

**SUMMER/ANNUAL  
1993**

LIBRARY - OTTAWA UNIVERSITY  
78 OTTAWA, KANS. #4

**THE  
Forensic OF  
PI KAPPA DELTA**



**SERIES 78  
NO. 4**

# 1991-93 PI KAPPA DELTA NATIONAL HONORARY FORENSIC FRATERNITY OFFICERS

Robert Littlefield, **President**, North Dakota State University,  
Fargo, North Dakota 58105

Sally Roden, **President-Elect**, University of Central Arkansas,  
Conway, Arkansas 72032

Harold Widvey, **Secretary/Treasurer**, South Dakota State University,  
Brookings, South Dakota 57007

Bill Hill, **Tournament Director**, University of North Carolina-Charlotte,  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28223

Edward Inch, **Professional Development**, Pacific Lutheran University,  
Tacoma, Washington 98447

Joseph Hamell, **Student Member**, Western Washington University,  
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Sydney Van Atta, **Student Member**, University of Puget Sound,  
Tacoma, Washington 98416

Terry Cole, **Past President**, Appalachian State University,  
Boone, North Carolina 28608

Don Swanson, **Editor**, University of Guam,  
Mangilao, Guam 96923

David Ray, **Historian**, University of Arkansas-Monticello,  
Monticello, Arkansas 71665

Margaret Greynolds, **Council Member**, Georgetown College  
Georgetown, Kentucky 40321

## PROVINCE GOVERNORS

**Lower Mississippi**, James Norwig, Louisiana Tech. University

**Northwest**, Brenda Marshall, Linfield College

**Plains**, C. Burton Crawford, Fort Hays State University

**Southeast**, Glenda Treadaway, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

**Colonies**, Jeanine Barr, York University

**Lakes**, Susan Millsap, Otterbein College

**Missouri**, Harold Lawson, Central Missouri State University

**Northern Lights**, David Warne, St. Cloud State University

**Pacific**, Don Brownlee, California State University—Northridge



# THE FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 78

ANNUAL 1993

NO. 4

Don Swanson, Editor  
University of Guam  
Department of Communication  
UOG Station  
Mangilao, Guam 96923

## REVIEW EDITORS

Cynthia Carver, Assistant Editor, Concordia College  
Don Brownlee, California State University — Northridge  
C.T. Hanson, Moorhead State University  
Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark College  
Carolyn Keefe, West Chester University  
Glenda Treadaway, University of North Carolina, Charlotte  
Willis Watt, Ft. Hays State University

## CONTENTS

<b>A Survey Analysis of Regional and National Programs and Competitive Trends in Collegiate Forensics</b>	
by Scott L. Jensen .....	1
<b>Communicator Style Perceptions of "Best" and "Worst" Teachers</b>	
by Anthony B. Schroeder and Rona Lyon Leber .....	11
<b>The Role of the Ex-Forensics Director as Mentor</b>	
by Cynthia R. Carver .....	17
<b>The Challenge and Opportunity of Finding a New Administrative Role for an Ex-Director of Forensics</b>	
by Robert Littlefield .....	23
A Retrospective Look at Debate: Editor's Note & Historian's Note	
<b>Some Remarks Upon Intercollegiate Debating (1922)</b>	
by Egbert Ray Nichols .....	32

Manuscripts/Research Notes submitted for review should follow the guidelines of the **A.P.A.**, 3rd ed. Two copies should be sent to the Editor, Steve Hunt. Other news items may be mailed to the Editor.

THE FORENSIC of PI KAPPA DELTA (ISSN: 0015-735X) is published four times yearly, Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$12.50 for one year and \$30.00 for three years. Second Class Postage paid at Fargo, ND. Postmaster and Subscribers: please send all change of address requests to Dr. Robert Littlefield, Box 5075, North Dakota St. Univ., Fargo, ND 58105-5075. THE FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 105 microfiche through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Printed by The Pierce Company, Fargo, ND 58102

Cover Design by Seven Sisters Design, P.O. Box 414A, Rte. 1, Detroit Lakes, MN 56501

# **A SURVEY ANALYSIS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL PROGRAMS AND COMPETITIVE TRENDS IN COLLEGIATE FORENSICS**

By Scott L. Jensen

■ Ulrich (1987) observed an important development in forensics coaching when he wrote "It is not as easy to coach forensics today as it was ten years ago" (p. 5). His comment was motivated by the growing complexity of debate and emphasis on theoretical arguments, the increase in numbers of individual events, and the increased sophistication of coaches. These factors lead to what Ulrich labeled "a watering down of the quality of coaching" (1987, p. 5). Although factors may be different, Ulrich's claim is as applicable today as it was in 1987. As budgets tighten and tournaments lengthen, many programs are forced into specialization. While some argue that debate and individual events are both improving as they grow more complex, such evolution makes it difficult for a broad-based program to compete in all categories of events. Ulrich wrote that the coach who "attempts to know all areas of forensics will end up knowing none of the areas well" (1987, p. 6). Kay (1987) suggests that programs are shaped by the "enthusiasm and commitment of the director of forensics, the mission of the institution and unit which houses the program, and the resources which can be secured for the program" (p. 2). Given Ulrich's observations, it is clear that two of Kay's three variables are in jeopardy in the 1990's. It is difficult for a forensics professional to maintain enthusiasm as demands increase. Likewise, as various forensic outlets grow and budgets diminish, critical choices must be made – choices that may well lead to increases in program specialization.

As forensic activities continue to experience change, it is worthwhile to identify trends in both coaching practices, as well as program features. In this paper, research is reviewed in an effort to identify important characteristics of our activity. Following the historical analysis the present study is reported, after which a discussion and implications for further research are provided.

## **Status of Forensics: Past Research**

The one characteristic of forensics that has remained constant through the evolution of the activity is the breadth of benefits for those who participate in it. A number of scholars defend forensics as an educational activity, while others detail specific benefits to be attained through participation in forensics activities (see, for example, Joraanstad, 1989; McBath, 1975; McBath, 1984; Freeley, 1990). Specific skills are attained through a variety of forensics outlets, most notably individual events and debate.

### **Specialization vs. Broad-based**

Although breadth of benefits is associated with breadth of involvement, some programs are limited in the opportunities offered



to students. Several factors contribute to limiting programs. A debate-only focus can be guided by the lack of time coaches have to give to both their teams and professional obligations, the growing number of individual events, the increasing costs of participating in all forensics activities, the increased complexities of coaching, and intrasquad conflicts between individual event and debate students (Ulrich, 1987). A focus on debate also highlights what the first national developmental conference suggested as the focus of forensics – the argument (McBath, 1975; Ulrich, 1987). The drawbacks of a debate only program include less diversity for students, as well as lower rates of retention and recruitment (Ulrich, 1987).

Reynolds (1987) describes a focus on individual events as affording students greater variety, autonomy, and flexibility in their levels and directions of competition. Disadvantages of such a focus are associated with the individualistic nature of the activity that deemphasizes the skills gained through group and team activities. Reynolds, (1987) also observes that debaters are better able to separate themselves from decisions than are individual eventers, given the vagueness of criteria and decision justification in individual events. Additionally, while individual events programs are able to service more students, are cost-effective, and are conducive to flexible coaching practices, Reynolds (1987) observes that such a focus emphasizes the product of forensics training (the performance) more so than a process. Additionally, individual events competition is less likely to adapt to the variety of students' experiential levels. Cue (1990), in arguing the benefits of debate only programs, observes that while many new students will be intimidated by debate, it is more likely to offer multiple divisions, allowing such a program to "sustain larger numbers of inexperienced students" (p. 6).

In a survey of directors of individual events only programs, Wright (1990) reports the most frequently cited factors for such specialization as budget constraints, research facilities that are insufficient to support a debate program, tradition of the program, and the background and philosophical position of the director. Wright also reports that the most frequently cited advantage of an individual events focus was the diversity available to students. The most commonly noted disadvantage is the lack of opportunity for students to engage in debate activities (1990).

Kay (1987) outlines benefits and drawbacks of a broad-based forensics program. Advantages include a maximizing of educational opportunities, shortcomings being compensated for through participation in other events, having more to offer to departments and universities in which forensics is housed, expanding training opportunities for assistant coaches, and increasing the number of awards won by the program. Dittus and Davies (1990) write in their defense of broad-based programs that "to limit students' options is to limit the educative nature of forensics" (p. 5). Dittus and Davies (1990) add that competing in both events aids in providing for social acceptance. The authors argue that integrating a variety of forensics experiences allows students to "see for themselves that the other side is not so different" (p. 6). In short, a major strength of the broad-

based program is its ability to "provide what some would consider a true liberal arts education" (Dittus and Davies, 1990, p. 6).

Drawbacks of not specializing in either individual events or debate can be seen in the time and expertise demands placed on the coaching staff, intrasquad rivalries over resources and attention being given to one category of events over another, and the competitive disadvantage a broad-based student may have when challenged by another student who focuses his/her attention on fewer events (Kay, 1987). Derryberry (1991) adds to the discussion of broad-based programs, proposing what he terms the "total forensics program" as a way to enhance what the forensics experience can offer to students, departments, colleges, and communities.

### **Program Status**

Lee, Lee, and Seeger (1983) compare CEDA and NDT programs for team characteristics and director attitudes. While these results have no doubt changed in a decade, the findings are nonetheless interesting. While the advent of CEDA had not resulted in new programs, it had created a difference in recruitment for existing programs. Although more high school debaters entered NDT programs, a higher overall total of students were involved with CEDA activities. As one might assume, longer traditions were found to exist in NDT programs. Although the study is dated, one conclusion can still be drawn from it – even with debate activities, specialization has profound implications for a program.

Perhaps the most extensive effort to determine the status of forensics is reported by the Cornell Forensics Society (Stepp and Thompson, 1987). Results indicate comparative numbers of programs involved in individual events and CEDA debate. The study also examines average budgets, reasons for specialization, numbers of students involved per event, and national tournament preference. Furthermore, it reveals that well over half of the programs in which students compete in both debate and individual events have crossover participants as a result of the student's own choice. Over 63% of the respondents describe their programs as broad-based (Stepp and Thompson, 1987). This study offers the best resource for determining the direction in which our activity is growing.

A more recent effort to chart forensics trends is offered by Pettus and Danielson (1992). The researchers report that in recent years "many schools have had to make choices regarding the direction of their program, and most directors seem to have selected individual events as the activity that they will continue to sponsor" (p. 16). Further, the study notes that the number of debate-only schools, as well as programs offering both individual researchers conclude their study by suggesting the following:

In the next five years, the biggest changes will be in the areas of dual programs and individual events; the individual events-only program will probably continue to replace the programs that now offer both debate and individual events (Pettus and Danielson, 1992, p. 18).



## The Present Study

This study is an effort to identify competitive trends existing in both regional and national collegiate forensics programs. What follows is a discussion of the survey's methodology, results, and implications for forensics participants and programs.

### Method

The study sets out to answer six research questions, listed below.

R1 - What type of training do today's forensics professionals receive during undergraduate and/or post-graduate study?

R2 - What are the attitudes of current forensics professionals regarding the current status of our activity?

R3 - What is the budgetary and funding structure of today's forensics programs?

R4 - Do forensics programs offer specialized, or broad-based opportunities to their students?

R5 - How have forensics programs changed over the past ten years?

R6 - In what ways do programs vary throughout the country by region?

A 27-question survey was designed and distributed throughout the country. Items varied, with several open-ended, limited response, and scale questions that center around issues addressed in the six research questions. A compilation of CEDA, AFA, NFA, and Pi Kappa Delta mailing lists was formed. From a total of 637 addresses, a randomly selected 500 were used for this study. While surveys were addressed to directors of forensics, these individuals were encouraged to copy the surveys for staff members. Consequently, one program may be represented by more than a single response in the results to attitudinal items reported herein. However, program information is provided by only the director of forensics per instructions on the survey.

It is important to note that, while this survey is similar to that which was used in the Cornell study from 1987 and the Pettus and Danielson study from 1992, the present instrument was designed without consultation with any pre-existing study.

### Results

Of the 500 programs surveyed, 245 surveys were returned; 208 were from directors. This 42% response rate provides a diverse sample from which broad conclusions can be drawn. Additionally, surveys were categorized by their appropriate AFA-NIET district according to the postmark on the return envelope. Those surveys with either an illegible or missing postmark were placed into an "other" category.

Results are reported according to each of the six research questions.

### Research question one

Most respondents, 67% report Master's of Arts of Science as their highest earned degree. Most respondents, 91%, competed in forensics, with most of those individuals having competed at the collegiate level.

Likewise, most respondents, 94%, had forensics activities offered at their undergraduate institutions, while 69% of those who competed had a coach who was involved in both individual events and debate (defined elsewhere in these results as 'broad-based').

Respondents were also asked two questions – "Which events do you coach," and "Which events do you feel qualified to coach." For all individual events and debate activities the number of respondents feeling qualified to coach was higher than the number actually coaching the various events. For example, 41 respondents presently coach NDT, but 117 feel qualified to do so.

A small majority, 54%, received special training beyond competitive experiences in their preparation for forensics coaching. The survey listed a number of specific types of training as examples of what may have been received by respondents. Percentages of respondents receiving each are listed below.

peer coaching while competing	61%
post-competition/graduate coaching	86%
coaching interpretation individual events	60%
coaching public address individual events	68%
coaching CEDA debate	49%
coaching NDT debate	62%
enrolling in a specified forensics course	57%
directing a forensics tournament	69%
assisting in directing a forensics tournament	67%
assuming administrative duties	52%

### Research question two

Respondents completed eight items intended to measure attitudes regarding a number of issues relevant to collegiate forensics. While the results of these items are valuable, they are somewhat limited by an error in survey design. An even number of intervals were offered, as opposed to an odd number which would provide an absolute middle point. Nevertheless, mean responses on the ten point scale are listed below. Agreement is represented by mean scores above 5.00.

competing is a necessary prerequisite to coaching	6.11
individual events and debate teach the same skills	3.14
college forensics emphasize education over competition	5.35
programs do a good job of training forensics coaches	5.82
college coaches are too specialized in their coaching	7.25
programs are too specialized in their competition	5.02
plenty of tournaments for broad-based programs	6.22
important for students to experience IEs and debate	9.01

### Research question three

A majority of programs operate within budgets of \$10,000 or less, with most of that percentage receiving between \$5,000 and \$10,000. Another 22% receive between \$10,000 and \$20,000 while 15% of the responding programs are funded between \$20,000 and \$30,000. A small number of programs, 10%, receive over \$30,000.



Overwhelmingly, most programs receive at least a portion of their funding from their institution as part of the college/university annual budget. The 198 programs funded at least in part with institutional allocations suggests a stable financial base (relative to other sources of revenue). Another 54 programs indicated that at least a portion of their budget was dependent upon fundraising, while 77 receive at least a portion of their funding from some form of student government allocation or student referendum.

#### **Research question four**

Most programs offer broad-based opportunities to their students. Likewise, most of the students taking advantage of broad-based offerings do so voluntarily. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of responding programs have students who compete in both individual events and debate, with only 14% requiring this broad-based experience. Meanwhile, 81% of the programs openly encourage students to compete in both individual events and debate. Furthermore, 73% of the programs that offer broad-based opportunities have individuals who coach both individual events and debate activities. Tournament preference also reflects this broad-based design, with 57% of the programs preferring combined individual event and debate tournaments. Additionally, 25% of the respondents preferred individual event only competitions, while 18% would rather travel to debate only tournaments.

Another aspect of the broad-based program included in the survey is audience performance. Most of the responding programs, 56%, offer some form of audience programs on their campus. Programs offering these events are evenly split between performances being individual event or debate oriented. As a rationale for offering these audience programs, nearly all respondents listed the public relations value as the primary motive.

#### **Research question five**

An open-ended item explores how programs have changed over the past ten years. As might be expected, budgets were often the major focus of change. However, it seems that as many programs that are experiencing growing budgetary problems are blessed with budgetary growth. Many programs also report growth in coaching staff. Not only are staffs growing, but also changing in that more non-tenured professionals (graduate assistants, non-tenure track appointees, etc.) are assuming major or sole responsibility for coaching, travelling, and administrative duties.

Several programs are reporting changes in the events they offer to students. Programs remaining active in debate are growing in their emphasis on CEDA activities, while an even larger number of programs are moving toward individual events as their sole competitive focus. Reasons for this shift are two-fold. First, programs report growing numbers of students and fewer resources to support them, both in the forms of staff and revenues. Secondly, programs report growing disenchantment with the competitive elements of tournaments and the lessening of an educational, communicative

emphasis in debate activities.

A larger number of programs report problems of frequent changes in directorship. These changes, as reported in survey responses, are results of factors ranging from structural instability in the appointment, such as a non-tenure track position with a fixed number of years for renewal, to directors who shift the bulk of responsibility to graduate assistants. Additionally, a small number of programs report leadership problems that stem from apathetic or burned out directors who admit to not devoting needed energies to the program.

### Research question six

A great deal of consistency is reported when examining results by AFA districts. Nonetheless, there are a few specific items that are associated with significantly different responses as a result of the district in which the program is housed. Each district is listed below, along with the states included in that region.

District One	CA, NV, HI
District Two	OR, WA, ID, MT, AK
District Three	OK, KS, TX, MO, LA, AR
District Four	ND, WI, MN, SD, NE, IA
District Five	IL, MI, IN, OH
District Six	GA, TN, FL, AL, NC, SC, MS, KY
District Seven	VA, MD, NJ, DE, PA, WV, DC
District Eight	MA, RI, NY, VT, CT, ME, NH
District Nine	UT, WY, CO, NM, AZ, El Paso, TX, E. Montana College

In terms of training and degrees held by directors/coaches, districts three, six, and eight have more non-Ph.D. directors than do the other six districts. District three has the highest percentage of directors/coaches with Master's degrees or below (62%). Meanwhile, district two reported the highest percentage of directors/coaches at the ABD level or higher (68%).

Most districts are consistent in that more of their programs coach public address individual events rather than interpretation (although the difference is very slight). In all but one district, more programs coach CEDA debate as opposed to NDT activities. District seven reported more NDT programs than CEDA, while districts four, five, and eight reported that over one-fourth of their programs offer NDT debate.

In terms of training, all districts' coaches reflected having more broad-based than specialized training. However, districts one, three, four, six, and eight had much higher percentages of individuals receiving specialized training than those reported in other districts. Similarly, only three districts – four, eight, and nine – had a higher number of respondents indicate they received no special training than



those who did receive training beyond competing.

Districts were quite consistent in their responses to attitude items. The only item wherein district differences existed was the question of whether plenty of tournaments were hosted that offered opportunities for broad-based programs. Districts one and three reflected the strongest agreement with this item, while district four respondents strongly disagreed that such tournaments were plentiful. Other districts were relatively balanced in their response to this item, with more agreement than disagreement being indicated within districts two, six, seven, and nine. These results can be compared with the numbers of programs that compete in both individual events and debate. Only in districts four, seven, and eight did the majority of programs reflect specialization. Additionally, in districts five and six the numbers of specialized and broad-based programs were virtually the same. District one reflected the largest percentage of programs that are broad-based in design.

## Implications and Discussion

The original premise motivating this research was that programs are growing more specialized in the opportunities they offer to forensics students. The results of this study do not support such a claim. Not only do nearly two-thirds of programs have students competing in both individual events and debate, but overwhelmingly those students both volunteer and are encouraged to do so by their coaches. On the other hand, the large number of responses to open-ended items indicating a move toward individual events compare interestingly with the conclusions drawn by Pettus and Danielson (1992). Despite the findings of this study, I would still agree with the hypothesis offered by Pettus and Danielson (1992). A number of respondents express frustration related to budget shrinkage, coach burnout, and the need to offer a program that can accommodate increasing numbers of students with decreasing resources.

Similarly, the large number of programs funded through university budget lines reflects a sense of fiscal stability for many programs. While a number of schools are experiencing severe financial hardship, it would seem to be more difficult to eradicate a program that does not have to justify itself annually to a group of often uninformed, unpredictable students. Even though the number of institutions funding forensics is large, budgets seem pitifully low. It is difficult, if not impossible, for any program to take on a national, and in some cases a regional, personality when limited to less than \$10,000 on which to travel. The notion that forensics is sorely underfunded, as a general rule, is affirmed with this study.

Particularly interesting is the forensics training and attitudes thereof that are reported in this study. While the majority of forensics positions advertised in *Spectra* and *The Chronicle of Higher Education* require, or at least prefer, an individual with a Ph.D. in hand, over two-thirds of the coaches and directors responding to this survey have degrees no higher than a Master's. These results provide interesting data to the on-going debate as to whether or not forensics

coaches should be required to have terminal degrees. Forensics programs are best served by individuals who are able to remain in a position for, ideally, an entire professional career. While few people remain in any position for such a length of time, the question as to how forensics programs are impacted by having non-tenured individuals directing them is a vital inquiry. The importance of this question is further magnified by learning that only a small percentage of respondents received any form of training beyond their competitive experiences. The mild to moderate disagreement when asked if today's coaches were adequately trained further suggests a need to re-evaluate both the means by which we prepare individuals to coach forensics activities and what we expect from forensics professionals. The mean response of 5.82 to that attitude item is reinforced by the 74% who disagreed to some extent with the notion that today's coaches were receiving adequate training.

A final point of discussion centers upon the experiences we offer our students. It has already been determined that most programs are broad-based, and prefer to attend tournaments that allow students to compete in both individual events and debate. While it is not clear as to what extent programs are broad-based (having a debate class attend one debate tournament, or having a debater compete in extemp at one tournament), the preference of IE/debate combined tournaments suggests a "legitimate" broad-based nature to programs represented in this study. Likewise, Pettus and Danielson (1992) have suggested that programs may well grow more specialized within the next five years. Such a trend should be a matter of concern, given the large number of respondents who feel that individual events and debate teach different skills. A number of institutions now offer individual events and debate, but within separate programs in which students seldom if ever cross over. In other words, schools may be broad-based, but students do not experience a broad-based forensics program. Even a greater number of respondents suggest that students should experience both individual events and debate. Broad-based programs must be preserved. But even more important is the attitude seen in this study that collegiate forensics events emphasize competition over education. It has already been noted herein that a solid base of scholarship supports the notion that forensics is an educational activity. Certainly competition is a healthy and inherent part of what we provide through our tournament experiences. However, these results suggest that the collegiate forensics community might do well to re-evaluate the opportunities we offer to students. We must determine how much validity there is to labeling forensics a co-curricular activity. Perhaps we have become, first, coaches, and second, educators.

## Summary

It is only by identifying where we stand that we are able to plot further direction. This and other studies like it offer us the means by which we can analyze ourselves and our activity. The specialization that was thought to exist does not appear to be characteristic of our



present day forensic arenas. What does appear to characterize forensics are limited resources, ill-trained forensic professionals, consistency in forensic practice across regions, and increasing pressures on forensic professionals to do more with fewer resources. All in all, collegiate forensics seems to be thriving, but in what may be a state of needed change and re-examination. Further research will more clearly chart the path on which we must travel as we take our activity into a new century.

### Works Cited

- Cue, W. (1990, November). *Philosophizing about debate only forensics programs*. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Derryberry, B.R. (1991). The nature of the "total" forensic program: The 1990's and beyond. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 19-29.
- Dittus, J.K. & Davis, M.R. (1990, November). *Philosophizing about debate and individual event programs*. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Freeley, A.J. (1990). *Argumentation and debate: Critical thinking for reasoned decision making*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Kay, J. (1987, November). *Advantages and disadvantages of participating in both individual events and debate*. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.
- Lee, R.; Lee, K.K.; Seegler, M. (1983). Comparisons of CEDA and NDT: Differences in program characteristics and director attitudes. In D. Zarefsky, M.I. Sillars, and J. Rhodes (Eds.). *Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation* (845-857). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- McBath, J.H. (Ed.). (1975). *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook.
- McBath, J.H. (1984). Toward a rationale for forensics. In D.W. Parson, (Ed.). *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics*. (5-8). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Pettus, A.B. & Danielson, M.A. (1992). Analysis of forensics programs administration: What will the 1990's bring? *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 11-18.
- Reynolds, C.L. (1987, November). *Advantages and disadvantages of participating in individual events only*. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.
- Stepp, P.L. & Thompson, R.B. (1987, November). *The 1987 Cornell Forensics Society survey of forensics activity at selected U.S. colleges and universities*. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.
- Ulrich, W.A. (1987, November). *Advantages and disadvantages of participating in debate only*. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.
- Wright, L.M. (1990, November). *Philosophizing about individual events-only programs*. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

## COMMUNICATOR STYLE PERCEPTIONS OF "BEST" AND "WORST" TEACHERS

By Anthony B. Schroeder  
and Rona Lyon Leber

■ The forensics coach, teachers of public speaking, communication education instructors and astute members of the audience observe the manner in which messages are delivered. Generally speaking, coaches will tell their students that the manner or "style" of delivery is important to their "winning". The ballot often suggests that the judging criteria concern itself with delivery. Often as instructors of various communication courses discuss the topic of delivery skills, students will refer to speakers they have encountered with good and bad delivery skills, often referring to their teachers. The purpose of this investigation is to determine if students felt their perceptions of delivery skills influenced their perception of "Best vs. Worst" teachers.

Teaching styles differ, presentational styles differ, and speaking styles differ as do the responses of students, audiences, and congregations. Is it possible that successful teachers are more dramatic? Is it possible that stylistic differences influence the instructional process? Is it possible that students perceive stylistic differences between teachers? The concern of this research is with the perceived differences that make for exciting and energetic presentations. Successful speakers and actors usually exhibit communicative styles that are more effective and attractive (Schroeder, 1977). Thus, it appears reasonable to assume that stylistic differences should effect the perception of successful, or better, teachers.

The perceived effect of a teacher's communicative style on learning and student interaction has received a great deal of attention recently. Research suggests that certain communicative behaviors signal effective teaching (Anderson, Norton, Nussbaum, 1981). Norton (1983) suggests that effective teachers are seen to employ a more dramatic communicator style. According to Norton "...the dramatic communicator manipulates messages through exaggerations, fantasies, stories, metaphors, rhythm, voice, and other stylistic devices to highlight, understate, or alter literal meaning" (p. 129).

The dramatic communicator demands attention which is an essential characteristic for the teacher. It is therefore no surprise that research has recently focused on the dramatic stylistic elements utilized by teachers.

### NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Norton (1983) devised the Dramatic Communicator Style Measure, identifying the distinguishing characteristics of the speakers. The concern is with the manner in which a speaker uses such techniques



as humor, narrative, vocal variety, fantasies, movement, and rhythm. The focus of the research is not with what is said or the content of the message but with how it is said, the style or manner in which the instructor communicates. Researchers (Nussbaum, 1982; Norton and Nussbaum, 1980; and Norton, 1977) have observed these differences and have called for future research to become more prescriptive, providing workable suggestions for teachers in order to improve their classroom effectiveness. The need for pragmatic teaching strategies is undeniable. Before prescriptions for improvements can be made, it is essential to know how and to what extent effective or ineffective teachers differ in their use of dramatic communicative behaviors.

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research has been done in the area of how teachers communicate. Anderson, Norton, and Nussbaum (1981) examined the teacher's perceived communicative behavior in an attempt to relate it to students' learning. They were unable to successfully do so; however, they were able to conclude instructor communication variables were an effective means of delineating the effective teacher from the ineffective teacher.

Other researchers have attempted to define those elements that are related to student learning. Nussbaum and Scott (1979) found that communicator style, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity were directly related to student learning.

Specifically related to the area of communicator style, Kearney and McCrosky (1980) found that a teacher's communication style is a predictor of student affect and behavioral commitment. Norton (1977) reports "strong evidence that perceived effectiveness in teaching is inextricably related to one's style of communication" (p. 541). Norton and Nussbaum (1980) conclude that the effective teacher is dramatic; however, the specific behavior is difficult to describe because of the many ways that a teacher may exhibit dramatic behavior.

Norton (1983) reports on the results of three studies that focus on the dramatic communicator style in teaching. In the first of these studies, he tells us that the ineffective teacher is not animated or lively, and that he or she is also significantly less friendly, dramatic, precise, and attentive. He/she is not relaxed and does not use a dramatic style. In the second study, he found that the effective teacher can be characterized by "...getting others to fantasize, catching people up in stories, and being entertaining" (p. 245). In the third study, the following recommendations were given to help the ineffective teacher: (1) use more energy when teaching, (2) anticipate how to catch attention, (3) learn how to make the class laugh, (4) learn what entertains a class, and (5) learn how to manipulate the mood of the class.

## HYPOTHESIS

Teachers designated BEST will be perceived as exhibiting Dramatic

Communicator Style behaviors while the teachers designated WORST will not exhibit dramatic behaviors. The null hypothesis is: No Dramatic Communicator Style difference exists between teachers designated the BEST and WORST teacher.

## METHODOLOGY

**SUBJECTS:** The subjects were first year college students enrolled in interpersonal communication and public speaking classes. The subjects were randomly selected to complete the two survey instruments. One hundred sixty-three completed surveys were analyzed in this study.

**INSTRUMENTS:** Norton's (1983) 64 item Dramatic Communicator Style Measure consists of a series of statements about the communicative manner employed by the instructor. The concern is not with *what* is said or the content of the message, but *how* it is said or the style – the manner in which the instructor communicates.

The instrument was altered for the purpose of analyzing stylistic differences between instructors. Each item was answered using a five point (Likert type) scale ranging from strongly disagree represented with a NO to strongly agree represented with a YES.

**PROCEDURE:** Subjects were asked to think of the very best teacher they have had, not the one they most liked but the one classified as BEST. They were also asked to think of the very worst teacher they have had, not the one they disliked the most but the WORST. They completed a separate instrument for each: one for the BEST teacher and one for the WORST teacher.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:** The t-test statistical procedure selected to compare the Dramatic Communicator Style perceptions of the BEST and the WORST teacher. The t-test will test for statistical differences between the mean scores. A .001 level of significance was used to test the likelihood of a chance finding.

## RESULTS

The results allow rejection of the null hypothesis; that is, that no dramatic communicator style difference exists between teachers designated the BEST and WORST teacher. The data indicates that a statistically significant difference does exist between perceptions of BEST and WORST teachers on 52 of the 64 items in the Dramatic Communicator Style at the .001 level of significance. (see Table 1).