& Weber, 2008, p. 13). South (2010) notes, "As America's largest generation, we are over 21 percent bigger than the Baby Boomer generation—those born between 1946 and 1964" (p. 1). Additionally, the Pew Research Center (2010) notes that this generation is predicted to be the most educated generation in American history. This indicates that more students are entering the college classroom and even continuing their education through graduate school. The size of this generation is not the concern; there are other characteristics that we must understand.

Setting the Millennial generation apart from others are their unique character traits. Howe and Strauss (2003) identify seven core characteristics of the Millennial generation: special, sheltered, confident, team-oriented; conventional, pressured, and achieving. Each of these characteristics may have a direct impact on forensic teams and the relationships between students and coaches.

Special

Millennial students believe that their future is America's future; therefore, if they have a problem or face a problem, adults will be more willing to help fix the issue. Society tells members of this generation of the importance of them being engaged with current issues. Jensen (2010) claims the voter turnout in the 2008 election reinforces this character trait. Feedback and creating structure in the students' lives are critical for this group of students.

Sheltered

Howe and Strauss (2003) claim that Millennials place a premium on security. Parents raised these children in a setting where this generation would not be placed in a situation for failure; therefore, the student would not take risks, afraid that they might fail. Forensics requires risk taking. From arguments in debates, to jokes in an ADS, to picking out literature for an interpretation event, we ask our students to take a leap of faith and meet the risk of negative criticism.

Confident

The confidence level of the Millennial generation is much higher than that of other generations. Woempner (2007) argues this confidence comes from parents who have a more protective parenting style. Additionally, these students come from an environment that rewards and honors participation, regardless of the merit of the award. Not receiving praise/awards for their work in the forensic community can often have a negative impact on forensic retention as the activity rewards quality performances.

Team-Oriented

The Millennial student is often more comfortable working in a group setting. Jensen (2010) argues, "To a large extent this generation

may even prefer group settings for social and task-oriented communication experiences" (p. 102). Perhaps this can be attributed to the team preparation we now find within debate preparation for both NPDA and IPDA.

Conventional

This generation has an appreciation for rules, standards, and structure that makes their life choices easier to make. The structure, or predictability of their day-to-day lives allows for more security as they proceed through their education. Just a matter of five years ago, it was understood in the author's program that students seek out coaches in their offices to see if they had a few minutes to spare to work on an event. Now, coaches make weekly schedules with students for them to practice.

Pressured

In an economy that has witnessed a lack of job openings, the pressure to perform well in classes weighs heavily on the minds of Millennials. Howe and Strauss (2003) claim, "There is less sense among Millennials than among their Gen X predecessors that one can rebound from failure" (p. 3). The added pressure has caused students to be better planners and to work on time management to fit in schoolwork and extracurricular activities. This places a strain on forensic programs as students worry about having enough time to compete and to do it well.

Achieving

With an understanding of the characteristics of Millennial students, it should come as no surprise that these students show a great desire to achieve. Howe and Strauss (2003) note that achievement test scores are at an all-time high. Not only are these students successful, but they also know they are successful.

Indeed, this generation has many unique characteristics. One of the more challenging aspects of working with these students is the input of parents. While visiting with a prospective student recently, the author found that it was the mother who was asking the most questions. When this author would turn his attention to the student, she would become shy and look away, looking to her mother for reassurance. Even as the students are at college on their own, parents still have a firm grip on their children. Numerous students have told this author that they cannot compete in forensics because they must maintain a 4.0 grade point average, or that their parents feel as if the program is taking up too much of their time. It is as if forensic educators are not only recruiting students but their parents as well.

The *Dangerfield Effect*

Comedian Rodney Dangerfield is perhaps best noted for his phrase,

"I can't get no respect." The *Dangerfield Effect* refers to an individual that does not earn the respect they should be afforded. From a research perspective, we have seen the *Dangerfield Effect* explained in technical communication (Miller, 2000), real estate (Gordon, 2002), and the teaching profession (Allard, Harvey, Pham, & Simpson, 2006). Allard, Harvey, Pham, and Simpson (2006) consider the *Dangerfield Effect* in the student-teacher relationship. Allard and colleagues (2006) show that there is a decreasing level of power distance between the student and the professor: "This results in an increase in student expectations of being treated more as an equal to the faculty member and higher levels of expectations for customer service in the educational process" (p. 1). This claim shows that the *Dangerfield Effect* is not only prevalent for educators but for students as well. With a greater understanding of the *Dangerfield Effect* in mind, we can observe strategies to put into place to make sure we stay away from the danger of the *Dangerfield Effect*.

Respectful Student-Coach Relationships

When we show our respect for other living things, they respond with respect for us. ~Arapaho Proverb

There is an old saying that says to get respect you must earn respect. Others say that you have to give respect to gain respect. Either way, respect, much like credibility, is something one must earn. There are multiple ways one might earn respect: actively listening to comments or concerns, being timely on returning feedback, not being late for meetings, allowing for feedback from the student, and asking the student to do something instead of telling the student to do something.

Perhaps the greatest show of disrespect from students comes from the issue of time. Coaches spend a great deal of time in their offices working with students, preparing lesson plans, grading assignments, and even writing their own research papers. While the occasional pop-in visit from a student is often a nice break from the rigors of the job, forensic educators must be allowed to work on their other duties, as well.

While it is important to speak with students about situations other than forensics, for the younger coaches this opens the door to establishing more of a friendship than a coach-student relationship through out-of-class communication. Students have a greater chance of experiencing intimacy when they experience out-of-class communication with a professor (Dobransky & Frymier, 2004). These visits are not all negative and often offer constructive criticism: "When instructors are more personable with students, they feel more comfortable and more willing to accept criticism as well as instruction" (Peters, 2007, p. 7). Throughout these encounters we can understand that forensic coaches are often perceived by students to be counselors (Colvert, 1993). "Due to the sheer amount of time we spend with our students in coaching sessions, meetings and weekend travel, it makes

sense that students will gravitate toward us when they need guidance and advice in other areas of their lives" (White, 2005, p. 89).

The importance of meeting with students is understood, but finding the right amount of time to spend in these situations is key to maintaining a positive relationship between coach and student. It seems that this generation is less aware of the time commitment coaches make. This author often has to flat out say that he needs to finish his work in order to get a student to catch the hint that his/her coaching session has ended. Respecting each other's time commitments is a great way to establish a respectful relationship.

Offering and receiving feedback is a vital way for a student to grow as a competitor. This feedback, however, is not always positive. As coaches we offer constructive criticism to our students in order to give them a better chance of success at competitions. Giving constructive criticism should always be at the top of every coach's "to-do list" after hearing an event. It is often difficult for students to be told that their speech topics will not work, that their solution steps need to be completely revamped, or that their literature is too old. Finding a way for the coaches to be respectful in this communication process can only allow for reciprocal feelings from our students. If we continually have a negative response to the student's ideas, the student is likely to think less of the coach. Carroll (2002) argues, "The level of trust the contestant places in the coach furthers open communication" (p. 9). Open communication leads to respectful communication.

Respectful Coach-Coach Relationships

Perhaps the greatest strategy of establishing respect with students is by offering a good example. The Director/Assistant Director relationship must be one built on respect. By illustrating a positive, respectful relationship between the coaches, it allows the students to mirror this behavior.

Students often learn how to act at tournaments by observing their teammates. The actions of our students ultimately begin at the top of the chain. "One job of the Director and Assistant Director is modeling discipline and professionalism for the students, as well as directing the maintenance of that discipline. Student behavior at tournaments, student coaching sessions, and team dynamics all have to be monitored" (Schnoor & Green, 1989, p. 47). Without consistency between the coaches, an avenue for potential problems arises. This can often lead to students playing one coach against another. This creates conflict between not only the coach and student, but between coaches as well. This conflict could ultimately resonate throughout the entire team. It becomes paramount that the coaching staff supports each other and does not ridicule their colleagues in front of team members.

We see several young coaches at the rank of Assistant Director, and it is vital that the Director allows the Assistant to have authority in certain situations. Dreibelbis (1989) argues, "Directors should give

assistants authority, realizing that authority allows individuals to make decisions within the scope of their capabilities and that assistants may assign specialized tasks to others (including students)" (p. 67). Authority can be granted by assigning specific individual events to be coached, asking the assistant to run sessions during team meetings, and including the assistant in all administrative decisions. If an Assistant Director's role is defined, the authority of the coach is strengthened.

In the middle of the forensic season, this author had to take over as Acting Director of Forensics of his program. While it was a difficult situation to be in, the author gives all of the success and credit to the fact that his Director gave him control and authority of the team. If a level of respect had not been present within the team structure, chaos might have ensued during the most important part of the forensic season.

By giving the Assistant Director certain duties and authority, the students see their coach in a respectful light. Schnoor and Green (1989) argue, "Most important, the Assistant should be made to feel a part of the administrative team. Once the Assistant begins to feel he/she has no input in team decision-making, he/she becomes nothing more than coach and van driver" (p. 44). This potential conflict between the coaching staff can cause a division within the team. If a Director does not respect the Assistant Director, the team members will not reciprocate those feelings. "The student should perceive all coaches as having authority, and that all coaches assist in the policy-making and administration of the team" (Dreibelbis, 1989, p. 66). While it can often be difficult to establish this perception among team members, it is a goal that should be strived for within the team administration.

Dreibelbis (1989) claims that it would be easy for students to question young coaches' authority when making decisions about discipline. As a young coach, we must be able to make decisions about discipline in order to obtain and keep control of our students.

Steps the Forensic Community Can Take

One of the biggest issues facing young coaches is the lack of training received for being a coach. Being a forensic coach is not easy. Bartanen (1996) claims, "Individuals who teach and coach forensics must be dedicated, 'jack-of-all-trade' teachers" (p. xiii). This skill set is one that is not often taught, but one that must be developed within coaches. As young coaches learn through experience, it can lead to situations that might reduce individuals' credibility. Not being aware of written and unwritten rules, making a mistake on an entry, or offering unsound advice can all decrease a coach's credibility and possibly cause a lack of respect. "As untrained or poorly trained coaches begin their positions they are not fully equipped to handle the sheer magnitude of tasks that require a wide array of skills" (Workman, 1997, p. 83). This problem is further enhanced when a graduate assistant

enters into this role. "Graduate students are placed on an emotional and intellectual roller coaster, because very few are ever taught what it means to be a DF or an ADF" (Elton, 1989, p. 55). More training in our educational degrees, forensic workshops, or finding a mentor on the forensic circuit can aid in the process of giving our young coaches a straight path to walk toward success and hopefully ease the burden of coach burnout.

Conclusion

Young forensic coaches already face an uphill battle when they enter their profession; earning the respect of their students should not be their biggest concern. By being accomplished throughout their other endeavors, young educators should be able to earn the respect of not only their students, but also their peers. By working closely with their fellow coaching staff as well as the forensic community, it should allow young coaches to avoid the *Dangerfield Effect.*

REFERENCES

Allard, M. J., Harvey, C. P., Pham, K., & Simpson, M. C. (2006). *What students are telling us about teaching: The Dangerfield effect.* Presented at the 31st International Conference on Improving University Teaching. Available: http://www.iutconference.org/2006/pdfs/AllardIVA2.pdf

Bartanen, M. D. (1996). *Teaching and directing forensics.* Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarlsbrick.

Carroll, R. C. (2002). Classical mentoring in forensics education: The coach as mentor and the contestant as protégé. Available: http://www.nflonline.org/uploads/Rostrum/1201_007_010.pdf

Colvert, A. L. (1993). *Coaching and counseling: Where to draw the line.* Paper presented at the 79th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993. Available: http://www.uvm.edu/~debate/NFL/rostrumlib/coachcolvert1298.pdf

Dobransky, N. D., & Frymier, A. B. (2004). Developing teacher-student relationships through out of class communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 52, 3, 211-223.

Dreibelbis, G. (1989). The director of forensics, assistant director and staff: An organizational communication perspective. *The National Forensic Journal*, 7, 63-70.

Elton, K. (1989). Second among equals: The graduate student perspective. *The National Forensic Journal*, 7, 53-62.

Gordon, J. (2002). Point of view: The Rodney Dangerfield effect. *Journal of Real Estate Portfolio Management*, 8, 1.

Greenberg, E. & Weber, K. (2008). *Generation WE: How millennial youth are taking over America and changing our world forever.* Emeryville, CA: Pachatusan.

Howe, N. and Strauss, W. Millennials go to college. *American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Offices and Life Course Associates.* Available: http://eubie.com/millennials.pdf

Jensen, S. (2010). Generational differences, stress-adaptation, and program stability: Identifying exigencies and strategies for enculturating Millennials into forensic programs. *Journal of the Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri, 40*, 100-110.

Miller, D. (2000). Moving from documentation to usability: The Dangerfield Effect. *Usability Interface*, 6, 3.

Peters, D. (2007). *Pedagogy, desire and debate: The issue of coach-debater relationships.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the NCA 93rd Annual Convention, Chicago, IL. Available: www.allacademic.com/meta/p192004_index.html

Pew Research Center (2010, February 24). "The Millennials: Confident. Connected. Open to change." Available: http://pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/millennials-confident-connected-open-to-change.pdf

Schnoor, L. & Green, K. D. (1989). Issues in the relational dynamic of the director/assistant director: Reactions from the respective positions. *The National Forensic Journal, 7,* 43-52.

South, S. (2010). Making the move from shouting to listening to public action: A student perspective on Millennials and dialogue. *Journal of Public Deliberation, 6, 1,* 1-10.

White, L. (2005). The coach as mentor. *The National Forensic Journal, 23,* 89-94.

Woempner, C. (2007, April). Teaching the next generation. *The Future of Education: A Structured Response to Uncertainty.* Available: http://www.mcrel.org/futureof-schooling/PDF/4005PI_GenerationsApril2007.pdf

Wong H. & Wong, R. (2007). Teachers: The Next Generation. *ASCD.* Available: http://www.newteacher.com/pdf/ascd_express_wong_teachers.pdf

Workman, T. A. (1997). *Solving for a healthy future: Creating national standards for training future directors of forensics.* Paper presented at the Third National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Houston, TX. Available: www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED427369.pdf

Editor's note: *Nina-Jo Moore assumed editorial responsibilities for this submission, since the author is related to the Guest Editor.*

Missing

FORUM

Managing Millennials: Coaching the Next Generation

TODD T. HOLM, MIAMI UNIVERSITY

Abstract: *As coaches and educators, we are welcoming into our classrooms and onto our teams a new generation of students known as the Millennial generation. In many ways this generation is the same as every generation before them, but in some distinct and important ways they are very different than any generation in history. By understanding this generation of students, coaches, instructors and anyone who tries to lead or motivate this unique generation will be more successful.*

The world of the forensic coach is ever changing. Not only are the norms of the activity in constant flux, but our students change as well. Students change in several ways and those changes ultimately change the culture of our teams. An incoming class can invigorate a team with new ideas and fresh perspectives. Their questions can provide teachable moments for new and varsity members alike (as well as learning opportunities for coaches). They sometimes force leaders to put into words the more ephemeral aspects of the activity as we try to explain why one organizational pattern is preferred over another, or why we attend one national tournament rather than another, or even why we like or dislike certain events.

It is hard to tell what changes a new wave of team participants will bring, but we can be sure they will bring change (Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985; Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982; Sackmann, 1990). New group members change the organization's culture. This is especially true in "short-term organizations" where the bulk of the membership changes far more rapidly than in traditional groups. Short-term organizations such as sports teams, emergency or relief organizations, and forensic teams have a dynamic culture that is in a constant state of flux because of a constant turnover in membership.

Gibson and Papa (2000) define organizational culture as "the practices, values, metaphors, stories, vocabulary, ceremonials, rites, heroes, and legends that are held by a group of people" (p. 70). Organizational members learn about the organizational culture through stories, vocabulary/jargon, and rituals important to the organization (Derryberry, 1994; Eisenberg & Riley, 2001; Jensen & Jensen,

TODD T. HOLM (Ph.D., Ohio University) is Director of Forensics at Miami University (Oxford, Ohio). An earlier version of this article was presented at the National Communication Association Annual Convention, New Orleans, LA, November 2011.

2007; Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982). New members inherently change the organizational culture because they bring new stories and add new rituals. This makes short-term organizational culture far more dynamic and malleable. Jensen and Jensen (2007) point out that forensics has an "inherent revolving door" (p. 21), and as such, the forensic team culture can and does change unless care is taken to maintain it.

Research on generational difference has gone on for decades. The most recent generation has been labeled the Millennials or Generation Y, and they were born between 1984 and 2002 (Wells, 2011). Because of the time period in which they were born and the era in which they have experienced the world, Millennials see the world differently than previous generations. As Millennial students join the ranks of our teams they will change teams' cultures. It is important that Directors of Forensics and educators understand the Millennial generation, know how to motivate them, and learn what this new generation of students expects from us.

Although we have researched generational differences for decades, there is a dearth of education research related to the Millennial generation. Given their prevalence in our institutions of higher education, it would be reasonable to assume that there would be a plethora of research about the learning styles, teaching techniques, and educational environments in which this new generation will thrive. A search of Education Research Complete for "Millennial Generation" and "Gen Y" yields fewer than 100 articles that even contain those terms. When you weed out the articles that only tangentially address the best educational practices for the new generation, you are left with a small handful of helpful articles. Clearly this is a field of study ripe for exploration and one where forensic coaches, because of the nature of their relationships with these students, are in a unique position to offer insight.

How the Millennial Generation Will Change Forensics

Obviously, when we examine the attributes of any demographic group, we will not find that what is true of the whole is true of every part of that collection. While the characteristics discussed in the following pages are reflective of a generation of Americans, it would be unrealistic to think that every member of that generation holds these characteristics. If we admit that each generation is unique, however, we must accept the idea that generational differences do exist, and as educators we must learn how to adapt to their changing needs.

Incoming students inherently change the culture of our teams. An incoming rookie class might be more interested in interpretation events or public address events or debate than the existing team, and consequently, they shift the focus or emphasis of the team. When a new class of students reflects a generational shift in perspective on a societal level, the impacts can be more challenging. As we look at generational shifts we are not looking at abrupt changes that will