

TABLE I

† Scores for Perceptions of BEST/WORST Teacher

STATEMENT	t score	prob.
Instructor gets along with all kinds of people	19.28	.001
Instructor is very good at making puns	9.19	.001
Instructor knows how to build tension when telling a story	18.83	.001
Instructor is witty	16.97	.001
Instructor is a good performer	16.81	.001
Instructor is very quick in reacting to what others say	8.59	.001
Instructor often uses his/her laughter to create an effect	11.67	.001
Frequently instructor gently teases students	6.82	.001
Instructor is a dramatic communicator	12.93	.001
Instructor makes the class laugh easily	20.59	.001
Instructor frequently tells jokes to the class	8.55	.001
Instructor dramatizes a lot	7.88	.001
Instructor often clowns around verbally	6.80	.001
Instructor deliberately uses laughter for an effect	7.96	.001
Instructor can easily insult a person if he/she wants to	4.14	.001
Instructor knows how to tell a good story	23.22	.001
Instructor's speech tends to be very picturesque	19.83	.001
Instructor sometimes pretends to be embarrassed to create an effect	5.09	.001
Instructor gets excited and knows how to get others excited	21.88	.001
Instructor is very humorous	24.03	.001
Instructor sometimes acts out a communication physically as well as vocally	16.32	.001
Instructor has a very good time when he/she tells jokes or stories	12.76	.001
Instructor has several different kinds of laughter that he/she uses	8.39	.001
Instructor knows how to catch the attention of the students	25.26	.001
Instructor gets excited easily	7.25	.001
Instructor knows how to get students to feel sympathetic for others	12.97	.001
Instructor knows how to tell a joke	16.80	.001
Instructor has a set of good stories that he/she uses to teach a class	17.36	.001
Instructor is very good at manipulating the mood of the class by the way in which he/she says things	12.84	.001
Instructor can always think of a story to tell the class	13.64	.001
Instructor is good at getting the students to fantasize	13.24	.001
Instructor can catch a person up in his/her stories	16.41	.001
Instructor likes to emotionally color what he/she is saying	9.75	.001
Instructor is an outgoing person	19.80	.001
Instructor likes to get people laughing	15.06	.001
Instructor uses a lot of energy in teaching	22.43	.001
Instructor goes to excesses to maintain attention	7.48	.001
Instructor often uses different voices to create a dramatic effect	10.37	.001
Instructor uses a lot of colorful words	10.18	.001
Instructor uses pauses to create a dramatic effect	10.31	.001
Instructor provides others with a lot of feedback by his/her laughter	13.27	.001
Instructor often exaggerates for emphasis	4.81	.001
Instructor sometimes shades or tones his/her voice to create a dramatic effect	10.08	.001
Instructor is often sarcastic	5.62	.001
Instructor plans stories about the topic he/she will be discussing in class	8.28	.001
Instructor deliberately tries to create emotional feelings when he/she communicates	8.58	.001
Instructor is very good at responding to insults when necessary	6.39	.001
Instructor likes to report unusual news events to the class	11.18	.001
Instructor is quite good at acting when he/she wants to	13.03	.001
Instructor often uses laughter to get students talking	12.25	.001
Instructor knows how to catch the imagination of the students	22.34	.001
Instructor often uses his/her laughter to create a dramatic effect	11.37	.001

Miller's (1976) research validates the concept of perceptive validity with the Communicator Style Measure; therefore, it is with this concept that the perceptions are analyzed.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of the study call for the rejection of the statistical hypothesis ($H=0$) which overwhelmingly supports the research hypothesis; which is, teachers designated BEST will be perceived as exhibiting dramatic communicator style behaviors, while the teachers designated as WORST will not. The results do point out the BEST teacher was different in his or her Dramatic Communicator Style behaviors. **The BEST teacher was perceived to be capable of telling jokes, stories, and even unrelated news items to the class and hold the students' attention. She/he was perceived as being dramatic, picturesque in speech, outgoing, and able to get along with all kinds of people.** These stylistic differences were revealed on 52 items. **Those perceived to be WORST teachers were not prepared to get and maintains the attention of the students, tell a joke or a story, or involve the students' imagination.**

These findings are consistent with previous studies by Norton (1983) which illustrate the differences in perceptions between teachers. **The teacher perceived BEST was animated, lively, friendly, dramatic, precise, attentive, able to involve the students in fantasies and stories, to make the class laugh and to manipulate the mood of the class.**

Many education majors are reluctant to take course work in public speaking, oral interpretation, or acting. They are also not involved in speech activities or school plays – experiences which would enhance their teaching effectiveness. Today's schoolroom is a tough audience, accustomed to the entertainment provided by the media. Students may not expect to be entertained, but they do expect a quality performance and an enjoyable learning experience. We are not suggesting teachers become actors, but that they develop performance or public speaking skills. Teachers should be required to take training in areas such as public speaking, interpretative reading, and acting as the findings suggest. The stylistic differences are of a performance nature requiring the acquisition and development of communication skills and a dramatic style. Our communicative behaviors and stylistic differences are developed over time by a repeating process of success and failure. If the behavior or style is rewarded with success then we will perfect and improve on that style. If the behavior is not successful, then we must find a new style, try it, and ultimately adopt it if the style is successful.

Teachers need to receive training in performing and speaking if they desire to be successful teachers or to be perceived as BEST teachers.

Forensics competitors are aware of the stylistic differences in others' performances and will develop for themselves a pleasing and impressive communicator style. The difference between first and

second is often in the manner in which the message was delivered. Classroom instructors need to be made aware that the manner in which the material is presented is important. Presentational skills are often overlooked, but as coaches of forensics are aware, the method of presentation and the content are conjoint.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.F. (1979). Teacher immediately as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 3*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction-Interactional Communication Association.
- Anderson, J.F., Norton, R.W., Nussbaum, J.F. (1981). Three investigations exploring relationships between perceived teacher communication behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, 30, 377-392.
- Kearney, P. and McCrosky, J.C. (1980). Relationships among teacher communicator style, trait, and state communication apprehension and teacher effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 3*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transactional-International Communication Association.
- Miller, L. (1975). Perceptual accuracy as a function of communicator style in dyads. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Norton, R.W. (1977). Teacher effectiveness as a function of communicator style. In B.D. Ruben (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 1*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction-International Communication Association.
- Norton, R.W. (1983). *Communicator style: theory, application, and measures*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Norton, R.W. and Nussbaum, J.F. (1980). Dramatic behaviors of the effective teacher. In D. Nimmo (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 4*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction-International Communication Association.
- Nussbaum, J.F. (1982). Effective teaching: A communicator non recursive casual model. In M. Burgoon (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 5*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction-International Communication Association.
- Nussbaum, J.F. and Scott, M.D. (1979). Instructor communication behaviors and their relationship to classroom learning. In D. Nimmo (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 3*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction-International Communication Association.
- Schroeder, A.B. (1977). Communicator style as a predictor of effectiveness and attractiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

THE ROLE OF THE EX-FORENSICS DIRECTOR AS A MENTOR

By Cynthia R. Carver

■ The concept of mentoring is actually quite old. Noonan (1980) suggests that the term was probably first introduced in Greek mythology when "Mentor," the faithful friend of Odysseus, was entrusted to care for Odysseus' son. Recently, however, mentoring has truly emerged as a topic of interest in a variety of settings ranging from business to teaching. Much of the recent interest in mentoring can probably be traced in part to a survey published by Roche in the *Harvard Business Review* (1979) in which over 4,000 top executives in the United States were interviewed concerning their experiences with mentoring relationships. When over two-thirds of those responding reported involvement in mentoring relationships and rewards ranging from increased salary and promotions to increased job satisfaction, other researchers started to take note and formal and informal mentoring programs started springing up (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newnan, 1984).

It is not surprising that the forensics community has also expressed interest in mentor programs and relationships. The Council of Forensics Organizations has published a collegiate forensic directory which lists coaches who are willing to serve as mentors for other coaches. The second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events in August of 1990 also led to recommendations for increased mentoring opportunities. At that conference this writer co-presented a paper entitled, "Mentoring Relationships and Programs: Applications to the Forensics Community". The paper addressed two questions. First, to what extent do mentoring relationships exist in the forensics community? Second, is it desirable for the forensics community to formally or informally encourage mentoring relationships, practices, or programs?

This paper poses yet another question for the forensics community. Is the role of mentor a desirable role for ex-forensics directors? In attempting to answer that question a summary of the work compiled for the second National Developmental Conference on mentoring will be presented and then extended by addressing issues which are raised specifically when ex-forensics directors are considered to fulfill mentor roles. Organizationally the paper will be divided into four parts. First, basic definitions and approaches to mentoring will be presented. Second, a brief summary of interviews conducted with forensics coaches concerning their thoughts about and experiences with mentoring will be discussed. Third, some conclusions about the applicability of mentoring practices and programs to the forensics community will be offered. Finally, specific issues which are raised by the idea of ex-forensics directors as mentors will be discussed.

DEFINITIONS AND APPROACHES

A review of the mentoring literature quickly reveals that mentoring has been defined in a variety of ways. Levinson et. al. (1978) offer one of the most restricted definitions suggesting: (a) that a mentor is a teacher, sponsor, counselor, developer of skills and intellect, host, guide and example; (b) that a mentor's most crucial function is to support and facilitate the realization of a dream; (c) that a mentor synthesizes the characteristics of a parent-child relationship and peer support without being either; and (d) that a mentor relationship is an intense form of "love," that lasts two or three years (at most ten) and possesses an 8-15 year age difference between mentor and protege. Roche (1979) on the other hand defines a mentor as someone who takes a personal interest in a person's career or who guides or sponsors a person. For the purposes of this paper, a forensics mentor will be defined as a person of greater rank, experience or expertise who teaches, guides, and develops a more novice person in the forensics profession (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newnan, 1984).

Actual applications of mentoring indicate further that it is possible to operationally define mentoring in several ways. Daloz (1986) uses a travel metaphor to distinguish two approaches. First, a mentor can be viewed as a person who makes a map for a protege. The mentor knows all the right people and the right paths to take. The mentor is a tour guide who has the travel tips necessary to smooth out a lot of bumps on a protege's professional road. It is also possible, however, to view a mentor as a trusted guide who is more interested in developing the traveler as opposed to fixing the road. The ultimate goal is to help to assure that the protege becomes a competent traveler who can traverse assorted roads in the future. Both applications will be considered in regards to forensics mentoring.

INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Interviews were conducted to try to ascertain the prevalence and nature of mentoring relationships in the forensics community. Ten extended interviews, with both novice and experienced coaches from the Midwest, were conducted. Interviewees were given the definition of mentor which was specified earlier in this paper and were asked to respond to a set of open ended questions. The answers received do provide some insight into the current status of forensics mentoring.

Both novice and experienced coaches felt that they had had a forensics mentor when they were getting started. Many, but not all mentors were faculty members at the coaches' home schools. Novice and experienced coaches cited similar types of things when asked what their mentor had done for them ranging from teaching them tournament and budget administration, to introducing them to people, to helping to develop their coaching philosophies. Although both novice and experienced coaches valued their mentors, experienced coaches attributed more of their satisfaction with and success in coaching to their mentor relationships.

Most novice coaches felt a need for more mentoring. Felt needs tended to fall into the category of "tour guide" mentoring. Issues related to fitting in and information seeking were mentioned most often. Suggestions for workshops, more instructional and descriptive materials, and more communication with other forensics professionals were noted frequently.

Novice and experienced coaches would favor moves by the forensics community which would result in more formalized mentoring programs. Neither group of coaches felt that formal mentoring programs were well established in the forensics community. At the same time, both sets of coaches were careful to point out that their desire for more formal mentoring programs did not mean that they wanted to see any decrease in informal mentoring relationships.

Many experienced coaches felt that they had served as a mentor to others. Some experienced coaches had sought out the relationship, but others felt that they had been targeted because of their position or reputation. Coaches who felt that they had mentored others also frequently referenced the role of mentor that they serve for their forensics students. Mentor coaches tended to gravitate toward the "trusted guide" metaphor in describing their mentoring activities. Developing self-concept, contributing to philosophy building, and promoting decision-making skills were types of activities described.

APPLICABILITY OF MENTORING TO FORENSICS

In considering the applicability of mentoring to forensics it is first important to note that questions and concerns do exist about both the practice of mentoring in general and the research conducted to date on mentoring relationships. Merriam's (1983) critical review of the mentoring literature suggests that a number of problems with research designs make any possible conclusions about the importance and effects of mentoring tenuous at best. She includes among the concerns: the use of varying conceptual and operational definitions of the mentoring construct making comparisons of research findings difficult; the fact that different research methods such as surveys versus interviews appear to produce different research findings; that only limited research designs, mainly surveys, have been used and with limited samples, often successful executives; and the existence of tenuous links between the existence of mentoring relationships and conclusions about effects of those relationships.

Dangers associated with mentoring have also been suggested including mentors who are exploitive, stifling, or over protective, the potential for the mentor to lose power or prestige as a result of the mentoring relationship or dependencies that may develop on the part of the mentoree. Overall, the literature appears to be biased in favor of mentoring relationships (Wilbur, 1987), but any effort to promote mentoring in the forensics community should clearly be aware of potential problems with mentoring relationships and be committed to the review of any mentoring efforts or programs to assess effects and desirability.

The interviews conducted with forensics coaches suggest keeping

the following four conclusions in mind when considering the application of mentoring to forensics practices and procedures.

1. Mentoring relationships do already exist in the forensics community.
2. Both novice and experienced coaches tend to be positive about the potential benefits of mentoring, but experienced coaches seem to attribute more positive consequences to mentoring than do novice coaches.
3. Novice and experienced coaches may clearly assign different values to different types of mentoring practices.
4. Both novice and experienced coaches would favor more formal mentoring efforts as long as they did not detract from informal mentoring.

THE EX-FORENSICS DIRECTOR AS MENTOR

Given these four conclusions, the question arises, is the role of mentor a desirable role for ex-forensics directors? At first glance it might appear that the role of mentor might be an ideal role for ex-forensics directors to fill in an attempt to continue to make contributions to the forensics community. Interviews conducted with a variety of active forensics coaches and ex-forensics directors, however, suggest that the fit may not be as good as we initially might think.

When individuals become ex-directors, it is natural to assume that one advantage they will enjoy, that would contribute to a mentor role, is the advantage of having additional time. An inherent problem with directing and coaching forensics is the tremendous time pressure involved. Mentoring requires time and active directors simply may not have the time available to develop and maintain mentoring relationships or to engage in mentoring practices and procedures. It is clear, however, that much more than time is required to assure a successful mentor role for ex-forensics directors. The following four issues are not intended to be exhaustive, but rather representative of some of the issues which need to be considered.

First, ex-forensics directors are not likely to be good mentors unless they were good mentors when they were active forensics directors. Mentoring requires certain skills, skills that are not likely to appear just because an individual is no longer serving as a director. The mentoring research cites a variety of mentoring skills such as the ability to be supportive, to be open minded, to be able to trust others, or to be a good listener. A mentor needs to be able to receive personal satisfaction from the advancement and achievement of others, to appreciate the difference between providing options and giving advice, and to know when to terminate a mentor relationship. The interviews conducted with coaches, referenced earlier, noted that directors who served as mentors for other coaches were usually individuals who were drawn to and skilled at mentoring. They were individuals who tended to serve as mentors for their students or graduate assistants and who also tended to mentor other teachers and colleagues.

Second, ex-directors are not likely to be good mentors unless they are truly ready to relinquish the power and control associated with a director's position. Ex-directors have made the decision to relinquish the title of director. The question that remains is whether they are ready to relinquish the other trappings of the position. They must be ready to move off of center stage. They must consciously desire for other coaches to have their chance. If these conditions do not exist, it would be all too probable for an ex-director, serving in a mentor role, to usurp a new director's power and prestige. Rather than mentoring a protege, the ex-director may continue to try to achieve personal goals through their mentoree or mentor relationship. In interviews conducted with active coaches and ex-directors this particular concern was mentioned with some frequency. Several cited references to ex-directors who had not really relinquished the director's role and to new coaches who had then been hurt rather than helped by the mentor relationship.

Third, some ex-directors may be effective mentors, but the longevity for the effectiveness of this role may be a concern. The question that needs to be addressed is whether an individual who is no longer actively travelling or coaching can really remain in touch with the activity and consequently serve as an effective mentor. Interviews with active coaches frequently cited examples of ex-directors who were "out of touch" with the activity. If ex-directors are to serve in a mentor role it is important to analyze what skills and functions of the director role are truly enduring and resistant to change over time. It is relatively easy to identify some aspects of our activity which change with some frequency such as a desirable or necessary travel schedule, literature for oral interpretation events, or some tournament practices and procedures. We might like to think that some other aspects of the activity are much more enduring like recruiting practices, motivational techniques, or squad management practices, but any ex-directors serving as mentors need to continually question the applicability of their experiences to the current status of students, coaches, and the forensic activity. At the very least, the potential to become outdated reinforces the need for certain mentoring skills such as waiting to be approached for help, describing options as opposed to giving advice, and being flexible and open minded.

Fourth, ex-directors will probably not be effective mentors unless they make a concerted effort to be cognizant of potential problems and issues associated with the forensics mentor role, consciously seek to learn about mentoring, and make a commitment to reviewing and evaluating their mentoring relationships, practices, and procedures. Interviews with coaches also highlighted that there are a variety of additional issues that deserve consideration by any ex-directors who are considering serving in mentor roles. Some of the concerns expressed include:

1. A mentor must know when to let go. The goal of the mentor relationship needs to be developing proteges who will be able to traverse on their own. Mentor relationships should not lead to dependent relationships.
2. Female coaches may have special mentoring needs. Women in

business organizations have traditionally lacked mentor opportunities because of the dearth of female mentors and the reluctance of men at times to serve as mentors for women. Ex-directors should consider cross-gender mentor relationships, but also be sensitive to special complexities involved including sexual tensions, increased public scrutiny, and stereotypical male/female roles.

3. Mentors must be willing to evaluate the specific nature of each mentor relationship. Directors who have had the opportunity to mentor a coach when they were first serving as their assistant may have a very different mentor relationship with that individual after stepping down as the director than they would have with an individual who they had not worked with previously. Ex-directors may also have to consider such factors as the age differential between them and the mentoree, their needs as well as the needs of the mentoree, and the power, prestige, and experience of the mentor and mentoree.

CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted to investigate the potential of mentoring for the forensics activity as well as the specific potential of ex-forensics directors as mentors. It is the opinion of the author that mentoring is appropriate and desirable for the forensics community. Ex-forensics directors are a potentially underutilized resource for fulfilling this role. Important issues, however, must be considered and addressed if ex-forensics directors are to effectively serve as mentors and contribute in that way to the forensic activity.

REFERENCES

- Alleman, E., Cochran, J., Doverspike, J., and Newnan, I. (1984). Enriching mentoring relationships. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 62, 329-332.
- Bolton, E.B. (1990). A conceptual analysis of the mentor relationship in the career development of women. *Adult Education*, 30, 195-207.
- Carver, C.R. and Larson-Casselton, C.L. (1990, August). *Mentoring relationships and programs: Applications to the forensics community*. Paper presented at the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Denver, Colorado.
- Daloz, L.A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Hunt, D.M. and Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 475-485.
- Levinson, D.J. et. al. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33, 161-173.
- Noe, R.A. (1988). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 65-77.

Noonan, J.F. (1980). *New directions for teaching and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Roche, G.D. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *The Harvard Business Review*, 20, 14-28.

Sheehy, G. (1976, April 15). The mentor connection: The secret link in the successful woman's life. *New York Magazine*, 33-39.

Sheehy G. (1974). *Predictable crises in adult life*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company.

Speizer, J.J. (1981). Role models, mentors, and sponsors: The elusive concepts. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 6, 692-713.

Wilbur, J. (1989). Does mentoring breed success? *Training and Development Journal*, 41, 38-41.

THE CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY OF FINDING A NEW ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE FOR AN EX-DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS

By Robert Littlefield

■ Generally, when individuals become involved in any activity or organization, they either like what the group does or they like the people who are associated with the group. Involvement in forensic activity adheres to this perspective. Forensic coaches often regard forensics as desirable and satisfying because they like the activity (the excitement of competition, leading organizations, running tournaments) and they like the people who are involved in forensics (the social relationships with other coaches, the student-coach relationships). Research conducted by Littlefield and Sellnow (1992) supported this position when a majority of forensic coaches surveyed indicated they preferred to remain in the activity despite the relatively high level of personal and professional stress involved (p. 5).

Perhaps the forensic coaches are a bit like entrepreneurs. It is not uncommon for coaches to seek positions where they can, more or less, be their own bosses; "stake their claims," and prove to themselves and their peers that they can and do have it all – teach, publish, lead forensic organizations, function as a mentor for their students, and administer programs – as Directors of Forensics.

Operationally, most people who work in forensics or forensic education have an understanding of what being a Director of Forensics entails. However, on many campuses, the Director of Forensics position is not clearly defined; and in fact, may differ from campus to campus (Klopf, 11). The First and Second Developmental Conferences on Forensics provided some clarity regarding the nature of the Director of Forensics position.¹ Expectations on the part of college or university administrators may vary regarding teaching load, travel requirements, expectations about research productivity, involvement in national forensic organizations, and service as a

Robert Littlefield is Associate Professor of Speech Communication at North Dakota State University.

mentor to students and other forensic directors in the state or region. As a result of the ambiguity associated with the role of a forensic director, individuals who are hired to direct programs and coach students often become overburdened and eventually seek either a non-forensic position or a way to reduce the amount of time associated with their commitment to forensics (Gill, 185; Pettus and Danielson, 17).

In the business world, this might be considered as the shift from employment to retirement. Others might characterize the change more as a move from company president to chairman of the board. Just as in the business community where some individuals struggle with coping with retirement, so too, in the forensic community, ex-Directors struggle with the role or roles they might play, as they seek to continue their affiliation with the activity which, for many years in their lives, provided professional and personal satisfaction. A program at the 1991 Convention of the Speech Communication Association entitled, "Metamorphosis: What Roles Do Forensic Directors Take On After Active Coaching Ends?" provided diverse perspectives on this issue.² The implication is there must be a transition, or metamorphosis from that of "super-director" to a different role or no role for all forensic coaches. Realistically, the luxury of having more than one or two faculty positions at any given school assigned to forensics is rare (Pettus and Danielson, 1992; Littlefield, 1991b). However, in programs where people are interested in continuing their association with forensics through other roles, there may be an opportunity for the Director of Forensics not to be the head coach; but rather the forensic administrator.

Before addressing the option for Directors of Forensics to become forensic administrators, there are a few assumptions to consider:

Assumption #1: After active coaching ends, ex-Directors of Forensics take on different roles enabling them to continue their involvement in forensics. Response: True.

Serving as a Director of Forensics is very challenging and time-intensive. The roles suggested earlier were not exaggerated. There is an expectation, and we may have bought into it as forensic coaches, that to be regarded as successful, one needs to "do it all." This means teaching, coaching, travelling, publishing, managing, mentoring, and leading (Faules, Rieke, & Rhodes, 1976). Somehow, by doing all of these things, and doing them well, coaches establish themselves as "legitimate" Directors of Forensics. While this may seem somewhat elitist, the pressure to succeed is real and felt by many coaches. One need only listen to the comments made by some on "the circuit" in some regions of the country to verify this tendency; for example: "He doesn't travel, so how can he know what makes a good oration these days?"; "she teaches mass communication, so how can she judge oral interpretation?"; or "how many papers has she presented or published?" If Directors of Forensics wish to counter these remarks, they need evidence to suggest the contrary. The pressure to perform all roles for an extended period of time can cause stress and lead to what is commonly referred to as "burnout."³ The forensic community has yet to subscribe to a "wellness paradigm" that helps coaches to

manage their stressors more effectively, so at some point in time, "retirement" comes with a sense of relief and remorse (Littlefield and Sellnow). While some ex-Directors quietly don the slippers of the more traditional faculty member without looking back, this assumption suggests that the "remorse" felt by some, as a result of the disassociation with forensic activities and the people who were involved, causes ex-Directors to find different roles, enabling them to continue their affiliation with forensics, without having to perform all of the roles previously assigned to them as Directors of Forensics. Even if an ex-Director decides not to participate in any way with forensic activities, that in itself is a role; the role of the uninvolved bystander.

Assumption #2: Ex-Directors of Forensics want to maintain contact with forensics. Response: True and False.

Carrying the "have it all" philosophy along, many Directors of Forensics find that at some point, they can no longer practice what they had been preaching. Either due to changes in relationships (e.g., marriage, divorce) or the additional responsibilities that children may bring to a relationship, or to the pressures of publishing more research, or additional college or university responsibilities; at some point, something must give. The result may be that the Director can no longer travel with the team. The extension of this position is that a great deal of cognitive dissonance occurs as the Director attempts to sort out priorities and values about forensics.

There is, of course, the possibility that ex-Directors may not want to maintain contact with forensics for a variety of reasons. However, because they built much of their professional reputation upon their relationship with forensic activities, they feel compelled to portray themselves as committed to the activity. If insincere, this mask doesn't take long to crack; and once exposed, these ex-Directors admit their lack of commitment and slip into retirement.

Assumption #3: Directors of Forensics cannot perform all tasks required of them as effectively as they would like; so they wait until active coaching ends to pursue different roles. Response: True and False.

Although Madison Avenue has portrayed the successful person as a "superhuman," most Directors of Forensics are not able to deal with all of the pressures to teach, publish, coach, travel, mentor, administer, and lead (Cardot, 82). Operationally, for many, involvement in forensics means focusing on one aspect of the activity. Some are great coaches but do not run tournaments; some are great tournament managers but do not coach debate; some are capable scholars but do not function well as leaders in forensic organizations. An option available for Directors of Forensics is to do what they can, as well as they can, but to wait until after they "retire" from active coaching to pursue different roles. For these individuals, waiting until they have finished active coaching to publish some research materials may be a realistic option. Serving as a leader in forensic organizations may not be possible for the single coach who maintains a twenty-tournament season in individual events or debate. However,

following retirement from active coaching, this same coach may find service in a leadership role to be rewarding.

There are some who suggest the difficulty in labeling as discrete the roles played by a forensic director (Schnoor and Green, 45). Similarly, there are those who suggest that one doesn't have to perform all roles in order to be regarded as an active professional in the area of forensics (Dreibelbis, 67). Waiting until one is finished with the active coaching and travelling does not mean that the doors to leadership in forensic organizations will automatically open; nor does it mean that suddenly all manuscripts submitted will be published by the professional forensic journals. However, the actual time needed for ex-Directors to assume new roles may exist once active coaching and travelling is reduced or eliminated.

Assumption #4: Forensic administration is different after active coaching ends. Response: False.

The assumption that the administration of forensic activities changes somehow after active coaching ends is not true. A forensic administrator must deal with the recruitment and retention of team members; budget control and management; professional affiliation and development; planning, organizing, leading, controlling, coordinating, motivating, and evaluating; as well as running tournaments, workshops, and clinics. The only major difference between an active Director of Forensics and an ex-Director, when dealing with the aforementioned issues, might be the number of years of experience involved (Pettus and Danielson, 1992; Littlefield, 1991). The experience factor may make the ex-Director more adept at managing the on-campus forces that often cause aggravation for the active coach trying to keep the squad moving forward while juggling teaching and other departmental responsibilities. Waiting to demonstrate one's forensic management skills until after retiring from active coaching is not reality nor is it an option for most ex-Directors.

Assumption #5: Active coaching is the "villain." Response: True and False.

To be a "real" coach, many suggest that one must travel with a team. While travelling can give insight, constant trips can wear out a coach. The length of the forensic season does nothing to enable the coach to prolong his or her involvement in the activity.⁴ At some point, the coach finally turns in the van keys and says, "I'm not going to travel any more. My time as a forensic director is at an end." While this scenario may be a little drastic, the torch is passed to a new, perhaps less-seasoned generation; and life goes on as usual. The retired coach justifies the exit by saying that the travelling finally got to be too much. The sad part about this situation is that unless the ex-Director assumes a new role, most contact with forensics and with the people who were involved in the activity is limited, if not ended. The villain – active coaching – wins the contest; the ex-Director – metamorphosized – loses what once provided satisfaction and fulfillment.

There is another perspective. If the option of finding a new role in forensic activities exists for ex-directors, then Assumption #2 might be at work. That is, ex-Directors do not want to continue their involvement in forensics after active coaching ends.

THE EX-DIRECTOR AS A FORENSIC ADMINISTRATOR

The assumptions provide a useful context for the following discussion of the role of an ex-Director as a forensic administrator. Initially, for this metamorphosis to occur, the forensic staff at any institution needs to be comfortable with different titles than they might prefer. If ex-Directors continue as forensic administrators, most likely, they will retain the title of Director of Forensics. The active coaches either assume assistant or associate director status and tend to "travel" with the team in order to keep their perceived "legitimacy" on the circuit. Another option labels these middle managers who serve as a conduit for information "flowing back and forth between executives [forensic administrators] and operatives [student team members] (Danowsky, 390) as "head coaches," with the forensic administrator functioning in much the same way as does an athletic director who schedules and manages a school's program without coaching.

There are benefits in having the ex-Director or "non-travelling" director function as the administrator of forensic programs, because administration is often seen as "the burden"; coaches like to be on the circuit where they are close to the pulse of what is happening with other coaches and competitors (Schnoor and Green, 44-45).

In business, management is viewed as "the attainment of organizational goals in an effective and efficient manner through planning, organizing, leading, and controlling organizational resources" (Daft, 5). Each of these functions, as well as other management principles, can be applied to forensic administration (Dreibelbis, 64). Planning is needed to define goals for the team and to decide how to use the available resources to reach the goals. Organization is important when assigning tasks, delegating responsibility to students and assistant coaches or graduate assistants. Administrators must be leaders, motivating students to attain their personal and team goals; and controllers as they monitor student performance and behavior, and help to keep the program/team moving forward. As forensic administrators fulfill these functions, they operate on many levels that include the environment, a suprasystem, and the system (Conrad, 135). The environment might be defined as higher education, the suprasystem as forensic activity, and the system being individual forensic contests.

Similarly, Daft (1991) identified ten managerial roles adapted from Henry Mintzberg's book entitled, *The Nature of Managerial Work*, that can be compared with those played by forensic administrators, including: Figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesperson, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator (p. 20). While these roles help to explain the kinds of activities a forensic administrator might undertake, they are not

unique to the ex-Director. Rather, they are also roles played by "active coaches" who served as Directors of Forensics.

A few of the specific benefits from having ex-Directors serving as forensic administration include: (1) Having more time to spend on administrative functions; (2) providing institutional stability; and (3) helping to increase support among the faculty for forensics.

More time for administrative functions. As university administrators increase their scrutiny of programs at every level, forensic activities are being pressured for accountability. Unfortunately, as Underberg (1989) suggested, the lack of a broad-based database profiling forensic activity in the United States makes accountability and justification of programs difficult (p. 78). Budget control and maintenance is an on-going concern. Planning for trips, arranging for transportation, drawing registration and judging fees from the budget, keeping track of receipts, and submitting and defending annual budgets before student groups or local administrators is time-intensive. Those who have observed Directors of Forensics, or served as one, can quickly see an advantage from having more time to devote to students who are preparing for competition.

Another function of the forensic administrator involves correspondence with future students in an effort to recruit them into the program. While the head coach should be an integral part of the recruitment process, the coordination of these efforts can be managed quite effectively by forensic administrators without sacrificing the personal, persuasive communication that a head coach might provide. Running tournaments, workshops, and clinics is normally associated with job descriptions for Directors of Forensics.⁵ Making on-campus arrangements for rooms, locating local judges, ordering trophies, sending out invitations and scheduling the contestants can be done by forensic administrators. The benefit for the coaches and students comes from the increased coaching time available. In short, if the ex-Director is going to maintain a relationship with a forensic program, helping with the administrative tasks can reduce stress on the head coaches and provide a very meaningful contribution to the success of a program.

Institutional stability. On many campuses, the Director of Forensics position is permanent and tenure-track (Pettus and Danielson, 1992; Littlefield, 1991). In situations where tenure possibilities exist, there is an inherent stability associated with the Director of Forensics position (Dreibelbis, 65). However, on other campuses where this is not the case, having the ex-Director remain affiliated with the program as a forensic administrator can be helpful in providing an historical perspective for student groups who decide how student activity fees are to be allocated. The ex-Director also knows the major institutional players and can communicate with them about issues of importance to the program. If the head coaches are not available because they are working with students or travelling, or new to the system, the ex-Director can continue to be accessible to University and student groups. Rather than re-establishing relationships every time new Directors join the faculty,

the ex-Director can provide the stability a forensic program needs when undergoing the scrutiny of administrators. (Littlefield, 1989, 74).

Increasing support for forensics. Finally, the ex-Director can be instrumental in increasing support for forensics among the other faculty and staff in a department, college, or university. Speaking from experience, ex-Directors can be advocates for the active coaches who are often busy coaching or travelling with the team. They can answer questions and defend programs. Ex-Directors can also be role models for other faculty, in that they can continue to promote and support forensic activities, even though they no longer travel with teams (Greenstreet, 72).

On another level, having the ex-Director available as a forensic administrator can be beneficial if a program is seeking support in the form of scholarships for team members. The ex-Director can meet with representatives from business industry, the legal system, medical centers, and Chambers of Commerce (to name just a few) to promote the program and generate scholarships. Time simply is not available for travelling coaches to take on this additional burden; and consequently, possible scholarship sources go unattended. If the forensic administrator is truly a liaison, spokesperson, and entrepreneur, the ability to generate support for a forensic program makes the ex-director an important player on the team (Greynolds, 38).

CONCLUSION

Somehow, it doesn't seem fair that a Director of Forensics has to disappear from the activity after active coaching ends. The level of experience lost when this disappearance occurs cannot be measured. The activity suffers significantly. Being able to continue involvement without travelling or coaching is one way ex-Directors can play a part in the on-going success of a forensic program. The three benefits of such involvement include: More time for coaches to work with the students because they do not have to allocate time to deal with management issues; programs enjoy institutional stability by having a person with knowledge of context and other campus issues to serve as a liaison with campus groups and offices; and additional support for the program can be garnered through regular contact with representatives from business and the professional community. On a related level, a forensic administrator can contribute to forensic education by teaching aspiring forensic directors the rhetorical traditions and pedagogy that have shaped the activity. Forensics is too valuable, as an educational experience for students and coaches, to ignore ways in which ex-Directors of Forensics can continue their involvement.

¹Note discussions of promotion and tenure issues in: J. McBath, ed., *Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1975; D. Parson, ed., *American forensics in perspective*, Annandale, VA: SCA, 1984.