function in sorting, evaluating, or providing feedback about the quality of the performance or the amount of work that the student has done.

- A. **Literal Symbols:** Ballots are literally symbols without meaning. They are simply marks on a sheet of paper that have no relation to the quality of the performance.
- B. **Tokens:** Ballots are tokens that are handed out for being present or giving a performance. Ballots are given to everyone but have no function in sorting or evaluating. They give no feedback about a student's work.



You did what?!?: An Expectancy Violation Approach to Normative Behavior in Collegiate Forensics

DARREN EPPING AND JENNIFER LABRIE,
HASTINGS COLLEGE

ABSTRACT: *Forensics is an activity with few written rules but instead has many norms to guide behavior. The abundance of norms in forensics causes a problem for the competitor, because often conflicting norms exist within the activity. Also, these norms are not effectively communicated throughout the forensic community, since the method of communicating forensic norms is the ballot. This paper attempts to take a closer look at the norms that have overarching dominance and the power these norms hold within the activity. The purpose of this study is to provide another outlet of communicating norms and their influence.*

INTRODUCTION

At the 2003 AFA-NIET tournament, two students from Arizona State University made it to the final round in Duo Interpretation by doing something unusual. By performing *Labyrinth*, a cult movie classic, they challenged preconceived notions of what is expected in Duo Interpretation. These competitors chose literature that was well known to the audience that lacked social significance, they used on-stage focus, and they touched. This duo violated forensic expectations. Interestingly, while these violations may have made the duo salient enough to break into final rounds, these violations may also have resulted in them receiving sixth place in the final round. This performance also sparked a discussion within the intercollegiate forensic community about norms versus rules and the effects of violating both.

Purpose

Forensics is an activity with few written rules, but instead it has many norms to guide behavior. Norms are unwritten rules that form standards of behavior within communication situations (Bond, Omar, Pitre, & Lashley, 1992). For example, in interpretive events, AFA guidelines require the use of manuscript (AFA-NIET, 2003); however,

DARREN EPPING was an undergraduate student at Hastings College majoring in Theatre Arts and Communication Studies when he participated in the writing of this paper. Jennifer Labrie was an undergraduate student at Hastings College majoring in Communication Studies when he participated in the writing of this paper. Both participated in forensics while students at Hastings. Both are now graduate students in Speech Communication at Kansas State University. The authors would like to acknowledge Jessica Henry, Ph. D. at Hastings College for advising them and helping them with putting this research together.

the norm is that the performer keeps the manuscript in a little black book. Performers who fail to comply with the norm by using a big orange binder, for instance, will probably be given lower ranks and possibly even made fun of on van rides home. Other norms include wearing professional dress, choosing unique topics and literature, memorizing speeches, meeting a minimum time limit, and using pen names for self-authored literature (VinLinden, 1997; Cronn-Mills, 1997). These are just a few of the many norms performers are expected to abide by and judges are expected to enforce when evaluating a performance.

The abundance of norms in forensics causes a problem for the competitor. Often conflicting norms exist within the activity. Also, these norms are not effectively communicated throughout the forensic community. The most prevalent formal method of communicating norms in forensics is the ballot. The ballot serves to inform one competitor about one judge's normative standards. In turn, this dyadic communication is not an effective way of communicating norms.

This paper is not an attempt to change forensic norms; rather, its aim is to take a closer look at the norms that have overarching dominance and the power these norms hold within the activity. The purpose of this paper is to provide another outlet of communicating norms and their affects.

Rationale and Significance

The abundance of norms in forensics, while providing a standard for judging and performing, has some impact on the forensic community (Rice & Mummert, 2001). Many first time competitors have not been informed about what all the norms are in college forensics. Every forensic participant has a story about a time when they breached the unwritten code. This often occurs because veterans have not informed the novices of the expectations of the community, making success even more difficult for new competitors than it already is.

Norms are difficult to learn if the program is new and does not have the guidance of veteran competitors or experienced coaches. Due to the nature of norms, it is hard to assimilate new members into the community. In order to learn the norms of the activity, the new member has to compete and potentially fail numerous times before being indoctrinated into the community. Because of the high level of potential failure, many may chose to discontinue the activity rather than continue to try; this stifles growth.

In competitive experience, participants have seen that norms are different in various regions of the nation and among different judges. Different schools have different opinions as to what makes an oral interpretation or public address presentation good, and when those students graduate, they take those norms with them. This hass the affect of creating different norms for different judges. This makes it difficult for students to know which norms to follow. It also becomes a problem when trying to bring the styles together nationally because

of the diverse nature of the norms in question. For example, take a look at limited preparation events. Some regions prefer a three-point analysis in impromptu and extemporaneous speeches. Other regions think that unified analysis provides a better analysis of the quotation or question that was drawn by the competitor. This difference in norms makes it more challenging for students who hail from different parts of the country when they come together for a forensic tournament. Competitors have to adapt to different norms, and if it is their first time in that region, they may not know what norms to follow until the first round is finished and they have already violated some expectations. Worse yet, they may not discover the violations until they are in the van on the way home reading their ballots.

Even though the existence of norms provides stability within the group, they can also harm the group. The problem within the forensic community is that it has turned these norms into rules, if not formally at least informally. This causes the norms to have as much weight as written rules (VerLinden, 1997). The forensic community faces stagnation by believing the norms that exist in forensics to be rules. In the status quo, a competitor who breaks a norm is considered taking a risk in performance; however, this should be standard procedure if forensics wants to continue as an art and an educational activity.

It is important that this issue be examined because forensics is a laboratory where students can test different communication theories which provide the foundation for effective communicators in society (Swanson, 1992; Friedley, 1992; Zeuschner, 1992, Dreibelbis & Gullifor, 1992). Students are able to learn different techniques for creating messages for an audience. After learning a new way to conduct audience analysis, a student can then try out that method in a lab-like setting. The norms that are in place tend to prevent this from happening because students are also competitors who like to win. Even though a student can try a new persuasion format, odds are good that if it is not a mixed causal design (problem-cause-solution) the student will probably get sixth place in the round. Many students will continue with the "normal" way to do an event, even if it is theoretically unsound, because they do not want to ruin their chances of doing well competitively (VerLinden, 1997).

Not only does forensics provide a laboratory experience, it also allows students to learn different skills that will be useful in society as a whole (Swanson, 1992; Friedley, 1992; Zeuschner, 1992, Dreibelbis & Gullifor, 1992). The laboratory experience trains communicators of the future. By looking at the norms that exist in forensics, it provides an evaluation of the skills that they are learning from the activity.

It is because of these reasons that the following research questions are asked:

RQ 1: What are the norms of forensic participation?

RQ2: What is the effect of norm violation on forensic competition?

By asking these questions, the researchers hope to discover the value audiences and judges place on norms and the expected behavior of competitors at tournaments.

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

For this research to evaluate the power that norms have in relation to behavioral influence within intercollegiate forensics, this study will use Burgoon's Expectancy Violation Theory (1998) as a theoretical framework. Forensics, as an activity, has certain expectations of its participants. Burgoon's Expectancy Violation Theory states that through experience people develop expectations of others in communicative environments. When those expectations are not met, there are either positive or negative consequences. This section will provide a concise explanation of Expectancy Violation Theory.

The original study developed by Burgoon (1978) was originally designed to examine the effects of socially prescribed proxemics in interpersonal communication. The study centered on changing the personal distance between communicators and how that changed the perception of the message and the sender. To conduct this study, the nonverbal cues of strangers were manipulated and the reactions of the participants were recorded. The findings, while specific to the stranger's cues, could be applied to a range of cues (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). The role that distance has on the interpersonal interaction was examined and tested only to discover inconsistent findings (Burgoon & Hale, 1988).

For Burgoon and Hale, the inconsistent findings only suggested the need to revise the theory and elaborate further. To remedy the inconsistent findings, they conducted another study to test how friends and strangers receive violations. To do this, students in a communication class were asked to bring in a friend who would also participate in the study. The student was then asked to discuss a social-moral problem for ten minutes with their friend and with a stranger. During the discussion with the friend, they were told to violate the expectations after the first minute of conversation by increasing the distance between them, adopting an indirect body orientation, leaning backwards, crossing their arms, and decreasing eye contact (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). The student was then asked to have a conversation with a stranger about a different social moral issue. Again, after the first minute, they were asked to violate the strangers' expectations by decreasing the distance between them and their partners, maintaining a direct body orientation, leaning forward, assuming an open posture, and increasing eye contact compared to the first minute (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). As a result of this revised research, Expectancy Violation Theory was developed and five key areas of the model were delineated.

The first element of Expectancy Violation Theory is that everyone has expectations of others in communication settings, known as *expectancies*. All communicators have assumptions about how others

are going to communicate with them. These are developed by past interactions and socialization. These expectations may include cognitive, affective, and connotative components. Communicators expect *unknown others* to follow societal norms, while *familiar others* are allowed their normal idiosyncrasies (Burgoon & Hale, 1988, p.60). Communicators who have known each other expect different things from each other. These idiosyncratic differences are a result of shared history, observation, and prior knowledge. This shared history changes what is expected of the other person (Burgoon & Hale, 1988, p. 60). Expectancies also represent a range of acceptable behaviors as opposed to a specific way of doing something. These norms, or ranges of norms, are not set in stone; rather they have some flexibility built into them. Once the threshold is passed, Burgoon and Hale (1988) contend that the deviation becomes a violation.

The second element of Expectancy Violation Theory is *violations and arousal*. If a person violates expectations, then the receiver of the violation will experience a heightened sense of arousal. This arousal causes the focus to change from the message to the messenger. The deviant becomes the center of attention, since they are the source of the arousal (Burgoon & Hale, 1988).

The third element of Expectancy Violation Theory is *communicator reward valence*, which is the reward value of the violator. Burgoon and Hale (1988) say that the receiver weighs all aspects of the communicator, such as gender, personality, reputation, and status, and the possible outcomes of the communication. After weighing these aspects, the benefit of communicating with the violator is assessed to facilitate choosing whether further communication is warranted.

The fourth element of the theory is *behavior interpretation and evaluation*. Burgoon and Hale (1988) state that the communicator reward valence affects the violation in two ways: interpretation and evaluation. Many nonverbal communication acts have multiple meanings and the interpretation of those meanings is affected by the Communicator Reward Valence (CRV). If the CRV is high, the act will be interpreted in a favorable manner. If the CRV is low, then the act will be given a less favorable meaning by the receiver. Finally, the act is evaluated as to whether it is a positive or negative act. If the communicator has a high CRV, then the act will most likely be viewed as positive; if the CRV is low, then the violation will be viewed as negative.

The final element of the theory is *violation valence*. This is the determination of whether the violation was positive or negative without the influence of the communicator. Burgoon & Hale assert: "The expectancy violations model predicts that an extreme violation, if committed by a high reward communicator, can be positively valenced, producing reciprocal communication patterns and positive outcomes such as higher credibility and attraction" (1988, p.63). If the violation is positive, then the receiver of the violation is motivated to do more than is expected. If the violation is negative, then the

receiver is motivated to do less than is expected (Burgoon & Hale, 1988, p.63).

After looking at the complex nature of Expectancy Violation Theory, it is necessary to review subsequent studies that have been conducted regarding Expectancy Violation Theory.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to further study expectancy violations in relation to norms within intercollegiate forensics, it is necessary to review previous research. Since there is no research linking expectancy violation and forensic competition together, these two subjects will be reviewed separately. In order to highlight the link between expectancy violation and forensics, an explanation of norms will also be included within this review. This section looks at three specific issues: expectancy violation, norms, and forensics.

Expectancy Violation

When reviewing research on the topic of Expectancy Violation Theory, these researchers found that it is a very broad theory which has many applications. As mentioned previously, Expectancy Violation Theory originates from Burgoon's research centering on conversational distance (1978; Burgoon & Aho, 1982). Burgoon contended that while an individual may violate an expectation, the violation may benefit the violator instead of always damaging the communication between the sender and receiver (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). While the theory has its origins within nonverbal communication, Expectancy Violation Theory has expanded creating two major subdivisions of research: Nonverbal and Verbal communication.

Nonverbal communication

Expectancy Violation Theory gives insight into human nonverbal communication. Nonverbal communication contains social meaning (Burgoon & Walther, 1990). Gesture, conversational distance, and posture, as well as other nonverbal channels, all communicate messages to a receiver. As these meanings have developed, expectations of nonverbal interaction have also developed (Burgoon & Aho, 1982). Because of these meanings and expectations, uncertainty within interaction reduces. Further, standard evaluations of the communicator are also established (Burgoon & Walther, 1990). This sets up a foundation for Expectancy Violation Theory.

Several methods for evaluating nonverbal violations exist. The study of nonverbal communication allows for the manipulation of several variables within a study. Burgoon uses conversational distance to show that when a nonverbal violation occurs, a reactant's attention changes from the task or information processing that was taking place to accepting or rejecting the violation (Burgoon & Aho, 1982). The manipulation of the communicators' social classes and physical char-

acteristics leads to further avenues for variable manipulation. Communicator attractiveness, as it is known, was another variable studied and it was found that it also affects the reward valence of the violation (Burgoon & Walther, 1990).

Violations of norms change the criteria that a participant uses to evaluate the communicator. Burgoon took this premise a step further with the seminal research on Expectancy Violation Theory. Burgoon and Hale found that violating expectancies brought both positive and negative rewards for the violator (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). While the non-verbal aspects of Expectancy Violation Theory outline the variables that effect the evaluation of an expectancy violation, there is still deficient information concerning expected and unexpected interpersonal behaviors (Burgoon & Walther, 1990).

Finally, while prescribed behaviors within interactions make conversations more comfortable for the participants, Burgoon and Afifi claim that uncertainty decreases when violations occur (2000). Congruent violations (behaviors that are inconsistent with previous behavior) reduce uncertainty in a communicative setting (Afifi & Burgoon, 2000). As Burgoon & Afifi claim, "these types of violations decrease the 'degrees of freedom' regarding future behavior" (2000, p. 225). This occurs because a violation does not allow the receiver to predict behavior, ironically because they do not know what to expect. This research in Expectancy Violation Theory shows the role that non-verbal communication plays in human communication.

Verbal communication

While Burgoon (1978) has developed a model grounded in non-verbal communication, other scholars have applied this theory to include verbal communication. Koerner and Petelle (1991) use an expectancy violation approach to examine student ratings of instructors. Koerner and Petelle postulate that while previous research focused on nonverbal communication (Burgoon and Aho, 1982), verbal communication also has an effect on expectancies and evaluations in a classroom setting (Koerner & Petelle, 1991, p. 343).

Verbal expectancy violation also has applications for the process of evaluating persuasive messages. Burgoon (1995) claims that individuals have expectations about language that can affect a person's willingness to accept or reject a persuasive message. Much like non-verbal violations, "communication that is out of character for an individual can threaten another's face or create an uncomfortable situation that immediately changes the nature of an interaction" (Bevan, 2003). While verbal expectancy violation parallels non-verbal Expectancy Violation Theory, it is still in its infancy.

Norms

Violating norms does not mean that expectations have been violated because norms and expectations are not the same thing. Berkos, Allen, Kearney, & Plax (2001) and Levine, Anders, Banas, Baum, Endo,

Hu, & Wong (2000) claim, norm violation does not lead to a violation of expectancies. Expectancies are defined as “enduring patterns of anticipated verbal and nonverbal behavior that are appropriate, desired, or preferred” (Berkos, et al 2001, p. 290). Norms, on the other hand, “specify the range of socially acceptable behaviors in a situation” (Levine et al. 2001, p. 134).

Norms, however, can create expectations (Bond et al 1992). Over time norms form standards of behavior within a communication situation. Individuals going outside of those standards or scripts create a violation. Bond et al (1992) argue that these violations cause the communicator to be viewed with suspicion. They say, “theoretically, the expectancy-violation model of deception judgments should apply to all nonverbal behaviors that violate norms” (Bond et al, 1992, para. 12). A violation of communicative norms causes the receiver to judge the sender with doubt as to the veracity of their message. They studied deception judgment based on the nonverbal discrepancies used by the confederate in the study to violate the norms and expectations of the participant. After conducting their study, they found that people tend to infer deception from nonverbal norm violations.

Because several components comprise an expectation, it is negotiable whether or not an expectancy violation has occurred. For example, if a highly narcissistic person was over self-disclosing in a social situation, there are two different ways for the action to be evaluated. Excessive self-disclosure is a violation of a social norm; therefore, their action should be assigned a negative value (Levine et al. 2000). An individual who knew this person, however, would expect this person to use inappropriate self-disclosure (Berkos, 2001). If this person were to conform to social norms of less self-disclosure, he or she would be violating the expectations of those who knew him or her. As a result, determining whether or not an expectancy violation occurs depends largely on the context of the situation, including the personal knowledge that members of a group have about one another.

Forensics

Within the forensic community, many coaches emphasize following norms so that competitors can succeed in the competitive aspect of the activity. Many studies and presentations have been conducted regarding norms and unwritten rules in forensics (VerLinden, 1997; Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Rice & Mummert, 2001).

There are a number of unwritten rules in all forensic genres (VerLinden, 1997; Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997). VerLinden (1997) identified the unwritten rules in public address events while Cronn-Mills & Golden (1997) identified those of interpretive events. Some of these norms include the uniqueness of topic, relevance to the audience, use, or lack thereof, of visual aids, memorization of speeches, use of manuscripts/black books, literature choices, movement and blocking, and using teasers and transitions, to name but a few.

Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997) discussed the unwritten rules of

interpretive events, and they list a 12-step process for creating an unwritten rule (see Appendix A). Basically a student tries something new and is rewarded for doing it well. Other students see this and try to emulate the successful student. Judges see all of these students doing something new and may assume that that is the way the event is supposed to be done. The judges start penalizing students who do not follow the new norm. Once these students graduate, some become judges and take their learned and created norms with them; thus, a new forensic norm is created.

VerLinden (1997) discussed why some norms are detrimental to forensics. For example, with regards to memorized public speeches, the norm of memorizing them is detrimental because it contradicts current public address pedagogy that says extemporaneous delivery is a better way to deliver a speech. It also "leads to a lack of spontaneity and generally results in an artificial style of deliver" (para. 61).

VerLinden (1997) also explained that people only talk about unwritten rules because of the competitive nature of forensics. There are some explicit rules to regulate the activity but there are unwritten rules that are "so taken for granted that we rarely give them a thought" (para. 10). VerLinden said that it is important to understand the unwritten rules of forensics because not following these expectations could lead to negative consequences.

While providing detailed examples of norms in forensics, as Rice and Mummert (2001) pointed out, they were unable to provide empirical data backing up their claims. To rectify this situation, Rice and Mummert conducted a study to "test for the existence of unwritten rules" in forensics (para. 4). They considered, as variables, whether the students were novices or veterans and whether they attended a university or community college. They found out that competitors do believe that there are unwritten rules in forensics. There are some differences between novice and veteran competitors as well as between university and community college competitors. These discrepancies could be because the rules have not been ingrained into the less-experienced students' perceptions of the events, nor do the community college students have veterans who have been in the activity for more than two years. Their study, however, did not include coaches and judges perceptions of events and unwritten rules. Their study did not try to find out the effect that these rules have on performances and rankings.

This literature review explains that expectancy violation theory has the potential to apply to not only nonverbal communication but to verbal communication. In addition, norms play a vital role in developing expectations. Because forensic activity has expectations of competitors, created out of norms, this study, through applying expectancy violation theory, has the potential to link these concepts together.

METHOD

After having looked at the research that has been done in the area of expectancy and norm violation and forensics, it is apparent that further study needs to be done to determine the effect that these norm violations have on the individual performers' behaviors. Earlier, two research questions were posited:

RQ 1: What are the norms of forensic participation?

RQ2: What is the effect of norm violation on forensic competition?

Participants

The participants in this study were coaches/judges from various schools within the collegiate forensic community. Twelve surveys were received from coaches and judges in the collegiate forensic community. Six of the respondents were female and six of the respondents were male. Four of the respondents were Directors of Forensics at their respective schools, three were Assistant Directors of Forensics, three were graduate assistants, and two were former members of the forensic community who judge on a regular basis. Participants have been members of the forensic community for 125 years collectively, and for an average of 9.6 years. Four of the respondents were from district four, two from district three, three from district five, one from district one, and two who are unaffiliated.

Procedure

An open-ended survey was used to question coaches in the collegiate forensic community with regards to normative behavior. This survey included questions about norms and forensic activity in general, as well as about the specific genres (see appendix B). In order to find respondents, the survey was emailed to the individual events list serve (IE-L) (see Appendix C). The list serve is a subscription service that allows forensic coaches, judges, and competitors to keep informed of the forensic community's activities and controversies. The surveys were also distributed to various coaches at the 2004 AFA-NIET by Kittie Grace, Assistant Director of Forensics at Hastings College and Dr. Jessica Henry, forensic coach at Hastings College. Five surveys from the IE-L and five from the AFA-NIET were received.

The survey consisted of nine open-ended questions. These open-ended questions created "longer, more detailed, and variable" findings (Patton, 1990, p. 24). By using open-ended questions, these researchers were better able to "understand the world as seen by the respondents" (Patton, 1990, p. 24). By using questionnaire categories that were not determined by the researchers, this study was able to determine a more balanced perspective of norms in the forensic community.

Four of the questions asked about the norms in specific genres. An example of these questions was: What norms are prevalent in Limited Preparation Events? One question asked what norms were more

important and one question asked about norms that were prevalent in forensics in general. Two questions asked about the reaction to norm violations by the judge and by the community.

Analysis

Once the survey was completed and returned, these researchers went through each of the surveys and identified the various themes that were present, with the aim of finding normative themes that can be extrapolated to define the influence of this behavior. Both researchers independently reviewed each survey, in order to ensure the validity of the themes found. Once the themes of each survey were identified, the themes of each researcher were compiled to find which themes were apparent in the survey. The themes from each survey were then compared to see which themes were prevalent throughout all of the surveys.

This thematic analysis was done to achieve two ends. First, this analysis will affirm previous research about normative forensic behavior (Rice and Mummert, 2001). Second, these researchers hoped to discover the consequences of violating these norms.

RESULTS

RQ1: What are the norms of forensic participation?

This research uncovered a number of norms in forensics. Some general norms include professional behavior and professional attire. Four respondents said that professional behavior and decorum were norms among forensic students. Seven respondents said that professional attire, including ties and jackets for the men and suits for the women, was a norm. Beyond general norms, there were overarching norms in each genre and across all of the genres of forensic activity.

The little black book

The black manuscript book was a predominant norm across all interpretation events. All but three respondents mentioned the black manuscript book that all interpers use. Five respondents said that the use of the book in general was a norm, while six respondents said that book work (or the way the competitor uses the book in their performance) was important. Two of the respondents mentioned both aspects of the black book.

Time management

The effective use of time in limited preparation events was a commonly identified norm. Five participants in the study said that it was a norm in forensics to use time effectively. Three mentioned preparation time in Impromptu. Two of those three specified a specific time limit with two minutes being the maximum preparation time but a minute and a half being ideal. Two respondents said only that appropriate use of time was a norm, but did not specify how "appropriate use" was defined. In public address events, one respondent men-

tioned a norm of a minimum time limit of eight and a half minutes.

Sources

Source usage emerged as a theme in both limited preparation events as well as public address events. In limited preparation events, six respondents mentioned sources in one form or another. Three said that sources over argumentation have become the focus of the event, while one respondent mentioned that current sources are necessary. In the public address genre, five respondents mentioned sources and four of them said that it is a norm to have a large quantity of sources. One of the respondents said that it has become a norm to use a poor quality of research and to get all of the sources from Lexis-Nexus in order to meet the norm of having a large quantity of sources.

Structure and argumentation

All of the genres have norms relating to the structure and argument of the performance. In interpretation events, three of the respondents said that programs of literature typically have an argument. In public address, organization was a common theme amongst all but four of the respondents. Three of the respondents who mentioned organization discussed two different aspects of organization. Three respondents said that a mixed causal design in persuasion was the norm, and two said that persuasion has to have multiple levels of solutions. In limited preparation events, seven respondents said that analysis was an important aspect. Two people said that two point analysis was the norm, while one person said that three point analysis was normative. One respondent mentioned that competitors have to agree or disagree with the quotation in impromptu.

Topic choice

A competitor's choice in topic was a theme that appeared in two of the genres; public address and interpretation events. Four of the respondents mentioned that topics and literature should be new, or never seen on the forensic circuit. Three of those respondents mentioned the currency of literature in both the public address question and the interpretation question. Another norm was that informative topics should be based on a new technological advance; three of the respondents said this was a norm. In interpretation, the choice of literature was also mentioned. Three of the respondents said that it is expected to use first person prose and two mentioned that the use of poetry that sounds more like a prose is becoming more common.

Polished Delivery

The next theme that was found was that polished delivery was expected. Six respondents mentioned it in public address, six mentioned it in limited preparation and three mentioned it in interpretive events. Three people said that memorization was expected in interpretation and public address. One respondent mentioned memorization in both categories. Three respondents said that the use of notes in limited preparation events was a norm.