

IPDA. Additionally, the students have to type all arguments, so time constraints were harder to enforce. Recently, Facebook has been updated to include video calling (Facebook Statistics, 2012). The addition of video calling has the potential to overcome this barrier; however, we have yet to test this feature.

Karl and Peluchette (2011) draw attention to another potential limitation of using Facebook in coaching when she discusses the conundrum of “friending” professors. Lipka (2007) further contends that the negotiation of the teacher-student relationship is challenged in new ways through social networking sites such as Facebook. While using Facebook group chat does not require you to “friend” your students, many students do request to become your friend after Facebook interactions. This was not an issue that we faced, because the coaching staff regularly uses the private Facebook group to post topic ideas, announcements, and other team business. The choice to accept or decline a friend request from a student, however, is a personal one.

Although Facebook poses some challenges, we found that the pedagogical benefits outweighed. When the students returned in January 2011, they were energized and ready to practice and compete. The coaching sessions were deeper and the introspection that the archives invited proved effective for our squad.

Skype

Technology integration into distance education is not a novel concept; however, researchers have been increasingly shifting their focus from the traditional approach of instructor-led pedagogy to a more student-centered learning approach (Michels & Chang, 2011; Revere & Kovach, 2011; Simon, 2001; Swing, 2002; Sax et al., 2002). Adams (2007) argues that many online learning environments fail because they seek to replicate traditional classroom instruction by focusing on knowledge acquisition and are not supportive of intentional student engagement. One platform that has garnered increasing attention is that of Skype because of the real-time exchange abilities. Skype is an Internet application for voice and video calls (Skype, 2012).

Our squad decided to incorporate the free and premium versions of Skype into our practices in November 2011. There are two versions of Skype. There is a free version that allows for two users to engage in an audio/video conversation and there is a premium version that allows for up to twelve users to interact simultaneously (Skype, 2012). We used the free version for individual coaching sessions and the premium version for debate rounds. For individual events sessions students would negotiate a time and date with the coaches and/or their peers when they would log on. For debate sessions, all of the debaters participating would negotiate a time and date with the coaches. Once all debaters and critics were online, the topic was announced and the students were allowed to go into private Skype sessions to discuss strategy and construct cases. The students returned after the allotted time and debated using regular NPDA time.

The use of Skype (free or premium) has multiple advantages. Michels and Chang (2011) note that the greatest advantage of using Skype is that students who may not be able to attend class in person, or in our case, practice, could do so. On our squad both the students and coaching staff travel to various locations domestically and internationally during semester breaks, so attempting to coordinate in-person practice sessions is severely limited. In addition to removing the space limitation, the use of Skype makes available an alternative instructional tool for live, interactive participation where distant viewers can go beyond just listening and are able to comment, share documents, and actively participate in real time (Revere & Kovach, 2011). For instance, while engaging in an online persuasive speech practice, one of the coaches noticed that an additional source was needed to substantiate the student's claim. Instead of just telling the student to find another source, the coach shifted to another window, downloaded an article, and shared it with the student immediately. This provided an opportunity for immediate discussion of the value of the added source.

Audio/video capabilities also allow for more engaged practice. The students can see each other, coaches, and audience members, much like in a regular practice session. One student noted that he enjoyed being able to see the audience and was able to more effectively use audience analysis. This real-time interaction is something that is lost during prerecorded speeches and lecture. Second, video software platforms, like Skype, enable participants to practice individual events and other forms of debate beyond NPDA and IPDA. File sharing is allowed; therefore, trading evidence cards is now an available option.

When we used Skype for our practices, we found that students were excited to sign up for practice sessions. When the coaching staff was unavailable, students conducted peer practice sessions and even invited alumni to participate. One of the benefits that we never imagined was the active participation of our recent graduates. Several alumni asked to be added to the mailing list for practice sessions. The participation of past graduates can be of substantial benefit to smaller programs or those at institutions that do not offer graduate programs in communication. Without graduate assistants, alumni participation in Skype sessions not only continues to build a network of support for the program, it also helps to ensure that current team members can continue to benefit from the experience of graduates even after commencement.

While using Skype does resolve a number of the issues that Facebook presented, there are still some disadvantages. First, using any video software opens the arena for technical difficulties. The Internet connection speed required and access to webcams could prove detrimental to some students (Revere & Kovach, 2011). For instance, we had a few students who had to go to a local library or coffee shop in order to be able to log into the system. Additionally, some students were also disconnected during the calls for various

reasons; however, this did not hinder their participation, presence, or ownership of practice sessions. Another disadvantage we found is that the free version of Skype only allows for one-on-one video sessions. If you wish to have more than two people involved in the session, then upgrading to Skype Premium is required. At the time of this writing, it costs \$4.99/day, \$9.99/month or \$59.88/year (Skype, 2012); however, only one host account needs to be purchased for up to twelve users to log in. Our usage of Skype and Skype Premium for practices was very successful as it kept the students engaged and got them excited about returning for the spring semester.

Google+

Google+ is a social networking site that was launched in 2011. The idea behind Google+ was to make connecting on the web more real world (Google+, 2012). Because of the novelty of this website, very little research has been conducted on its uses and capabilities within education. We still decided to venture into the usage of the *Hangouts* feature for practices. Our use of Google+ was very similar to that of Skype and Skype Premium and was organized in the same manner.

Though there are many similarities between Skype and Google+, there are some unique advantages to using Google+. The first one is that Google+ is a completely free service. The students and coaches signed up for free Google+ accounts. Once Google+ accounts were established, interacting in the *Hangouts* area was simple. We hosted several debates and individual events practices within the interface. The students and coaches were able to interact freely and had fewer disconnections than with Skype. Newman (2011) notes that the manner in which you add friends and use *Circles* is different than other social media sites, like Facebook. Users create *Circles* for different parts of their life and only share information with certain users. *Hangouts* lets up to ten people chat via webcam simultaneously, so it can be used with individual events and debate practices. File sharing is also enabled, so all forms of debate can be completed. Like Skype and Skype Premium, the reliance on high-speed Internet connections and webcams is still a factor; however, we have found fewer dropped connections with Google+ than with Skype and Skype Premium.

Conclusion

This is not an exhaustive list of the different software platforms that could be utilized in forensic education or the means in which they could be used. It is a call for a much-needed discussion of how we can use innovative methods to continue our mission of promoting sound forensic pedagogy. Using new technology within forensics is not an invitation to continue coaching as we have grown accustomed, except now online. Although embracing new technology may force some out of their comfort zones, seeking additional training and professional development can overcome some of the barriers to adoption. As Compton (2012) contends, "inoculating against specific com-

plications, like frustration with technology problems, fosters more nuanced ways of thinking" (p. 62). The use of social media and other online platforms opens the space for intentional student engagement. Thomas (2010) argues that in order to make the best use of these "new learning spaces," special attention must be placed on planning and integration. As forensic educators, we should concentrate on the role of agency, ownership, intention and motivation behind learning for our students. The key to the successful implementation of social media is to allow students to use their own tools and knowledge. This means providing possibilities for participation and ownership of their learning environments. Allow the students to be active in the discussion of what they want to get out of the experience and the methods in which they wish to interact.

Additionally, as coaches, we have to spend some time planning how we can harness the potential of our "new coaching spaces." For instance, will we take the time to go through the archives of practice sessions and use it to further engage the students in reflection? Or will we just watch the student and offer critiques afterward? Using social media without forward thinking will not provide any net benefit. But allowing this new medium to provide more meaningful activities that result in deeper learning requires rethinking the practices and the learning culture of forensics.

Social media itself is constantly evolving, providing new opportunities for pushing the boundaries of all fields, including forensics. Although, except in ADS rounds, the use of Skype practices will not lead to calls for an "Occupy Forensics" protest, the use of this media does have the potential to enhance the way in which we both coach and practice as members of the forensic community and the way in which we spread the messages so eloquently phrased in rounds to wider swaths of society. As our teams become more digitally engaged, it only follows that our practices and methods should follow suit. Many "establishment" forces (both domestically and abroad) have learned the hard way that there are consequences to ignoring the powerful influence that social media can have in all environments. Many other organizations, including the successful campaign of President Barack Obama in 2008, have learned and demonstrated the benefits of embracing Millennials and the new means of communication that so define their generation. The immediate benefit of adopting social media is providing an effective way to combat "speech atrophy" over winter and summer breaks. The long-term benefit is the enhancement of the field as a whole.

REFERENCES

- Adams, N. B. (2007). Toward a model for knowledge development in virtual environments: Strategies for student ownership. *International Journal for Social Sciences*, 2 (2), 71-77.
- Bosch, T.E. (2009). Using online social networking for teaching and learning: Facebook use at the University of Cape Town. *Communicatio*, 35 (2), 185-200.

- Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*. London, England: Kogan Page.
- Brumberger, E. (2011). Visual literacy and the Digital Native: An examination of the Millennial learner. *Journal of Visual Literacy*, 30 (1), 19-46.
- Cain, J & Fox, B.I. (2009). Web 2.0 and pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education*, 73 (7), Article 120.
- Cain, J. & Policastri, A. (2011). Using Facebook as an informal learning environment. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 75 (10), Article 207.
- Chao, J.T., Parker, K.R., & Fontana, A. (2011). Developing an interactive social media based learning environment. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 8, 323-334.
- Cheung, C., Chiu, P., Lee, M. (2010). Online social networks: Why do students use Facebook? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27, 1337-1343.
- Console, G., de Laat, M., Dillon, T., & Darby, J. (2006). *JISC LXP: Student experiences of technologies: Final report*. Joint Information Systems Committee.
- Compton, J. (2012). Frustration vaccination? Inoculation theory and digital learning. In S. Ferris, *Teaching, learning, and the Net Generation: Concepts and tools for reaching digital learners* (pp. 61-73). Hersey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- Dbal, J. & Karl, K. (2008). Social networking profiles: An examination of student attitudes regarding use and appropriateness of content. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 11 (1), 95-97.
- Estus, E.L. (2010). Using Facebook within a geriatric pharmacotherapy course. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education*, 74 (8), Article 10.
- Facebook Statistics (2012). Retrieved May 22, 2012 from <http://newsroom.fb.com/content/default.aspx?NewsAreaId=22>.
- Fox, B.I. & Varadarajan, R. (2011). Experiences with Twitter in a pharmacy management course. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education*, 75 (5), Article 86.
- Ghannam, J. (2011). Social media and the Arab world: Leading up to the uprisings of 2011. *A Report for the Center for International Media Assistance*. Center for International Media Assistance and the National Endowment for Democracy.
- Google+ (2012). Retrieved May 30, 2012 from <http://plus.google.com>.
- Hew, K. F. (2011). Students' and teachers' use of Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27, 662-676.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (1991). *Generations*. New York: William Morrow and Co.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, B. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Howe, N. & Strauss, B. (2003). *Millennials go to college: Strategies for a new generation on campus*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.
- Hung, H. & Yuen, C. (2010). Educational use of social networking technology in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15 (6), 703-714.
- Illeris, K. (2007). *How we learn. Learning and non-learning in school and beyond*. London, England: Routledge.
- Jacobsen, W. & Forste, R. (2011). The wired generation: Academic and social outcomes of electronic media use among university students. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14 (5), 275-280.
- Jones, C. & Healing, G. (2010). Net Generation students: Agency and choice and the new technologies. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 26, 344-356.
- Jordi, R. (2011). Reframing the concept of reflection: Consciousness, experiential learning, and reflective learning practices. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 61 (2), 181-197.
- Karl, K. & Peluchette, J. (2011). Friending professors, parents, and bosses: A Facebook connection conundrum. *Journal of Education for Business*, 86 (4), 214-222.
- Karlin, S. (2007). Examining how youths interact online. *Education Digest*, 27, 6-9.

- Kennedy, G., Judd, T., Churchward, A., Gray, K., & Krause, K. (2008). First year students' experiences with technology: Are they really digital natives? Questioning the Net Generation: A collaborative project in Australian higher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 24(1), 108-122.
- Lewis, J. & West, A. (2009). Friending: London-based undergraduates' experience of Facebook. *New Media Society*, 11, 1209-1229.
- Lipka, S. (2007). For professors, 'friending' can be fraught. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54 (15).
- Mason, R. & Rennie, F. (2007). Using Web 2.0 for learning in the community. *Internet and Higher Education*, 10, 196-203.
- Mazman, S. & Usuel, Y. (2010). Modeling educational usage of Facebook. *Computers & Education*, 55, 444-453.
- McCarthy, J. (2010). Blended learning environments: Using social networking sites to enhance the first year experience. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26 (6), 729-740.
- Michels, B. & Chang, C. (2011). Attending a presentation at a distance in real-time via Skype. *TechTrends*, 55 (1), 23-27.
- Newman, J. (2011). Google+: Facebook gains a rival. *PC World*, September, 17-18.
- Oliver, B. & Goerke, V. (2007). Australian undergraduates use and ownership of emerging technologies: Implications and opportunities for creating engaging learning experiences for the Net Generation. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 23, 171-186.
- Papp, R. (2011). Virtual worlds and social networking: Reaching the Millennials. *Journal of Technology Research*, 2, 1-15.
- Palfrey, J. & Gasser, U. (2008). *Born digital: Understanding the first generation of digital natives*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pilgrim, J. & Bledsoe, C. (2011). Learning through Facebook: A potential tool for educators, *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 38-42.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9, 1-6.
- Revere, L. & Kovach, J. (2011). Online technologies for engaged learning: A meaningful synthesis for educators. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 12 (2), 113-124.
- Sanchez-Franco, M.J., Villarejo-Ramos, A.F., & Martin-Velicia, F.A. (2011). Social integration and post-adoption usage of social network sites: An analysis of effects on learning performance. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 256-262.
- Salavuo, M. (2008). Social media as an opportunity for pedagogical change in music education. *Journal of Music, Technology, and Education*, 1 (2), 121-136.
- Sax, L., Keup, J., Gilmartin, S., Stolzenberg, E., & Harper, C. (2002). *Findings from the 2002 administration of your first college year (YFCY): National aggregates*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Simon, H. (2001). Cooperation between educational technology and learning theory to advance higher education. In R. Goodman (Ed.), *Technology Enhanced Learning: Opportunities for Change* (pp. 61-74). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Skype (2012). Retrieved May 30, 2012 from <http://www.skype.com/intl/en-us/features/>.
- Smith, S., Salaway, G., & Caruso, J.B. (2009). *The ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology*. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research.
- Snider, A. (1994). *Debate central on the Internet*. National Town Hall Meeting, Speech Communication Association Convention, New Orleans, November 1994.
- Snider, A. (1999). World's first Internet distance debate. UVM vs. Cornell University. Viewed by people globally via UVM's streaming video capability.
- Snider, A. (2000). Web cast, Final Round (Emory vs. Michigan State), National Debate Tournament, from Kansas City, MO via UVM's streaming video capability.
- Snider, A. (2006). Internet debating: Technical solutions for the 21st Century. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 27, 140-147.

- Swing, R. (2002). The impact of engaging pedagogy on first-year seminars. In *Essays Describing the Results of a National Survey of First-Year Seminars*. Columbia, SC: The Policy Center on the First Year of College.
- Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing up digital: The rise of the Net Generation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown up digital: How the Net Generation is changing your world*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thomas, H. (2010). Learning spaces, learning environments and the displacement of learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41 (3), 502-511.
- Vasalou, A., Joinson, A., & Courvoisier, D. (2010). Cultural differences, experience with social networks and the nature of true commitment in Facebook. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 68, 719-728.
- Vincent, A.H. & Weber, Z.A. (2001). Using Facebook within a pharmacy elective course. *American Journal of Pharmacy Education*, 75 (5), Article 86.
- Voth, B. (2003). State of the art: A survey of technology and debate practice in the 21st century. Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference On Argumentation), 1416-421.
- Woods, C., Brigham, M., Heavner, B., Konishi, T., Rief, J., Saindon, B., & Mitchell, G. (2006). Debating debate's digital futures. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*, 27, 81-105.



Missing

FORUM

Avoiding the Dangerfield Effect: Earning Respect as a Young Coach in a Millennial Environment

JORDAN COMPTON, OHIO UNIVERSITY

Abstract: *As a new generation of students fills the seats of our classrooms and the vans head to forensic tournaments, understanding how to reach this new generation is paramount. As a young educator, it is crucial to earn the respect of this group of students. This article seeks to discover how to accomplish the goals of reaching this new group of forensic students and offers suggestions to achieve these goals for all members of the forensic community.*

When this author was offered the position of Assistant Director of Forensics at his alma mater, a certain feeling of trepidation entered his mind. There were many questions that needed to be addressed. Are you experienced enough? Can you handle the pressure of working with your former coach? Will your students respect you? Do you even know what you are doing? These questions aside, he decided that working at his alma mater, side-by-side with his former coach, was too big of an opportunity to turn down.

With most new jobs there are several obstacles that the new employee must overcome. This author's obstacle came in the form of a senior member on the team. Being away from forensics for only two years, the author was presented with a situation that needed to be addressed. A former teammate of his was now one of his students. The freshman he mentored while he was a senior was now a senior himself. This was no ordinary student.

As the squad met for their first meeting, the author noticed the student walking by his office. A sly grin on his face, the student enquired as to how this situation was going to work. The author let him know that he was to treat him like he would any other faculty member on campus. He was to address the author just like the other team members would, and he was to respect the author's time and authority just like everyone else. The meeting between the author and this student helped set the tone not only for the relationship with this student, but with the relationship between the author and the other members of the team.

JORDAN COMPTON (M.A., Missouri State University) is a second year Ph.D. student at Ohio University where he serves as a Teaching Assistant and is the Acting Associate Director of Forensics. An earlier version of this article was presented at the National Communication Association Annual Convention, November 2010, San Francisco, CA.

In the three short years the author has been coaching, the author has noticed a decisive change among the characteristics of the students competing in forensics, even from the two short years he was away from competition. Nationwide the Millennials have been occupying college classrooms and vans traveling to forensic tournaments. Jensen (2010) relates from his perspective that these students are, "more egocentric, demanding, and less respectful of authority, tradition, and the strain of transition from previous forensic experiences and training" (p. 100). Each of these qualities may very well send chills down the spines of educators' backs, but to the young educator, not receiving respect from students has the ability to keep them up at night. The Millennial generation has created an interesting challenge in the forensic environment. As experienced coaches are still attempting to figure out this new generation, the younger coaches on the circuit find themselves in a precarious situation as we enter into our coaching roles. Wong and Wong (2007) remind us that young faculty members entering the workforce are Millennials as well. Woempner (2007) sees a problem in the way we prepare the young generation of teachers:

Yet teacher induction programs are largely founded on Baby Boomer-centric models of one-on-one mentoring that are often counter to Millennial strengths and preferences, thereby setting up new teachers for failure. Generational misunderstandings such as this may contribute to many of the teaching, learning, and operational difficulties that seem to bog us down and get in the way of improvement and change. (p. 1)

To reach this new generation of educators, new practices of teacher and coach training need to be included to meet the needs of the young coach. With this in mind, it is clear that older members of this generation are presented with an uphill battle as they begin their teaching profession.

The following article seeks to understand this phenomenon through a forensic perspective. It will focus on the characteristics of this generation; the Dangerfield Effect, which is when an individual receives less respect than they deserve; what young coaches can do to build and maintain a respectful relationship between themselves and their students; as well as offering insight into how the forensic community can better serve the new participants of intercollegiate forensics.

The Millennial Generation

Members of the Millennial generation are often referred to by many names: the *Millennials*, *Gen Y*, the *Dot Nets*, *Generation WE*, the *Nintendo Generation*, and even the *Trophy Kids*. While there is debate about the specific year the Millennial generation begins, those who are considered to be part of the Millennial generation were born between 1978 and 2000. Research shows that this generation is said to be "the biggest age cohort in the history of the nation" (Greenberg