

Chair. Each team would contact and partner a social program, charitable cause, or local charity. Throughout the year, team members would work closely with the leadership of the program or cause to provide advocacy resources, such as research, public relations, work events and public speaking engagements at local and regional civic organizations or at political rallies and events at the state legislatures. These activities would be invaluable in modeling social advocacy and building life skills for the post forensic world.

The benefits of such a social advocacy program extend far beyond the student. As Derryberry (1998) observed we must recognize that forensics cannot assume favorable appraisals in today's competitive, academic environment. Our activity has the opportunity to meet challenges with programs that are visible to the community and calls for us to reach diverse audiences through public service outreach that will help to mentor the next service oriented generation. A well-executed advocacy program has the potential to foster good will and to provide readily accessible program assessment opportunities with which to further justify our programs' existence.

At the local, regional and national tournament levels, we would encourage the establishment of an advocacy fund. Tournament directors would earmark a certain portion of the entry fees for persuasive speaking toward this fund. During the final round, judges – or a designated tournament official – would be tasked with identifying the speech with the greatest potential impact to impact its problem through its solvency mechanism. During the awards assembly, this speech would be identified and a donation from the advocacy fund would be made on behalf of the winning student to their solvency mechanism. This practice would have several potential impacts. First, students who are passionate about their causes would be rewarded in a very real way and be given the opportunity to make a difference. Second, other competitors would see a commitment to social advocacy modeled by the community. Third, students and coaches would be incentivized to not only select topics with social significance, but would work to develop solvency mechanisms beyond the formulaic "Write Your Congressman." Finally, this ability to look for solvent solutions to real world problems is a skill that we would argue is readily transferable to the business and professional post forensic world.

At this year's Missouri Mule, hosted by the University of Central Missouri, \$100 was donated to the winning persuasion's solvency advocate on behalf of the winning forensic competitor. Two student representatives from AFA Districts 1 and 2 were so impressed by the innovation that they intend to bring the idea before the AFA membership at the AFA business meeting at NCA's annual meeting. Morris (2011) describes a similar practice at the Wisconsin Love Fest Tournament, co-hosted by Ripon College, where participants are encouraged to engage in activities which raise money for local charities. For the past few years, the Mid-America Forensic League

(MAFL) has donated funds to designated charities. For several years Creighton hosted a tournament where the trophies were purchased from Ten Thousand Villages, a charity dedicated to helping stimulate economic freedom in Pakistan. All of these projects are worthy of emulation. All that is lacking is the creative engine necessary to start the process on a local and regional tournament basis.

Finally, at a state and national organizational level, we would encourage state and national councils, boards or the elected leadership to model a commitment to social advocacy through the establishment of advocacy programs. Perhaps, much as we vote for the topic in Lincoln-Douglas debate, state and national organizations could extend a call for advocacy topics from its memberships and then select the state and/or national "cause" through an election of their membership. These advocacy causes could be fairly broad in scope: for example, women's issues, gender issues, poverty and hunger. Local teams could then find specific applications within their local area to support. If the national cause is women's issues, perhaps the local team could find a local battered women's shelter to partner with for the year. In the case of poverty and hunger, perhaps the team could partner with a local food bank or after school feeding program.

In years past, Pi Kappa Delta had offered competition at the national tournament in Chapter History. We would both encourage and extend a call for PKD to offer national chapter competition in Social Advocacy. Chapters would develop a presentation on their social advocacy program to include the specific actions and outcomes for their team's advocacy throughout the year. Again, we would argue that this commitment from the national organization would model the importance of social advocacy as a life-long commitment.

Tweak 4 - Developmental Conferences

One of the challenges shared by coaches and student competitors alike is how to leverage their research skills into tangible, measureable outcomes that serve themselves, the forensic community and the university environment as a whole. Coaches are often so busy coaching and preparing their teams and then travelling to tournaments that they neglect their professional obligations to research and publish. Researchers Cronn-Mills and Cron-Mills (1997) were not the first to observe the tremendous toll that serving as a Director of Forensics (DOF) can place upon the professional careers of coaches. They lamented the current state of the future of tenure-track positions because DOFs have such difficulty getting to professional conferences to share their research and seek publication opportunities. In the same vein, forensic students, who often have excellent research skills have little time to collaborate with professors to hone those skills, attend conferences, and hopefully showcase their research in a manner that opens opportunities for graduate school or professional careers.

In 1996, the University of Texas at Tyler, began hosting the South

Central Development Conference. The conference was hosted on the Thursday evening and Friday morning prior to the Patriot Games Speech & Debate Tournament. It was the goal of the annual conference to encourage coaches and competitors to submit panels and papers that examined various aspects of forensic, the communication discipline, or how communication might be used as a lens to examine other pedagogic fields or phenomena. Out of the conference, the *Southern Journal of Forensics* was born. This not only provided the coaches and students a conference opportunity within which to share their research in a professional arena, but also provided them with a peer-reviewed, publication outlet. Since the conference was hosted just prior to and during the tournament, it help travel resources to a minimum. So long as the conference had a reasonable, regional representation of participants, and was peer-reviewed for selection and inclusion on the program, it was successfully counted as a state or regional conference towards tenure and promotion on a number of occasions.

What if Pi Kappa Delta, which has hosted a number of developmental conferences in the past, provided national leadership to organize and sanction these regional development conferences. Large regional tournaments know to attract a sufficient cross-regional competitive draw (such as the Gorlock hosted by Webster University in St. Louis) could bid for the "right" to hold such a conference. A regional representative, perhaps the Governor or Lt. Governor of the Province, could aid in setting up and hosting the regional conference, thus taking some of the burden off of the tournament host? An added benefit would be a potential increase in the number and quality of the submissions to *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*. Once these conferences caught on, this would give coaches and students alike an outlet to satisfy their professional research commitments and the potential for publication. These regional conferences might also help to provide programs and competitive papers for Pi Kappa Delta and other forensic organizations' submissions to the NCA or other regional communication and forensic / argumentation conventions.

Conclusion

We conclude this article with the realization that our suggestions are woefully inadequate when attempting to address a challenge as expansive as effectively mentoring students towards a future that includes the vision of responsible citizenship articulated so eloquently by forensic icons such as Bartanen, Casey, Derryberry and Schnoor. However, we strongly suggest that if we, as coaches and members of the greater forensic community, dedicate our efforts toward making coaching decisions and commitments that reflect an intentional and purposeful focus on preparing our students for the post forensic, personal and professional world, we can, as a community, make a collective difference. Further, we would suggest that the pedagogic value of inclusive communities intentionally mentored to effectively pursue public service and social advocacy is a critical strategy for

achieving our goal of teaching and reinforcing skill sets that extend beyond the competitive weekend and into the post forensic world.

Toward that end, we would extend a call to the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta to consider convening a National Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference at some point in the near future to consider ways that we might come together to foster the intentional development of our student forensicators towards the perfect ideals of Pi Kappa Delta. We would echo the words of Dr. Bob Derryberry, in his keynote address at the 1993 Development Conference when he says "Overriding all that we attempt is the assurance that what we do really matters in the lives of developing speakers and in our communities where ideas, values, and the best of our literary past await challenges and communication."

REFERENCES

- Bartanen, K. M. (1998). The place of the forensic program in the liberal arts college of the twenty-first century: An essay in honor of Larry E. Norton. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84:1, 1-15.
- Bartanen, M.D. (1993). The educational objectives of the Guild of American Forensic Educators. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 78:2, 1-11.
- Bartanen, M., & Frank, D. A. (1994). *Nonpolicy debate* (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Colbert, K. (1994). Replicating the effects of debate participation on argumentativeness and verbal aggression. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 79:3, 1-13.
- Colbert, K., & Biggers, T. (1985). Why should we support debate? *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 21, 237-240.
- Cronn-Mills, D. & Cronn-Mills, K. (1997). Institutional Circuit Rider is the Future of the DOF. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2:3, pp. 248-251.
- Derryberry, B. R. (1998). Forensics as a cooperative agent: Building a tradition within an academic community. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 83:3, 33-41.
- Freely, A.J. (1996). *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision-Making* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Greenstreet, R. W. (1997). Going Local. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 83, 37-44.
- Greenstreet, R., Joeckel, K., Martin, J., & Piercy, K. (1998). The gender-based experiences of women in intercollegiate forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 83:3, 1-22.
- Greenstreet, R., & Frederick, T. (2000). The sounds of silence: The gender-based experiences of women in intercollegiate forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 85: 3, 25-36.
- Hetlinger, D. F., & Hildreth, R. A. (1961). Personality characteristics of debaters. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 47, 398-401.
- Hill, B. (1983). Intercollegiate debate: Why do students bother? *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 48, 77-88.
- Hill, B. (1993). The value of competitive debate as a vehicle for promoting development of critical thinking ability. *CEDA Yearbook*, 14, 1-23.
- Hill, S. (1997). African American Students' Motivation to Participate in Intercollegiate Debate. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2:3, pp. 202-235.
- Hinck, E. A. (2003). Managing the Dialectic Tension Between Competition and Education in Forensics: A Response to Burnett, Brand, & Meister. *National Forensic Journal*. XXI (2), 60-76.
- Hinck, E. A. & Hinck, S. S. (1998). Service-Learning & Forensics. *National Forensics Journal*. XVI (1 & 2), 1-25.

- Hollihan T.A., & Baaske, K.T. (1994). *Arguments and arguing: The products and process of human decision-making*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Horn, G., & Underberg, L. (1993). Educational debate: An unfulfilled promise? In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (Eds.), *CEDA 20th anniversary assessment conference proceedings*, (pp. 37-74). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Infante, D.A., Trebing, J.D., Shepherd, P.E., & Seeds, D.E. (1984). "The Relationship of Argumentativeness to Verbal Aggression," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 50, 67-77.
- Jensen, S. L. (1994). "The Challenge of Serving Inner-City Students in Forensics," *Proceedings of the Pi Kappa Delta Development Conference*, March 1993, Tacoma, WA, University of North Dakota, Fargo: Pi Kappa Delta, 1994, 105-109.
- Jensen, S. L. (2001). A Forensics Icon as Citizen-Educator: The Citizenship of Bob Derryberry within the Forensics Community. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 86:4, 23-27.
- Jones, K.T. (1994). Cerebral gymnastics 101: Why do debaters debate? *CEDA Yearbook*, 15, 65-75.
- Keefe, C. (2001) A profile of a long-term forensics director: Dr. Bob Derryberry of Southwest Baptist University. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 86:4, 11-16.
- Kuyper, C. (2011). Fistful of Sand: Quantifying the Intangible Benefits of Forensic Participation. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 96:1, 17-24.
- Loge, P. (1991). Black participation in CEDA debate: A quantification and analysis. *CEDA Yearbook*, 12, 79-87.
- Logue, B. (1985a). *The debate activity: Void of a feminist perspective*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.
- Logue, B. (1985b). *Male/female levels of participation in regional and national CEDA debate tournaments*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.
- Logue, B. (1987a). *Minority students in CEDA debate: Involvement, success, and barriers*. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association Conference, Syracuse, NY.
- Logue, B. (1987b). *An examination of gender-based levels of participation in regional and national CEDA debate tournaments*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern States Communication Association, Syracuse, NY.
- Millsap, S. (1998). The benefits of forensics across the curriculum: An opportunity to expand the visibility of college forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84:1, 17-26.
- Morris, K. R. (2011). Service, Citizenship and Personal Integrity: Forensic and the Quintilian Ideal of "The Good (Wo) Man Speaking Well." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 96:2, 1-10.
- Paine, R.E. & Stanley, J.R. (2003). The yearning for pleasure: The significance of having fun in forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 21, 36-59.
- Pratt, J. (1990). Business leaders' perceptions of forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 75:2, 7-17.
- Rohrer, D. (1987). Debate as a Liberal Art. In D. Thomas & J. Hart (Eds.), *Advanced Debate* (pp. 7-14). Lincolnwood: IL: National Textbook Company.
- Rogers, J. E. (2002). Longitudinal Outcome Assessment for Forensics: Does Participation in Intercollegiate, Competitive Forensics Contribute to Measurable Differences in Positive Student Outcomes? *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate*, 23, 1-27.
- Rogers, J. E. (2005). Graduate School, Professional and Life Choices: An Outcome Assessment Confirmation Study Measuring Positive Student Outcomes beyond Student Experiences for Participations in Competitive Intercollegiate Forensics. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate*, 26, 13-36.
- Rogers, J. E. & Rennels, A. (2010) Outcome Based Life Choices: An Outcome Assessment Confirmation Study Measuring Positive Social Outcomes Beyond Undergraduate Experiences for Participants and Society in Competitive Intercollegiate Debate, paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Argumentation, Rhetoric, Debate and the Pedagogy of Empowerment, Oct 22-24, 2010, Maribor, Estonia.
- Rowland, R. C. (1995). The practical pedagogical function of academic debate. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 16, 98-108.

- Schneider, V. (1984). Debate experience aids professional success. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 70:1, 9-11.
- Simerly, G., Biles, R., & Scott, L. (1992). "Strategies to Achieve Cultural Diversity in Intercollegiate Debate," *Speech & Theatre Association of Missouri Journal*, 12, 28-34.
- Simerly, G., & Gartin, B.A. (1994). *Gender and participation in intercollegiate debate*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Spangle, M., & Knapp D. D. (1996). The effectiveness of debate as a corporate decision-making tool. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 1:3, 138-157.
- Stenger, K. (1999). Forensics as preparation for participation in the academic world. *The Forensics of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84:4, 13-23.
- Stenger, K., & Roth D. (1998). Male generic language in the forensics community: Definition, usage and harms. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 83:4, 19-24.
- Stepp, P. (1991). *Is CEDA debate white-male dominated?* Paper presented at the meeting of the Cross Examination Debate Association Commission on Women and Minorities in Debate, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA.
- Stepp, P., Simerly, G., & Logue, B. (1993). *Sexual Harassment in CEDA Debate in 1993*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, FL, November 1993.
- Williams, D. E., McGee, B. R., & Worth, D. S. (2001). University student perceptions of the efficacy of debate participation: An empirical investigation. *Argument & Advocacy*, 37, 198-209.
- Wood, S. & Rowland-Morin, P. (1989). Motivational tension: Winning vs. pedagogy in academic debate. *National Forensics Journal*, 7, 81-98.



EDITOR'S NOTE: Normally, Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.) prescribes that Tables are to be inserted within the text of the article. Due to the nature of the authors' non-sequential reference to the Tables, they are placed at the end of the article.

Extemporaneous Speaking Competitions: Investigating the Impact of Conventional Extemporaneous Speech Organization and Judge Experience on Speaker Ratings

BRIAN D. HOUSEHOLDER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY &
ALLAN D. LOUDEN, WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

Abstract: Extemporaneous speaking has long been a cornerstone event in competitive forensic. According to public speaking scholars, organization is of paramount importance in determining the success of a speech. This experimental study examines judges (N=66) responses to two extemporaneous speeches. The results indicated that experienced judges who viewed the speech without a numerated preview and review, which the forensic world considers the normative structure, rated the speech as being poorer than the group that had the normative structure present. Experienced judges also rated the two speeches as significantly different on the speech rating criteria of analysis when that factor was held constant. The findings also show that judges of high experience are more punitive in their scoring of the speech that does not meet the normative organization pattern. This research points to a strong normative convention governing the extemporaneous speaking event.

In most judged competitive events, the competitors understand the importance of rule compliance. Deductions of a point here and a point there increase contestant awareness of how they are performing. Point deductions in most contests are established bywritten rules. In extemporaneous speaking competitions no established written rules exist with regard to content, and no specificity is offered for how many points will be deducted for rule violations. This study examines data from judges viewing a hypothetical extemporaneous speech to examine if an organization "rule" is present in extemporaneous speaking contests. Moreover, if an organization convention (rule) is present, what impact does a

BRIAN J. HOUSEHOLDER (Ph. D., University of Georgia), is the Director of Undergraduate Studies in Communication at Rutgers University. ALLAN D. LOUDEN (Ph.D, University of Southern California), is Professor & Chairperson in the Department of Communication at Wake Forest University. Correspondence should be sent to: Brian.householder@rutgers.edu.

convention violation have on the assessment of a speaker? Finally, this study explores how judges communicate the normative convention and attempts to inform contestants of their potential transgressions.

Many have argued that extemporaneous speaking is the most educational event in forensics (Arden & Kay, 1988; Crawford, 1984; Faules, Littlejohn & Ayres, 1976). The extemporaneous speaking contests offer speakers the ability to learn critical thinking skills, argumentation, research skills and oral communication skills. Outside of the classroom, students equipped with these skills emerge as strong participants in the legal, political, educational and business communities (Bartanen, 1994; Winkler & Cheshier, 2000). As Preston (1990) notes, extemporaneous and impromptu speaking contests offer practical skills for the modern world.

Every weekend, thousands of students from the middle school to the college level compete in extemporaneous competitions and even more students participate in other forensic events. Yet, there is little quantitative research on competitive speaking contests.

The Extemporaneous Speaking Contest

The Event

In the extemporaneous speaking contest, speakers give five to seven minute speeches on questions in current events (e.g., Should the US initiate a Marshall plan in Iraq?). Typically contestants are given thirty minutes to formulate a speech, utilizing reference materials (newspapers, magazines and books). Speakers utilize their preparation time to write an outline, organize their ideas and practice delivery. After preparation, speakers hasten off to deliver their speech to waiting judges.

Judges are provided a ballot at most tournaments that include a criterion of evaluation. Standard ballots in the extemporaneous speaking contest typically list delivery, analysis/content and organization as areas of evaluation.

Organization

First, it is important to characterize what is meant by organization in extemporaneous speaking. Crawford (1984) outlines the prevailing philosophy in competitive extemporaneous speech organization as stating the question, providing an answer to the question and providing two or three numerated main points. Kearny and Plax (1996) define this organization process as: "Linear logic: A way of organizing thoughts and ideas in which points are made in ordered, sequential way and linkages and conclusions are explicitly stated" (p. 259). This form of organization gives the judge a type of intellectual road map via clear numeration, signposting and parallelism (Preston, 1990; Sprague & Stuart, 1992). Formulaic and prescriptive conceptions

of organization find easy pedagogic justification when, as Barrett notes, "Speech instructors emphasize organization . . .because they know that clarity and orderly unfolding of parts of the message are essential to effectiveness in communication" (p.66). Kearny and Plax (1996) discuss the importance of organization when they write:

Organizing allows you to make sense of your speech both for yourself, as a speaker and for your audience, as receivers of your message. It helps you determine what information is truly relevant and what information you cannot use. You must arrange the relevant information in some logical manner that makes sense. Research indicates that organized speeches are preferred by audiences, result in greater audience comprehension, and are associated with higher perceptions of speaker credibility. (p. 259)

Sprague and Stuart (1992) support this view when they say a listener will perceive that a speaker is "uninformed" if the speaker is unorganized. A speaker's ability to persuade is also diminished if s/he is disorganized (Baker, 1965; McCrosky & Mehrley, 1969). In his study on the effects of speech organization on college students, Smith (1951) found two effects with regard to organization: that organization was an extremely important factor in persuasion and that speakers with better organized speeches are better liked (p. 299-300).

There are also empirical implications of organization on education. The data show that clear organization is very important to message learning and retention (Baird, 1974; Civikly, 1992; Spicer & Bassett, 1976;Thompson, 1960; Whitman & Timmis, 1975). With all the empirical support it is reasonable that organization is a central pedagogical goal among forensics coaches.

Organization Convention

Among forensic educators there exists a *prescribed style* of organization in extemporaneous speaking contests. The "formula" of organization falls into what Preston (1990) calls the "unwritten rules" or norms. Preston (1990) goes on to write, "Conventions such as signposting, following the structure outlined, reviewing the (preferably three) points..." govern the event as strongly as any written rules (pp. 4-5). The organization convention can be summed up more precisely: a numbered preview of the main points, clear transitions from point to point, numbering of the main points in the body of the speech and a numbered review of the main points in the conclusion (Benson, 1978). The convention stands as a hyper form of organization; thus, the reasoning seems to go that if organization is important, the more a speech is organized the better it will be.

This rigidity of organization also impacts other speech factors (i.e. delivery and analysis). In the service of organization, delivery has become more formal. Transitional walking, planned gestures and stronger vocal signposts are just a few of the normative elements that

highlight organization. For example, analysis is often little more than, "According to Newsweek, January, 2007," followed by a quote or a statistic. The norm here is the *form* of the front-ended organization of the citation. In fact, evaluators might expect the pillar criterion of organization to trump the other factors and have a strong impact on the other speech factors. Certainly delivery and analysis are structured in service of organization and even style is arguably constrained by organizational mandates.

Speeches that fail to function within the norm are often considered abnormal and their deviations from the norm are readily apparent. As in social contexts, events and behaviors that fail to "function normally" are often marginalized (King, 1975). In the forensic culture, the main fear of the forensic coach is the fear your students' performances are seen as outside the "acceptable" evaluative structure. Often, individuals who attempt to move beyond the normative practices in the forensic setting are criticized of taking the risk (being abnormal) and a paralysis occurs from the inflexibility of the extemporaneous speaking event (Dean, 1992).

Certainly not all individuals that buck the norms are castigated. In most cases, we want people to fit in and when confronted with extreme violators of norms we seek to reduce or eliminate the perceived discrepancy between a deviant action and the norms that it violates (Robinson & Kraatz, 1998). Robinson and Kraatz call our attempts to cognitively bring these deviants back into the normative fold, a neutralization strategy. In the forensic organization, the marginalization or neutralization of a deviant is the consideration of the judges and is noted in their ballots, ranking, and ratings. Judges use sanction as a way to get competitors to comply with the standing norms of "excellence."

With foundation of empirical support, classical theory, "conventional wisdom" and "conventional rules," a void remains regarding the importance of competitive compliance to the organization conventions in extemp. Given these considerations, the following four hypotheses are offered:

- H1: Competitors in extemporaneous speaking contests that use the conventional organization technique will receive superior overall ratings on ballots when compared to speakers that give a speech absent the organization convention.
- H2: Competitors in extemporaneous speaking contests that use the conventional organization technique will be perceived as having superior organization when compared to speakers that give a speech absent the organization convention.
- H3: Competitors in extemporaneous speaking contests that use the conventional organization technique will be perceived as having superior delivery when compared to speakers that give a speech absent the organization convention.

H4: Competitors in extemporaneous speaking contests that use the conventional organization technique will be perceived as having superior analysis when compared to speakers that give a speech absent the organization convention.

This study not only examines whether the conventional or unconventional organization type is perceived as being better, but additionally set out to determine if any difference between scores is a result of a judges understanding or knowledge of the conventional organizational pattern.

Judges

In competitive speech contests, judges signal their approval or disapproval of the speakers' abilities to conform to these prescribed rules in two ways. First, judges provide a rank (the ordinal placement of a competitor in a round of 5-7 peers), and second, judges provide a rating (most often a Likert-type scale: 1 being superior to 5 being poor or a percentage: 100% being superior to 50% being poor, scores can fall anywhere within this range). Ratings are defined on most judging ballots as the relation of that speaker to other speakers in general (i.e., how far plus or minus is this speaker from the average extempore?) The scores of speaker ratings are also used as a tie-breaking mechanism to determine which speakers advance in a competition.

In a survey, Harris (1986) asked judges to rate the importance of the different general categories of extemporaneous speeches (organization, delivery, and analysis). According to Harris, the area the judges rated most important was organization, although the other two were important). Harris went on to note, judges most often comment on delivery factors.

One aggravation for competitors and coaches the variation among judges criterion Crawford (1984) states, "...Students... are likely to be frustrated during competitions because of the inconsistencies that occur between and among coaches, tournaments and judges with respect to philosophy of the extemporaneous speech" (p.41). Not all judges know or use the formulaic convention as a criterion for speaker ratings. A large portion of judges are persons with limited training in contest judging or limited current experience and are not familiar with the norms (Bartanen, 1994).

Arguments have been made in the past that inexperienced judges should not be allowed to judge contest speaking Cox & Honse, 1991; Gass, 1988). The reason often cited is that decisions would be based on random factors or only on delivery (Bartanen, 1994; Cox & Honse, 1991; Gass, 1988). Yet, these studies failed to demonstrate a substantial difference in the decisions of judges. Bartanen (1994) notes that coaches in ballot discussions chastised ballots of the inexperienced judge as the ballot from the "slob off the streets" and use the term "Lay Judge" in a pejorative way, creating a further entrenchment of the conventions when students conform solely to the experience

judges preferences at the bequest of their coaches (p. 249).

With these factors in mind, a judge that has been in the forensic activity for a longer period of time is likely to have a better understanding of the normative conventions of a speaking event. As a result,

H5: Judges of high levels of experience will rate the conventional organization technique speech higher than judges of low levels of experience.

In other words, judges of greater experience will be more punitive in their scoring of the unconventional speech.

Methodology

To explore the hypotheses, three methodological choices were made in an attempt to make the results applicable to the extemporaneous speaking contest world. First, this study was conducted at real speech contests with bona fide speech judges. Second, the speeches the judges viewed were "authentic," a replication of a real extemporaneous speech. Finally, the tournaments supplied large and diverse judging pools, allowing for random sampling.

Participants

Study subjects were judges at two large high school invitational forensic tournaments. The two tournaments were: the National Earlybird Forensic Tournament, an invitational held at Wake Forest University, and the Santa Clara University Invitational. The Earlybird Tournament is a major national tournament, drawing schools for a wide variety of locations (New York to California). Approximately 70 schools enter the individual events portion of the tournament. The Santa Clara University is a major California state tournament, drawing schools from across the state. Seventy-seven schools attended the Santa Clara Invitational and over four hundred students participated in individual events. At most high school tournaments, the judging population consists of coaches, hired college students, parents, community members, and teachers. The utilization of two large tournaments on two coasts provided a cross-sectional selection of judges,

A total of sixty-six judges participated in the study: forty-four judges from the Earlybird Tournament and twenty-two judges from the Santa Clara Invitational. Thirty-three were male and thirty-two female, with one subject not identifying sex.)

Procedures

Judges were recruiting utilizing a convenience sample drawn from the judge waiting pools at both tournaments. In most cases judges were excused from one round of judging in exchange for their participation. Participating judges were then randomly assigned to

one of the two treatment groups and then assigned to smaller viewing groups of approximately 4-6 participants. Participants were asked to read and sign an informed consent form. Each group was informed that they were going to watch video taped speech, that they were to view it as if it were in a normal speech round and that the speech they would be watching was an extemporaneous contest speech. Each treatment group watched a seven-minute speech (videotape viewed on a television monitor). Group-A, watched an extemporaneous speech that used the conventional organization pattern. Group-B watched a speech that did not incorporate the conventional organization pattern.

After viewing a speech, judges were given a questionnaire to complete. The questionnaire contained a four item, 7-point Likert scale measuring, the perceived quality of the speech. The measure is similar to a criterion-based measure used by Faules, Littlejohn and Ayres (1972) with reliabilities (on content of .87, delivery .90, organization .89, and overall effectiveness .90). The Faules, Littlejohn and Ayres (1972) measure was changed in this study to a 7-point scale from a 5-point scale. Also, two terms were changed: "content" to "analysis" and "overall effectiveness" to "overall rating." These terms are synonymous with categories currently used in judging circles (Preston, 1990). Additionally, five items on the questionnaire served as an induction check to test whether or not the organization constructs were *present* in each of the video taped messages. Moreover, the questionnaire provided an open-ended question, affording judges the opportunity to include qualitative comments about the speech. The remaining items on the questionnaire dealt with demographic variables.

Subjects were then thanked for their participation and told not to discuss the video taped speeches or the questionnaire with any tournament judges. Debriefing followed the tournament by placing in each schools tournament results packet a sheets describing the research and a way to acquire information about study.

Messages

The speech the judges viewed was adapted from a transcript of the National Forensic League national championship speech in domestic extemporaneous speaking. Two versions of the speech were recorded utilizing an experienced former competitor to deliver the prepared transcripts. The recordings were made in the same session in an attempt to ensure commensurate performances.

The conventional speech was verbatim from a transcript of the national championship speech. It contained a numbered preview, clear transitions to points/summary statements, numbered points in the body of the speech, and a numbered review of the points in the conclusion. The unconventional speech, viewed by Group-B, was adapted from the same original transcript with the overt organization features removed so that the speech did not have: a **numbered**

preview, clear transitions to points/summary statements, numbered points in the body of the speech, or a numbered review of the points in the conclusion. *No changes* were made in the content of the speech. The use of the same speech protected against a number of potential confounds: 1) word choice, 2) number of sources, 3) source quality, 4) topic bias, and 5) argument choice. In total, only 128 words were removed from the original speech transcript for the unconventional speech. On the other hand the unconventional speech ignores the preview and just goes into the first point.

Message pretests were performed to determine if judges could identify the absence or presence of the conventional elements. Twenty judges at the California High School State Speech Championship were randomly split into two groups of ten and given a written transcript of either the conventional or unconventional speech. The pretest indicated that judges were able to identify the absence or presence of the convention constructs ($\alpha = .87$).

Using the pretested transcripts a speaker was videotaped delivering the speeches. The same speaker was used for both speeches. This procedure controlled for delivery confounds: gender, ethnicity, accent, gestures, rate, tone, pitch and dress. Moreover, to help insure that the speaker followed the transcripts exactly and to insure the maintenance of eye contact, a teleprompter was used in videotaping session.

RESULTS

Demographic Descriptors

In addition to the demographic question of gender reported earlier, essentially a 50-50 split, the study asked participants the number of years involved in extemporaneous speaking contests and the number of rounds of extemporaneous speaking judged or competed in the last 5 years. Gender was not significantly correlated with any factor.

Two demographic questions served as indicators of judge experience with extemporaneous speaking (years judged and rounds judged). Judges' responses to the two experience questions had a significant positive correlation. As judge experience increased, the number of rounds judged in the last 5 years also increased ($p < .01$, frequencies reported in Table 1). The years involved in extemporaneous speaking were significantly correlated with four speech factors (Table 2). As the participants years involved in extemporaneous speaking increased, participants assigned poorer ratings to the speeches overall quality, speech delivery and organization.

For all of the demographic factors, there was no significant difference between the participant at the Early Bird Tournament ($n=44$) and the Santa Clara Invitational ($n=22$). Additionally, t-test and Pearson's correlation analysis failed to indicate any difference between tournament and speech factors or induction factors.