

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Passing the Torch: A Call for Forensics Education for the Next Generation of Coaches

NICOLE P. M. FREEMAN, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI
JACK E. ROGERS, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI
IAN P. HOPKINS, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Be it Resolved that Debate is Resolute: Deep Structures as Explanation for Predictable Cycles in the Evolution of Intercollegiate Debate

SCOTT JENSEN, WEBSTER UNIVERSITY

The Political Climate as a Barrier to Civic Engagement: Are Students Ready to Engage?

TOMEKA M. ROBINSON, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
CODY M. CLEMENS, BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
RACHEL GARNETT, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
BRANDON JOHNSON, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

Book Review: Kiewe and Houck's *The Effects of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of Effects: Past, Present, Future*

Reviewed by David Bailey, Southwest Baptist University



Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society
National Council

DAVID BAILEY, PRESIDENT

*Bob R. Derryberry School of Communication Arts, Southwest Baptist University
Bolivar, MO 65613 417-328-1697*

TOMEKA ROBINSON, PRESIDENT-ELECT

*Department of Rhetoric, Hofstra University
Hempstead, NY 11549-1000 516-463-5431*

PHILLIP VOIGHT, SECRETARY-TREASURER

*Department of Communication Studies, Gustavus Adolphus College
St. Peter, MN 56082 507-933-7369*

JEFFREY A. STOPPENHAGEN, PAST PRESIDENT

*Columbia High School/Boise State University Forensics Alumni Association
Nampa, ID 83687 208-440-1794*

JOSH COMPTON, EDITOR OF *THE FORENSIC*

*Institute for Writing and Rhetoric, Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH 03755 603-626-9842*

SUSAN MILLSAP, HISTORIAN

*Department of Communication, Otterbein University
Westerville, OH 43081 614-823-3386*

CHRIS LELAND, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Office of Academic Affairs, Colorado Christian University
Lakewood, CO 80226 303-963-3479*

RYAN LOUIS, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Department of Communication Studies, Ottawa University
Ottawa, KS 66067 785-248-2526*

SPENCER WAUGH, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Department of Multimedia Communication, Simpson College
Indianola, IA 50125 515-961-1891*

MACKENZIE MOSS, NATIONAL COUNCIL - STUDENT

*c/o School of Social Work, Boise State University
Boise, ID 83714 208-861-0516*

CAMERON SMITH, NATIONAL COUNCIL - STUDENT

*c/o 2017, Wiley College
Marshall, TX 75670 314-297-6831*

NATIONAL OFFICE - PI KAPPA DELTA

Lisa Vossekul
401 Railroad Place
West Des Moines, IA 50265-4730
pkdnationaloffice@gmail.com
Phone: 920-748-7533
Fax: 920-748-9478
Visit us at: www.pikappadelta.com

Series 102
Number 1
Winter 2017

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

- 1 Passing the Torch: A Call for Forensics Education for the Next Generation of Coaches**
NICOLE P. M. FREEMAN, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI
JACK E. ROGERS, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI
IAN P. HOPKINS, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

- 17 Be it Resolved that Debate is Resolute: Deep Structures as Explanation for Predictable Cycles in the Evolution of Intercollegiate Debate**
SCOTT JENSEN, WEBSTER UNIVERSITY

- 31 The Political Climate as a Barrier to Civic Engagement: Are Students Ready to Engage?**
TOMEKA M. ROBINSON, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
CODY M. CLEMENS, BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
RACHEL GARNETT, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
BRANDON JOHNSON, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEW

- 41 Kiewe and Houck's *The Effects of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of Effects: Past, Present, Future***
Reviewed by DAVID BAILEY, SOUTHWEST BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta invites authors to submit manuscripts related to scholarship, pedagogy, research and administration in competitive and non-competitive speech and debate activities. *The Forensic* welcomes submissions from forensic coaches, communication/rhetoric scholars, and students (undergraduate and graduate).

The Editor and Editorial Board invite scholarly discussion of making competitive individual events and debate powerful tools for teaching essential citizenship practices, including clear and ethical communication. Topics of particular interest to the Editor and Editorial Board include, but are not limited to: ways to increase diversity in forensics, speech/argumentation pedagogy, and transfer as it relates to forensics (e.g., transfer among individual events, debate, and interpretation; transfer between competition and the classroom, and vice versa; transfer between forensics and careers).

The journal seeks submissions reflecting perspectives from all current debate and individual event forms, including, but not limited to: NDT, CEDA, NEDA, NPDA, IPDA, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, as well as NIET, NFA and non-traditional individual events. The journal also welcomes explorations of non-competitive speech and debate activities, including classroom projects, interdisciplinary efforts, and civic programs. *The Forensic* may also publish reviews of books, activities, and other educational materials. Potential authors should contact the Editor regarding the choice of material for review.

All submitted works must be original, unpublished, and not under review by other publishers. Any research involving human subjects must have the approval of the author's institutional review board. Submissions should conform to APA guidelines (latest edition). E-mail submissions to the editor in Word format with no specialized internal formatting. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references. The title page should include the title, author(s), correspondence address, e-mail address and telephone number of the author(s). The second page should include an abstract of between 75 and 100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with no reference to the author, and with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed and double-spaced on the pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

SEND MANUSCRIPTS TO: Josh Compton, josh.compton@dartmouth.edu. Do not fax submissions. Authors should have an editorial decision within three months.

REVIEW EDITORS

David C. Bailey - Southwest Baptist Univ.
Michael Bartanen - Pacific Lutheran Univ.
Heather J. Carmack - James Madison Univ.
Mark S. Hickman - West Chester Univ.
Ed Hinck - Central Michigan Univ.
Jeffrey Hobbs - Phuket Rajabhat Univ.
Todd T. Holm - Marine Corps Univ.
Gina Jensen - Webster Univ.
Brian Kaylor - Independent Scholar

Nina-Jo Moore - Appalachian State Univ.
David Nelson - Valdosta State University
Jack E. Rogers - Univ. of Central Missouri
Don R. Swanson - Monmouth Univ.
Crystal Lane Swift - Mt. San Antonio College
& California State Univ., Northridge
Scott Thomson - Ithaca College
Phillip A. Voight - Gustavus Adolphus College
Kelly Jo Wright - Univ. of Wisconsin,
Eau Claire

THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA (ISSN:0015-735X) is published twice yearly, Winter and Summer, by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$20.00 for 1 year, \$40.00 for 2 years, and \$60.00 for 3 years. Second class postage is paid at West Des Moines, IA. Postmaster and subscribers: Please send all address change requests to: PKD, 40 Railroad Place, West Des Moines, IA 50265-4730. **THE FORENSIC** is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 100 mm microfilm from University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Special Note: PKD National Office Address Change

Pi Kappa Delta National Office
401 Railroad Place
West Des Moines, IA 50265-4730

Passing the Torch: A Call for Forensics Education for the Next Generation of Coaches

NICOLE P. M. FREEMAN, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI
JACK E. ROGERS, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI
IAN P. HOPKINS, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Abstract: This monograph is intended to begin a dialogue within the profession of how to best prepare new coaches for the increasingly demanding role of coaching and administering forensic programs. New coaches were surveyed to identify key challenges for which they felt under-prepared to address as they began their coaching careers. Each challenge is examined and ideas for better preparation and training are discussed. The article concludes with a call for further research and possible development of formal training and mentoring programs.

Writing for the *Harvard Business Review*, Hamori, Cao, and Koyuncu (2012) explore the various reasons increasing amounts of young professionals have been leaving their positions, and even their given field, over the last decade. They collected data from over 1200 young professionals, which led the researchers to find that one of the primary reasons individuals are dissatisfied with their job, and/or leave their job, stems from the lack of formal training and/or professional development received (Hamori, Cao, & Koyuncu, 2012). Business management scholar Victor Lipman (2013) explained the connection between training, success, and satisfied employees, writing: "If it's done well, the payoff can be substantial in terms of long-term loyalty. If it's not, the costs can be substantial in terms of long-term talent" (p. 1). Although highly desired and valuable, formal training and development is often neglected, leading to the exodus of talented, driven people from the industry (Hamori, Cao, & Koyuncu, 2012). These findings, however, are not mutually exclusive to the business world.

In a more anecdotal approach, this study was conceived through a reflective conversation between two of the researchers, who, when they were both fairly new to their roles, found themselves in numerous unexpected scenarios, causing them to rely heavily on each other to determine how to best navigate through such situations. Although

NICOLE P. M. FREEMAN (Ed.D., University of Missouri, Columbia) is Assistant Director of Forensics at University of Central Missouri (Warrensburg, MO). JACK E. ROGERS (Ph.D., Louisiana State University) is Director of Forensics at University of Central Missouri (Warrensburg, MO). IAN P. HOPKINS (MA, George Mason University) is a doctoral student at George Mason University (Fairfax, Virginia). Please refer all questions and comments to the first author at nfreeman@ucmo.edu.

one can never truly be prepared to face all the surprising twists that arise in the coaching profession, the two researchers often felt ill-equipped, or at the very least, unsure of how to best be the authority figure in such settings, encapsulating Jensen and Jensen's (2007) words perfectly: "The realities of participating in forensics as an educator or student are that few activities are so mutually rewarding and frustrating" (p. 1).

The researchers found themselves doubting their actions and abilities, and becoming emotionally exhausted, which naturally led to questioning career choice. Although this only outlines the progression of thought for two coaches, these concerns and stresses are not new (Carmack & Holm, 2013). After enlisting the help and advice of a more seasoned coach, and gaining more years of experience themselves, the researchers engaged in many deep discussions, often leading to the same question: How are we adequately training and preparing the next generation of forensic coaches?

Review of Literature

Although training and preparation is only one small component to the larger coaching puzzle, it would seem to be pertinent to the establishment of early confidence in role fulfillment. In an activity notorious for high turnover and burnout rates amongst coaches, it is prudent to explore the struggles young coaches are facing in our profession, and whether or not they are receiving the training to address said struggles—or if training individuals to be prepared for such unique instances is even possible. Training continues to be desired, however, and is often viewed as a pillar to professional success (Hamori, Cao, & Koyuncu, 2012; Lipman, 2013). Richardson (2005) expressed great concern over the increasing numbers of young forensic coaches considering an early exit strategy from forensics. It is important to analyze whether formalized training, or the lack thereof, contributes to this early exit strategy for so many within our community.

Zhang and Zhu (2007) shed some insight into the issue of job dissatisfaction and burnout in relation to proper and sufficient training. They attribute the source of burnout as the stress created by "role conflict." Role conflicts are the problems caused by 1) competing roles; and 2) role ambiguity (lack of clarity about competing expectations). They note that these role conflicts are particularly serious and most often present when teachers become involved in additional duties such as extracurricular activities outside of their normal teaching roles and responsibilities. Essentially, when the lines distinguishing roles are blurred or unclear, it is difficult for individuals to feel personally and professionally successful (Zhang & Zhu, 2007).

For some programs in our community, the roles of the forensic coach and teacher have evolved considerably over the past two decades to reflect the "do more with less" mentality. For example, Berube (1999) and Workman (1997) observed that forensic profession-

als were increasingly becoming administrators, clerks, and managers with a multitude of tasks ranging from bookkeeping to public relations. This does not take into consideration teaching classes, the many self-planned and led fundraising efforts various programs are forced to employ, the time spent making travel arrangements, or time attending meetings and trainings, as examples. Yet, in a climate of ever increasing administrative policies and regulations, how many new coaches have received adequate training in accounting, legal policy, fundraising, or bookkeeping?

Even if the role of coach were simply coaching, without the added administrative duties, the practice of coaching alone has evolved to serve a new generation of competitors. Robinson and Rees (2012) point out this new generation of competitors is one of the first to grow up completely "wired in" to the Internet and technology. Social media such as Facebook and Twitter have a profound effect upon not only students' organizational and communication skills, but how they "self-define," which ultimately impacts team culture and communication strategies. Additionally, though no fault of their own, many of these students were raised in an educational setting rooted in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) era. In a 2008 article by the Citizens League, students attributed the NCLB act as significantly decreasing their exposure to critical thinking and problem solving skills. Furthermore, Stapleton and Robles-Pina (2009) point to a host of socioemotional issues and a lack of coping skills attributed as unintended consequences of the NCLB act. While studying millennial behaviors, Grohol (2014) found increased rates of depression - as high as 44% among college students - and attributed it to being raised without skills in conflict negotiation, something he terms "frustration tolerance." Grohol (2014) explained that a lack of frustration tolerance leaves students without the ability to cope with life's frustrations and often, simple things, such as bad grades or a break up, often leading to bouts of severe depression and/or suicide. As a result, the role of forensics coach continues to blur, now including informal counselor or advisor responsibilities. However, the legal implications regulating what can or cannot be said or how or when to recommend referrals to university provided support services can be confusing and somewhat frustrating. With that in mind; how many coaches have completed coursework in counseling or instruction in maintaining confidentiality and legal reporting responsibilities?

For many young coaches, the blurring of the interpersonal lines is also highly problematic. Lewis (2011) reflected on the difficulty young coaches face in an attempt to maintain friendly relationships with team members and their own "coolness" factor while also becoming established as an authority figure. Outzen (2016) described being "...between social roles with not one of them being fixed or static" (p. 1). Without adequate training or exposure to such role conflict, young coaches are left to search for clearly defined personal and professional lines in a very ambiguous field.

In summary, today's young coaches not only attend to the traditional duties of teaching, coaching, and traveling with their teams while balancing tenure and promotion earning activities, but have increasingly become quasi administrators responsible for navigating a maze of paperwork and procedures, fundraisers often carrying the burden and responsibility for the financial survival of their programs, legal standard bearers of their programs and host institutions, and informal counselors and life-coaches with all of the legal, time and emotional demands entailed—often with little, if any, formal training in such vastly differing areas. Bistodeau (2015) cautioned that the sheer magnitude of the workload may leave many young coaches with a reduced sense of personal accomplishment, trapped within the role conflict described by Zhang and Zhu (2007) with little hope of relief except to execute their exit strategies. Carmack and Holm (2013) observed the "health of forensics is dependent on the physical, emotional, and psychological health of its coaches" (p. 41). This sentiment, paired with the personal experiences of the researchers, led to the creation of this study, with the intent to begin a meaningful dialogue and start collecting input through which a list of common themes, or areas of concern, could be developed. Those common themes would include issues, topics, or subject areas that the new coaching group felt they faced on a significant basis, but had received little, if any, preparation through training or formal education. The end result would be to use the information gathered as the catalyst to begin a discussion on how to better serve and prepare our new coaches and colleagues. Essentially, this study seeks to heed the words of Carmack and Holm (2013) when they ask the forensic community to consider what is needed to produce healthy engagement at the coaching level:

Cultivating and grooming forensic educators is a significant investment on the part of the department, college, university, and the forensics community. When we create systems that are not sustainable or viable for healthy long-term professional participation, we need to consider not what we are doing, but the way in which we do it. (p. 54)

Methodology

After obtaining IRB approval, a qualitative survey was distributed via the Internet (IE-L and Facebook) soliciting survey respondents who had been coaching fewer than 10 years. Respondents were asked to reflect specifically on their first five years within the field. Although some may deem 10 years as highly experienced, and therefore impervious to this study, the researchers felt the broader experience window would increase response rates, and more importantly, garner valuable observations through thoughtful reflection on preparedness once one was further removed from the situation, simply because it is often difficult to realize how ill prepared one may be in the moment. A sample of convenience resulted in N=21, with participants representing 17 comprehensive, three individual events specific, and one debate spe-

cific programs. The majority of respondents identified as males (14), while six identified as females, and one identified transgendered. Regarding age, five respondents identified as being 25 years of age or younger, seven as being between the ages of 26-30, five as being between 31-35, and four as being over 40 years of age. Eight participants identified their title as the Director of Forensics while three were Assistant Directors. Seven identified as graduate assistant coaches and three identified their role as "other." Regarding team and coaching staff sizes, four respondents coached for teams comprised of fewer than 10 individuals, eight coached teams consisting of between 11-20 participants, seven coached teams between 21-30 participants, and two coached teams of 31 participants or larger. The majority of respondents (11) identified themselves as being members of a coaching staff that consisted of between one and three individuals, while six were members of a coaching staff ranging from four to six individuals. The remaining three participants were members of coaching staffs that consisted of more than six individuals. Regarding years of experience, eight respondents had coached for fewer than two years, while six had coached for three to four years, and three had coached for five years. Only four respondents had been coaching for more than five years.

The survey questions were open-ended and sought information regarding: the specific training participants had received to prepare them to assume the duties of coaching, issues and concerns they had faced for which they felt ill-prepared or untrained to address, what had surprised them most about coaching, and finally how participants typically dealt with issues for which they felt ill-prepared to address. Once the data were collected, the researchers each individually performed an analysis of the data. Codes were created per question using the guidance of Creswell's (2014) three key areas of coding qualitative data: topics expected to arise, topics that were surprising and/or not expected, and finally, topics that were unusual but still "...provide conceptual interest to the reader (p. 198-199). After individually coding, the researchers engaged in cross-checking codes with one another to identify any patterns or consistent themes that emerged. Additionally, the researchers involved an outside, peer debriefer to ensure accuracy of data analysis, increase validity and reliability, and decrease individual biases (Creswell, 2014).

Results

Content Question One: Please explain any training you received to prepare you for your position.

The data produced two themes in response to participant training, which first included modes of informal training and second, formal training. Informal training, however, was the most predominant theme, yielding two subthemes, including: time as a competitor, and modeling. For coding purposes, informal training was identified as modes that were not specifically arranged for the purpose of job train-

ing—rather, they occurred organically. The majority of participants (16) identified their years as a competitor and/or judge at both the high school and intercollegiate levels as one of the primary modes of training they received. One respondent explained: “There was no formal training. My training came from my time as a competitor and the limited experience I had judging in the three year interim between my competitive years and re-entering the circuit as a coach.” Another respondent echoed, explaining: “I received no formal training, per say, but was a competitor myself.” Similar sentiments were shared by numerous participants, making time as a competitor the predominate mode of training respondents identified as what prepared them most for their role as coach.

In addition to years as a competitor, modeling, or replicating the coaching behaviors participants had witnessed their former coaches engage in, was another theme that emerged under informal training. As one respondent explained: “The training I received was minimal. I took everything I learned as a competitor, watching how our graduate students/coaches taught and coached, and implemented it the best I could.” “Informal conversations,” informal mentoring, and “close interactions” with bosses and more experienced coaches were also mentioned by several respondents as modes of training which further contributed to modeling learned and observed coaching behaviors.

Regarding formal training, although seven of the 21 participants mentioned receiving coaching experience at the graduate level, as a graduate assistant, only two respondents specifically mentioned participating in coursework designed to teach forensic pedagogy, coaching strategies, or administrative duties. That is not to say that more formal modes of training did not occur for those who were/are graduate assistants; they were simply not reported. Three respondents identified participating in guided tournament administration duties as graduate students while one additional respondent explained being observed during coaching sessions by his/her DOF as a way to receive training on coaching techniques. Additionally, one respondent identified participating in coursework as an undergraduate student, explaining: “I completed an undergraduate course sequence in directing forensics and had a strong student leadership position as a competitor.” This particular participant did not mention receiving any further training at the graduate level, however. In fact, he/she continued by explaining, “Beyond that, I’ve had to learn it all as I go.”

In summary, modes of informal training were far more prevalent amongst participants’ responses, with time as a competitor being identified as the primary training received. Overall, the majority of respondents identified receiving far more modes of informal training than formal as a forensic coach.

Content Question Two: As a coach, what issues have you encountered that you felt ill-prepared for/untrained to address?

The responses provided for content question two yielded the rich-

est, and perhaps most diverse, responses which produced four emerging themes: interpersonal issues, legal concerns, administrative issues, and personal issues. Nothing should be inferred from the order in which the themes are presented or discussed.

For the purposes of this study, interpersonal issues included any component of relational-based issues, which were then further split into coach-competitor issues or coach-coach issues. Seven respondents identified myriad coach-competitor interpersonal issues as one area they felt ill-prepared to address. Among the interpersonal issues identified were how to handle the intimate relationships between and among team members along with how to guide the individuals and team members if a break up occurs. Additionally, several respondents mentioned feeling forced into the role of intercessor. One respondent shared: “Students are sometimes incredibly hurtful to each other, and I have to moderate between them.” Another wrote:

I felt very ill-prepared to address concerns students have with other coaches. There is really no set protocol of what to do. I don’t want to bad mouth the other coach, but I also don’t want to be dismissive of the students’ concerns.

Another area of concern specifically shared by five participants was the amount of time spent informally counseling team members on personal issues with family and friends. As one participant explained,

I never imagined the interpersonal issues I would have to deal with as a coach. At one tournament my first year, I had to help a competitor cope with learning his girlfriend[,] who had gotten pregnant unexpectedly, had had a miscarriage.

Another shared, “I wasn’t prepared to help students address major family conflicts that, even though they happened in the past, still clearly impacted them in major ways.”

In addition, six participants identified interpersonal issues between coaches as an area of concern. Three respondents identified struggling with “philosophical differences” amongst coaches, along with how those differences impact the program. Three others identified issues of authority as being highly troublesome. For instance, one participant explained: “I took over a relatively new team so implementing rules and standards was a challenge. There was some resistance and some blatant disregard for my requests.” Another shared, “I can be an authority to students or to grad students, but I struggle with how to balance youth, experience, and authority in the DOF/ADOF relationship.”

The second theme surrounded issues of legality. Respondents were particularly concerned with issues of liability and safety, and more specifically, a lack of information, training, or understanding regarding how university policy dictated their actions. Legal protocol and vague school policy in regard to sexual assault, as well as alcohol usage, were specifically identified by four respondents. One partici-

pant in particular elaborated: "I had an incident with students who used alcohol in the hotel room. No one had given me any guidelines of what the university's policies were so I had to just figure out how to proceed on my own." Survey participants did not provide elaborations regarding this theme, but the fact that several specifically identified issues of addressing sexual assault was surprising and alarming to the researchers, warranting mention.

For the purposes of this study, administrative issues were described as any non-coaching, non-teaching issues, which was the third theme to emerge. Respondents identified three administrative areas where they lacked formal training, and/or felt ill-prepared to address. The first was the area of fundraising. Seven respondents expressed concern that their operating budgets were insufficient and that, as a result, the university placed significant pressure to plan, direct (train their students), and effectively execute fundraising events. One participant elaborated: "Now, because our budget has been cut so much, we've been told to fundraise. I don't have time to do massive fundraising." Time, training, expectation, and resources available were all mentioned by numerous participants as being issues directly linked to fundraising.

The second area, how to effectively help the administration to "understand what we do and why it is important," as one respondent wrote, closely tied to the first. Another elaborated on the link:

I wasn't prepared for the massive political game that is linked to funding. It seems like we are in a constant battle for funding, therefore survival, and I just don't really know how to go about proving our importance to administration.

In addition to helping administration understand what we do, another area of concern addressed by three participants was feeling little departmental support due to apathetic or uninterested colleagues.

The final administrative area participants felt ill-equipped to handle dealt with being unaware of protocol regarding budgeting and travel. Although unique to each institution, it is worth mentioning that eight respondents identified issues regarding securing vans, filing cash advances, filing paperwork, and budgeting as being surprisingly problematic to address as a new coach.

The fourth and final theme to emerge under content question two was that of personal concerns, which, for the purposes of this study, were defined as any issues directly impacting the respondent in a non-professional manner. Five respondents reported that no one had prepared them for the work load or amount of time required to balance coaching with all of the other duties required of them at the start of their careers, and furthermore, how the time commitment impacts one's own interpersonal relationships. One participant shared: "I consistently work 60-70 hour weeks when tournament weekends are considered, and this has just totally destroyed any semblance of work-life balance I might have." Alarming, some even reported suffering

health consequences related to stress and sheer exhaustion directly related to trying to juggle the various roles they are forced to fill.

In addition to time commitment concerns, several participants expressed their personal struggle to accept the relatively low pay in relation to their work load, and especially when they looked at other professors without coaching duties and compared their workloads for the same, or perhaps more, pay. One respondent shared: "The pay is insultingly low. I do not feel as if my skills are appropriately valued for the effort I am contributing."

Content Question Three: What has surprised you most about coaching forensics?

Perhaps, after examination, the third thematic area seemed to provide less insight into the question of providing specific education and training regarding forensics pedagogy and coaching responsibilities than the others. Their responses do provide insights, however, that could be useful in the preparation of future forensic coaches. One very predominant theme emerged from the data, which is closely linked to the personal issues previously discussed. Respondents were most surprised by the time commitment that results from balancing the duality of coach and administrator duties.

The continual tug of war resulting in the balancing act of time spent coaching versus time spent on administrative duties is a difficult and time consuming practice (Carmack & Holm, 2013). Respondents agreed, as seven participants mentioned how time consuming juggling responsibilities can be. One respondent shared, "...most of my job is not coaching, but everyone expects that it should be," while another added being surprised by "[h]ow little coaching you actually do." The impact of this constant juggling act was summed up by one respondent, who was most surprised by "...the time commitment and emotional exhaustion" that occurred from trying to balance coaching and administrative duties. The respondent elaborated, explaining:

With no graduate program, my ADOF and I are the only coaches and as a result, we are left frustrated and drained from all the coaching, or we watch students get frustrated when we simply don't have any more time left to help them.

This respondent was not alone. Another participant remarked:

Burnout has kicked in much more quickly than I anticipated. I am young, have few relational or financial commitments, and have a genuine passion for the activity, but I do not see myself being willing to sustain my current level of coaching commitment for very long.

Though many participants were surprised by the time commitment and juggling act of coaching and administrative duties, most reported that their experiences were rewarding. One respondent wrote: "I

really love working with the students. I knew I enjoyed teaching, but coaching takes that to a whole new level. I also love building relationships with some of the most incredible students on the planet." Similar comments addressing how rewarding coaching can be were shared by six other participants. Although rewarding and fruitful, the time needed to fulfill coaching demands continues to surprise and negatively impact new coaches.

Content Question Four: When you encounter issues you were not prepared to deal with, how do you typically address them?

As reflected in the comments regarding training received, the prevailing theme that emerged from the data set was that of informal mentoring. Fifteen respondents shared they most often attempted to seek advice from colleagues, co-workers, or coaching mentors when confronted with issues they were not prepared to handle. Several respondents specifically identified having mentors outside of their particular program who were also willing to provide advice. One shared: "I seek advice from other DOF's that are open, kind, and freely share what they know just because they love students and they love forensics regardless." Another agreed, commenting: "The new coaches ban together and work through common problems together and the more experienced coaches are always willing to offer me advice." Informal mentoring and constant communication with peers and colleagues proved to be the most used technique for addressing coaching/team concerns or issues.

Although not as specifically related to the field, it is interesting to note that over half of the respondents explained they also accessed past experiences and intuition to help guide them through the decision-making process by taking the time to listen and process the information before responding. For example, one respondent shared: "I ask others how they would deal with it, or I think about which response will create the smallest amount of waves." Another explained: "Sometimes, I just have to trust my gut and make a call. If I'm right, I'm right. Otherwise, I have to make a change and keep moving forward." Despite not being specifically identified, resiliency was a common thread amongst the responses, perhaps summed up best by one participant who wrote: "I make it work. And when it doesn't, I try something new."

Discussion

New coaches feel most comfortable with their role when coaching events, simply because that is what they had the most direct contact with as a competitor, which, as the study indicated, was the primary mode of "training" identified by the respondents. There is far more to directing a forensic program, however, than simply coaching events. Although this study was small in size, the data collected does warrant the beginning of a dialogue regarding current, and perhaps future, training practices for new forensic coaches. It is important to note

that informal training/learning is a very beneficial and useful practice and therefore should not be devalued. More formalized measures of training, however, are also valuable due to their ability to be more easily managed, controlled, and measured, making it a more appropriate mode for certain content areas, such as legal policy and procedure. Therefore, both training methods should be used, depending on the content and situation (Park & Choi, 2016).

Regarding content question one, which examined the training participants received, data showed there is an overwhelming lack of formal training to either prepare new coaches pre-professionally, or within the first five years, to assist new coaches who are starting out in the forensics profession. Rather, the vast majority of respondents have relied on their experience as competitors; however, how much of the "big picture of coaching" do students truly experience as undergraduate competitors? Although a great deal of knowledge can be obtained via informal mentoring and observation, the researchers suggest implementing a more formal mentoring system and/or training program either individually at each institution, or at the state or national level. Unfortunately, the number of new coaches who are afforded the opportunity to either co-coach or receive formal mentoring at their given institution is rather small. If done at a regional or national level, formal mentoring and/or training could enhance current efforts to develop more far-reaching and sustained forensic education and training efforts. If a more formal approach to mentoring or training were to occur, the researchers suggest building off the data collected for content question two as subject areas to be addressed. Although it would be impossible to address every issues and/or concern that may arise, adequately preparing new coaches for the multitude of roles they will likely fill is critical.

Almost two decades ago, Workman (1997) warned the forensic community of the current state many of our colleagues are working through. 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 – from bookkeeping to public relations" (p. 253). Understanding this position is dynamic and often evolving is critical to the success of new coaches. A key factor in minimizing job-related stress and burnout is decreasing the role conflicts brought about through the necessity of managing and organizing extra-curricular activities and balancing them against normal teaching roles and responsibilities (Innstrand, Langballe, Falkum, & Aasland, 2011; Zhang & Zhu, 2007). As more seasoned coaches, the researchers suggest the community engage in a proactive approach to training by addressing the vast amount of role conflicts that emerge due to carrying coaching, teaching, and administrative duties. Even if some procedures are institution-specific, implementing a proactive approach to teaching the administrative duties, or, at the bare minimum, exposing new coaches to the diverse roles that must be filled, is key to fostering better prepared, more confident new coaches.

At the administrative level, it is imperative new coaches are equipped with the information needed to champion their program. Bartenan (1998), Derryberry (1980), Millsap (1998), Strine (1999), and Freeman (2016) have all articulated the critical need for linking a competitive program's outcomes to the educational mission of the curriculum, department, college and university levels. Anderson (1974) says it best when he observes: "In an age of educational accountability, the forensics community is and will increasingly be called upon to tell what it seeks to do, how well it accomplishes its goals, and what other effects it has" (p. 155). Although this sentiment was articulated over 40 years ago, the point remains today: "It is becoming important to be able to tell stories which effectively sell forensics within campus communities that are increasingly experiencing budget cuts and proliferation of extra-curricular activities that compete for limited resources, students, and recognition" (Jensen & Jensen, 2007, p. 17-18). For example, Freeman (2016) conducted a case study specifically analyzing the unique ways in which the University's competitive academic teams successfully advanced the institution's mission statement, which was then provided to the administration as usable data for The Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) accreditation standards. By not only providing usable data and/or models, but also training and assisting new coaches in the accrual of their own site-specific data, perhaps they will be more prepared to share the stories administrators desire. Additionally, new coaches would benefit greatly from more training regarding budgeting, management, and fundraising, as examples.

On a personal and interpersonal level, there is no shortage of literature that supports the perception of significant tensions occurring between balancing coaching responsibilities and maintaining interpersonal relationships (Bartenan, 1996a, 1996b; Carmack & Holm, 2014, 2015; Dickmeyer, 2002; Gill, 1990; Gilstrap & Gilstrap, 2003; Jensen, 1998; Jensen & Jensen, 2001, 2004, 2007; Jones, 1997; McDonald, 2001; Preston, 1995; Rogers & Rennels, 2008; Wicklegreen & Phillips, 2008; Workman, 1997). In their discussion of coach burnout, Carmack and Holm (2015) stressed the critical importance of strong social support networks. These networks have the ability to provide emotional affirmation, strengthen problem solving abilities, and decrease both job related stress and burnout (Babin, Palazzolo, & Rivera, 2012; Feeley, Moon, Kozey, & Slowe, 2010; Wright, Banas, Bessarabova, & Bernard, 2010). Additionally, they can provide a buffer from a variety of physical and psychological problems and increases loyalty to the organization (Feeley et al., 2010). Although interpersonal issues are expected, the prevalence of issues being linked to interpersonal differences experienced by new coaches is overwhelming and saddening. If training, or at the very least, exposure to said issues, could occur in a more proactive manner, perhaps our community's new coaches would be provided with the affirmation, confirmation, and support from a social and professional network needed that would ultimately increase their confidence and preparedness, both personally and professionally.

Questions for Future Study/Research

As our community moves forward toward future research and possible solutions to the complex challenges of training new coaches, it would be prudent to further explore the themes that were identified in this study in more depth, to better guide the crafting of an appropriate and useful training and mentoring program. Therefore, the researchers identified three questions that should be further addressed.

First, since there is currently an overwhelming amount of "training" occurring through an informal system of mentoring and some limited online coaching resources, how can we more effectively use informal mentoring as a tool that better positions new coaches for a more successful transition into coaching and leverage online resources in order to present a systematic, cogent database of effective training? Additionally, is informal mentoring better at personalizing the evolution of a new coach than a more formal mentoring program, or would formal mentoring be better utilized in this situation?

Secondly, as veteran coaches, we must ask ourselves, what can we do as coaches to better inform competitors of all that coaching encompasses in a better attempt to prepare them for potential coaching roles, should that be a career they are considering? When we know students have aspirations to coach, are we doing enough to prepare them for the rigors of the job they often do not see?

Finally, regarding the formal training that currently occurs (often from the hierarchy that exists within one's current position), is there a way to best format mentoring/training new coaches? Essentially, what are the "best practices" in mentoring/training new coaches? Is formal training best delivered through state, regional or national forensics organizations, and if so, what form would that take?

Conclusion

LaMaster (1998) recognized the importance of the coach's role in helping to shape students' personality formation by asking the forensic community to envision a coach-student relationship wherein the coach serves as adult guarantor who provides formative personal guidance. He continues: "If personal development is inherent in the age of many students and the nature of the activity, then aiding in that development is also intrinsic to the coach's position" (p. 278). If we as coaches invest that much into our students' development, why are we not investing the same amount of effort into our new coaches, who are also experiencing a new era of personal and professional development? As more "seasoned" coaches, the researchers hope these findings will be used to create more substantive dialogue of effective ways to better prepare those who will come after us and pick up the coaching torch. The duties and responsibilities of coaching and directing a forensic program have significantly changed over the last decade, saddling new coaches with legal, administrative, fundraising, program survival and justification issues, and interpersonal chal-

lenges that many of the respondents of this study felt either underprepared or ill-prepared to effectively navigate or address. Although informal mentoring does often occur, it does not seem to fully meet the need, with many respondents relying on their experiences and coaching observations as undergraduate competitors, which often show only a very small sliver of what the role of coach entails. An increase in a more formal mentoring system may better serve our new coaches, preparing them to balance the full magnitude of coaching responsibilities. The future of this activity is in our hands. What we choose to do to prepare the next generation of coaches should be a subject of critical importance to us. We ignore these issues at the risk of our activity and the health and sanity of those forensic professionals who represent the future.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, K. E. (1974). A critical review of the behavioral research in argumentation and forensics. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 10(3), 147-155.
- Babin, E. A., Palazzolo, K. E., & Rivera, K. D. (2012). Communication skills, social support, and burnout among advocates in a domestic violence agency. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 40(2), 147-166.
- Bartenan, K. M. (1996a). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensic education, part I. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 81(4), 1-21.
- Bartenan, K. M. (1996b). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensic education. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 82(1), 1-15.
- Bartenan, K. M. (1998). The place of the forensics program in the liberal arts college of the 21st century: An essay in honor of Larry E. Norton. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84(1), 1-16.
- Berube, D. (1999). The future of debating: A forum. *The International Journal of Forensics*, 1(2), 131-173.
- Bistodeau, K. C. (2015). The first-year coach. *Speaker & Gavel*, 52(1), 81-94.
- Carmack, H. J. & Holm, T. T. (2015). A little help from my friends: A relational health communication competence approach to social support for forensic educators. *National Forensic Journal*, Summer, 14-34.
- Carmack, H. J., & Holm, T. T. (2013). Stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and intent to leave among collegiate forensic educators. *National Forensic Journal*, Spring/Fall, 41-54.
- Citizens' League. (2008). *What is the Impact of the NCLB Act?* Retrieved from http://www.citizensleague.org/data/pdfs/sso/SSOIssueBrief_NCLB.pdf
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derryberry, B. R. (1980). Forensic programs in a scrutinizing decade. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 65(4), 4-5.
- Dickmeyer, S. (2002). Give it to me straight doc, how much longer can I coach: The length of the individual events season and its effect on the wellness of coaches. *National Forensic Journal*, 20, 57-61.
- Feeley, T. H., Moon, S. I., Kozey, R. S., & Slowe, A. S. (2010). An erosion model of employee turnover based on network centrality. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(2), 167-188.
- Freeman, N. (2016). Leveraging university mission statements: A case study analyzing competitive academic teams' contributions towards advancing mission statements (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.
- Gill, M. (1990). Why forensic coaches quit: A replication of extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 179-188.
- Gilstrap, C.A. & Gilstrap, C.M. (2003). Managing emotions in forensics and family: A family dialogue about emotion labor and emotion work. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 88(3), 3-15.
- Grohol, J. (2014, January 8). Millennials' problem? Depression & few skills in conflict negotiation. *Psych Central*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychcentral.com/blog/archives/2014/01/08>.
- Hamori, M., Cao, J., & Koyuncu, B. (2012). *Why top young managers are in a nonstop job hunt*. Retrieved from the Harvard Business Review website: <http://www.hbr.org/2012/07/why-top-young-managers-are-in-a-nonstop-job-hunt>.
- Innstrand, S., Langballe, E., Falkum, E., & Aasland, O. (2011). Exploring within- and between-gender differences in burnout: 8 different occupational groups. *International Archives of Occupational & Environmental Health*, 84(7), 813-824.
- Jensen, S. (1998). Preserving the pedagogy: The Director of Forensics as an at-risk professional. *Journal of the Speech & Theatre Association of Missouri*, 28, 28-41.
- Jensen, S. & Jensen, G. (2001, November). *Assimilating family and forensics: Balancing forensics education and family when two become one*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Atlanta, Ga.
- Jensen, S. & Jensen, G. (2004, November). *The contemporary face of forensics and family: A survey analysis of the relationship between forensic education, participation, and family status*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, Il.
- Jensen, S. & Jensen, G. (2007). Pursuing forensic goals while protecting family time: An application of Brock's Commodity Theory. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 92, 17-25.
- Jones, K. (1997, November). *Forensics and divorce: When two worlds collapse*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, Il.
- LaMaster, G. (1998). Identity formation in forensics: The coach as adult guarantor. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2(4), 266-280.
- Lewis, R. (2011). Buddy Ryan, can we stop by the liquor store on the way home? Negotiating tensions as a young forensics coach. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 96(1) p. 1-15.
- Lipman, V. (2013). *Why employee development is important, neglected and can cost you talent*. Retrieved from the Forbes website: www.forbes.com/sites/victorlipman/2013/01/29/why-development-planning-is-important-neglected-and-can-cost-you-young-talent/#4e7f28202ce0.
- Millsap, S. (1998). The benefits of forensics across the curriculum: An opportunity to expand the visibility of college forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84(1), 17-26.
- McDonald, K.M. (2001). Demanding expectations: Surviving and thriving as a collegiate debate coach. *Argument & Advocacy*, 38, 115-120.
- Outzen, C. P. (2016). Looking over my shoulder: An autoethnographic account of a first year coach. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 101(2), 17-33.
- Park, Y. & Choi, W. (2016). The effects of formal learning and informal learning on job performance: The mediating role of the value of learning at work. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(2), 279-287.
- Preston, C.T. (1995). Contributory factors to coach burnout and brain drain in forensics: Some suggestions for credibility and activity survival. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 80, 16-22.
- Richardson, R. R. (2005). Burned out or born to run: Research and directives on forensics coach burnout. *National Forensic Journal*, 23, 108-115.
- Robinson, T. T. & Rees, B. (2012). Digitalizing forensics: Coaching the net generation. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 97(2), 3-13.
- Rogers, J. & Rennels, A. (2008). The forensics professionals' dilemma: Do the tensions between coaching responsibilities and marriage and family commitments contribute to coaching exit decisions? *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 93(2), 1-22.
- Stapleton, K. & Robles-Pina, R. A. (2009). *Grade retention: Good or bad? A review of the literature*. Retrieved from <http://www.shsu.edu/piic/Fall2009/Robles-Pina.html>.
- Strine, H. (1999). Getting your grubstake: The funding of a forensics program. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 85(1), 7-10.
- Wickelgren, B. F. & Phillips, L. P. (2008). When metaphor and reality collide: A coach negotiating between family and forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 26, 81-97.
- Workman, T. A. (1997). Solving for a healthy future: Creating national standards for training future directors of forensics. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2(3), 251-256.

- Wright, K. B., Banas, J. A., Bessarabova, E. E., & Bernard, D. R. (2010). A communication competence approach to examining health care social support, stress, and job burnout. *Health Communication, 25*(4), 375-382.
- Zhang, Q., & Zhu, W. (2007). Teacher stress, burnout, and social support in Chinese secondary education. *Human Communication, 10*, 487-496.



Be it Resolved that Debate is Resolute: Deep Structures as Explanation for Predictable Cycles in the Evolution of Intercollegiate Debate

SCOTT JENSEN, WEBSTER UNIVERSITY

Abstract: Debate activities within intercollegiate forensics have proliferated in an almost predictable cycle over the past several decades, reaching a point at which there are as many debate formats available to students as there are individual events. This paper does not take issue with the breadth of debate options available to collegiate forensic programs. It does examine a cultural explanation for such growth. Deep structures are systems or institutions within cultures that shape core structures, values, and identities. Deep structures of both the forensic community, as well as debate activities are discussed as a primary reason for debate formats being created, growing, evolving, and often reaching their peak with norms that reflect those that sparked the initial formation of the debate format in question. The paper identifies deep structures, analyzes examples of the evolution of debate formats that illustrate the influence of deep structures, and discusses implications for the evolution of collegiate debate activities now and in the future.

Things change, and forensics is no exception. Over the course of time our community has seen proliferation of events and changes in the competitive practices of those events. While the numbers of events have grown, the increased opportunities within the individual events community has, generally speaking, been characterized by uniqueness from what previously existed; participants have been afforded different opportunities with little to no decline in the opportunities that existed prior to any major changes. The debate community has evolved a bit differently. While there are more collegiate debate opportunities now than ever before, this growth in formats has often been in response to, or at the expense of, existing formats. Moreover, practices within formats often evolve to reflect the practices that motivated change in the first place. While more is often better, the question of why the debate community and its reforms are often cyclical should be addressed. Because cyclical evolution reinforces similar practices and perspectives, the breadth of opportunity afforded by many debate formats risks remaining a potential opportunity left unfulfilled. As forensic programs shape their own cultures around what they understand debate formats to be, identities of for-

SCOTT JENSEN (MA, Central Missouri State University) is Full Professor and Coordinator of Sports Communication and Speech Communication Studies at Webster University (St. Louis, MO). Please refer all questions and comments to the author at jensensc@webster.edu. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2014 National Communication Association conference in Chicago. The author would like to thank reviewers for their insights and helpful suggestions.

mats as a result of this evolution are critical. Among potential explanations, deep structures within the debate community, arguably intrinsic within debate itself, are the reasons the evolution of debate practices often cycle back to practices common to several debate formats, making this analysis important to our community. A discussion of deep structures, an examination of these cultural constructs within debate communities, and implications for future growth in debate opportunities offer insights into why debate is so resolute.

Deep Structures Defined

Samovar, Porter, and McDaniel (2013) write that "the key to how members of a culture view the world can be found in that culture's *deep structure*" (p. 59). They add that these deep structures shape a culture and explain "the *how*" and *why*" of a culture's collective action—an action that is often difficult for "outsiders" to understand" (p. 60). The authors explain that three particularly influential social organizations inform cultures and shape their deep structures. These three—family, state, and religion—work together to "define, create, transmit, maintain, and reinforce the basic and most crucial elements of every culture" (p. 60). The authors note that each of these three is defined in general terms, almost as metaphorical labels for a broader range of organizations of influence. "Family" represents a group that shares a legal and/or genetic connection and a commitment to caring for one another. "State" refers to societal communities, both governmental and non-governmental. "Religion" takes into account the spirituality and worldview of a culture. As the authors note, "regardless of what we call the three deep structure institutions, they form the roots of every culture and provide the fundamental values and attitudes that are most critical to that culture" (p. 60). Where debate is concerned, the worldview, history, and institutions that have and continue to shape the culture are extensions of these deep structures.

Samovar et al (2013) offer four reasons to explain the power of these institutions to shape choices and identities of cultures. The first is that "deep structure institutions carry culture's most important messages" (p. 61). These messages are often the justification for choices we make about how we live our lives. The second reason is that "deep structure institutions and their messages endure" (p. 62). The validity and relevance of these messages and the institutions that promote them stand the test of time, often because they survive challenges and are reinforced over time. The third of the four reasons is that "deep structure institutions and their messages are deeply felt" (p. 62). Individuals are passionate about the messages within these institutions. As the authors write, "regardless of the culture, in any hierarchy of cultural values, love of family, God, and country top the list" (p. 62). The final explanation of the importance of these institutions is that "deep structure institutions supply much of a person's identity" (p. 62). As we grow older, our identities become more grounded within community; as this evolution occurs, individuals take on more of their culture's norms and core values as central to

who they are. Inevitably, this means deep structure institutions and what they communicate become definitive of who we are as individuals. These dynamics are particularly compelling when cultures experience change that is influenced by deep structures, as history has chronicled for the collegiate debate community. Coach/educators who have been active within the community for a number of years are uniquely positioned to reflect on and react to how deep structures impact the debate community and its evolution.

Deep Structures of Debate

As a culture, the debate community has reflections of deep structures similar to those outlined by scholars of cultural communication in the form of practices, principles, and philosophies entrenched within the communities' activities. In their explanation of how deep structures help shape identity, Samovar et al (2013) explain that the three institutions of family, state, and religion interact broadly with cultural dynamics in the form of clans, communities, and worldviews. Religion, for example, extends beyond faith-based traditions and incorporates values and belief systems. They further explain that we navigate our worlds, moving from

identities based only on the 'I'...to identities linked to the 'we.' That is to say, you begin to realize that while you still have a personal identity, you also have shared identities. You belong to a 'community' and relate to its norms, values, communication behaviors, and the like. (p. 63)

In this way, debate is not only a culture, but one—like any other culture—that is manifest in deep structures.

There are examples of our debate culture's deep structures that are common in some form within arguably all of its formats. This commonality makes these characteristics illustrations of the deep structures that define debate culture. Most texts that discuss the nature of argumentation and debate relate the activity to critical thinking and preparation for the democratic process. Bartanen (1994b) goes so far as to characterize debate as "the foundation of a free society" (p. 97). O'Donnell (2011) writes that

intercollegiate debate, positioned at the nexus of liberal learning, is uniquely located to rejoin the call to renew the promise of the American experiment. Debate is a technology that connects the explosion of political speech with a civic-oriented vision for the future as well as a mode of speech and inquiry that is constitutive of citizenship; people (students) become citizens both in and through their participation in debate. (p. 19)

Snider and Schnurer (2006), in advocating debate across the curriculum, argue that "debate provides the potential for independent vigorous free thought and dialogue. Debate cannot easily be policed or controlled, and its process requires active thinking" (p. 4). Critical thinking is an intrinsic quality of debate, probably the most com-

monly cited benefit of participating in the activity. Being central to debate makes critical thinking, both the goal and the activity, a deep structure in the same way the institutions and their content outlined by Samovar et al are deep structures in any culture.

As a deep structure, critical thinking is impacted by the same four reasons social institutions are important. Given the significant presence of critical thinking as illustrated in the aforementioned scholarship, this dimension of debate matters to its participants, has endured, is rooted deeply within debate practices and desired outcomes, and helps shape the debater and former debater that is often held up as the illustration of why our activity is important. In particular, critical thinking carries with it the important elements of debate as we know it in the competitive forensic culture. Bartanen and Frank (1994) frame a critical thinking approach as "a dialectical process in which participants learn by creating arguments" (p. 11). Within this approach they describe the audience as unimportant and the critic's responsibility being to adapt to the debaters and arguments as a *tabula rasa* adjudicator. Snider and Schnurer (2006) describe the process of debate, focusing on the critical thinking nature of the activity, as "dynamic, fluid, and changing" (p. 5). They highlight the need to constantly adapt arguments and work with teammates, all pointing to a spontaneous, critical process that unfolds and is subject to strategic management by its participants.

This strategic management of an unpredictable process is another central extension of deep structures within the debate community, and the primary reason debate cycles in a manner that reinforces particular practices and principles. The uniqueness of debate within the forensic community is the direct confrontation between competitors, which becomes the bright line between success and failure. A debater or debate team participates in a round of debate, after which they win or they lose. While there are ranks and ratings that contribute to tie-breakers and elimination round seedings, and speaker awards that acknowledge individual excellence, these are less immediate in their importance when considering the round itself. In contrast, "winning" an individual event round with the lowest rank and highest rating marks success is accomplished without interaction or confrontation with other competitors performing in the same round. With the exception of limited preparation events, the "standard" individual events are prepared within a process that unfolds prior to the tournament and critics evaluate the product that was created through this process. Similar preparation occurs prior to the tournament for debate, but that process continues at the tournament prior to and during the debate round. The combination of vying for a win and the opportunity for managing the strategy within the round makes the *process* of competitive debate paramount in how it is approached. Even Willard (1983) defines argument as a form of social interaction. He posits that "communication concepts are more appropriate to argumentation than are logical ones" (p. 19). In a later work, Willard (1989) suggests process is inherent to argumentation in that "ground

rules and etiquette permit, encourage, and even require critique and rejoinder" (p. 13). In this way, strategically managing a debate round is central to achieving success in the form of winning.

The similarity in all debate formats is the presence of critical thinking as a core process and outcome, and the pursuit of a win over the opponent in a given round. Debaters approach debate rounds having created a strategy for approaching that team, debating that topic, and persuading that judge. Strategy, in many cases, was shaped through a dialectical process involving working with coaches, researching last-minute claims, constructing arguments and rejoinders, and learning what will most likely persuade the judge. Winning is often accomplished by being as strategic and creative as possible within the rules or guidelines of the given format. In this way, debaters pose theory and other offensive arguments that potentially broaden the rules of engagement or justify why an opponent has broken a rule, either "ethically" (e.g., a critique) or "legally" (e.g., a topicality argument). Debaters may speak quickly in order to expand their number of arguments or the breadth and depth of support for their arguments. Space for team preparation may be "marked" in order to guarantee easier team collaboration. In short—the process of debate motivates choices that make a win more likely. The process encourages critical thinking as part of strategizing content and practice that has the highest potential for winning a given round.

Deep Structures and Cyclical Evolution

Clearly, not all debate formats are the same. That being said, deep structures of critical thinking and strategic management within the debate community transcend the boundaries of formats. So long as debate remains a process as described herein, there is motivation for debaters to manipulate the process in ways that advantage them, albeit within each format's framework that helps shape the choices available to debaters. Bartanen and Frank (1994) write that "many of the common criticisms of debate can be traced to excessive use of critical-thinking and games perspectives" (p. 11). The pursuit of a win over engaging argument with no final decision has been a concern within the forensic community since the early 20th century. Bartanen and Littlefield (2014), in their chronicle of the history of forensics, note that "arguments justifying decision and no-decision forms of debate reflected the similar philosophical positions of those who advocated debate as a game versus those who viewed it as a training activity for civic engagement" (p. 124). The advent of wins and losses created a context in which the goal was no longer reasoned, persuasive discourse that reflected positively on debaters, nor was collaboration or consensus from a round of discourse the end result of a debate performance. With decision forms of debate, the goal was now to "win" because there was a clear bright line as to when that happens. Bartanen and Littlefield go on to connect the increased competitiveness in debate with a number of elements within the debate community that are at the heart of the activity's cyclical evolution. They

note, in particular, specialized and technical debate, an increased expectation for *qualified* judges who have an understanding of more sophisticated argumentation and strategy, and a national circuit tournament schedule that ultimately established norms that made it more difficult for "parochial" teams (p. 139).

Despite the uniqueness in formats idealized within organizational meetings of founders, expressions of principle, and original governing documents, the overwhelming majority of formats function within decision models that reflect debate's deep structures that aspire to wins over losses, along with the manifestations of these structures—specialized argumentation and strategy, expert judging, and a national tournament circuit. *Success* is always going to be the goal. When wins and losses are the measurable outcome extending directly from debate rounds, that success is often going to be measured in wins. The reality that may often remain understated is that success is also grounded in the skills developed in the effort to earn the win/loss record that meets standards of "success."

This sharedness of deep structures has led to normative practices, reflecting critical thinking and strategic management in ways that have already been identified, that were exported with community migration from one format that gave way to another. These practices began as central to National Debate Tournament (NDT) debate splitting off to Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) debate. After debate in CEDA mutated back to the characteristics from which many schools left, National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) debate was founded. As norms continue to evolve away from founding principles upon which NPDA debate was grounded, National Forensic Association Lincoln-Douglas Debate (NFA-LD) continues to enjoy a growth in its participation. These four formats represent the most profound evolutions within the debate community within the last 50 years. An additional evolution was also the introduction of debate, NFA-LD, within a traditionally individual event-oriented association. One of the unique aspects of NFA-LD is codified rules that limit the strategy and content within debates. More recently there have been several other formats that have been met with mixed success in terms of growth and sustainability. These include International Public Debate Association (IPDA) debate, British Worlds debate, public forum, and National Educational Debate Association (NEDA) debate. A combination of rules, uniqueness in format, and regionalization of the formats has prevented similar cyclical evolution within these specific communities. Another factor that has prevented the same cycle of NDT, CEDA, and NPDA in other formats deals with the dynamic of competing deep structures. Each of these formats shares deep structures. While a variety of considerations led to the formation of new formats, central issues of concern centered on the same considerations aforementioned scholars noted as manifestations of critical thinking and strategic management. Normative practices became those that had the greatest potential to win rounds, including judge preferencing, argument content, volumes of evidence, and other

choices. Many of the programs opting to move away from formats did so with a sharing of the importance of critical thinking and strategy, but a difference of opinion regarding how these should manifest themselves in a debate round.

Competing Deep Structures and Breaking the Cycle

Rhetorical traditions that are as historic as the period of no-decision debate to which Bartanen and Littlefield allude remain steadfast within the forensic community. These traditions have typically been the reasoning for developing alternative formats that allow for more systemic practices that balance rhetorical traditions with the processes central to contemporary debate. Often new formats enjoy significant migration from schools disenchanted with the evolution of formats they once found to be complementary to their vision of competitive debate. A linear relationship exists between the start and growth of the cyclical evolution so common in debate communities and the decline of participation in the format from which the migration happened. Programs seek large tournaments, high levels of competition, and competitive success. These ends become more likely in the more populated formats. Programs who embrace the deep structures they once found in the now less popular format bring their approach to debate into the new format, essentially becoming a hegemonic influence that cultivates deep structures from previous formats into the new debate community.

The hegemony of these normative approaches rooted in the enduring nature of how the debate culture has come to understand the deep structures of critical thinking and strategic management. As Samovar et al (2013) note, the ability to endure is a defining characteristic of a deep structure. For generations, debate communities have come to understand effective critical thinking and strategic management within the practices we first saw in NDT debate, and later witnessed as the practices that gradually became commonplace in the formats to which migration from NDT gave birth. Crossman (1996) writes that CEDA was resistant to acknowledging its founding principles when it began to merge with NDT, including sharing national debate topics. He offered the same caution for the NPDA community as former team policy programs move to that format from their former CEDA or NDT activities. McGee and McGee (2000) argue that CEDA experienced profound declines in memberships and levels of participation because it looked away from where it once was and left principles that are central to forensics. Preston (2006) offers a symbolic convergence critique in which he argues rhetorical visions declined within the broader debate community, suggesting core identity changes.

The rationale these authors provide for the cyclical evolution of CEDA is further explained by a lack of codified framework that checked(s) how debate should transpire within the format. "Rules" for some formats are expressed as aspirational statements of how debates should proceed within the vision of the select community. Other for-

mats, such as NFA-LD, IPDA, and public forum, have rules that can be referenced and enforced as responses to in-round choices. These rules range from not being able to read evidence, to how evidence should be cited, and from rates of speaking to the kinds of arguments that are allowed or disallowed in debates. In no way do these rules negate the sharedness of critical thinking or strategic management of debate rounds. They do, however, shape how these deep structures manifest themselves within rounds.

Essentially, these core identity changes and organizations' founding principles represent manifestations of deep structures that compete with one another. Some emerging formats are powerful enough to entice large numbers of programs to form new outlets that remain distinct from other formats, while others are enduring enough to power repeated cycles of evolution within the collegiate debate community. While some may argue these cycles of evolution are not negative, an important implication is that they make some formats uncertain long-term options for programs. As formats change, they become more disconnected from some programs who no longer find the brand of debate they once embraced congruent with their program. As these deep structures compete with one another, it is important to consider strategies for either resisting the cyclical evolution, or securing co-existence of communities that can remain strong in the face of competing core differences in their worldviews of debate.

There is nothing inherently negative about the cyclical evolution that reinforces normative manifestations of debate's deep structures. Clearly a critical mass of programs preference these norms as consistent with the form of debate that best serves their students and campus community. The most critical potential negative manifestation of this evolutionary cycle is its impact on programs searching for debate communities whose own normative practices reflect critical thinking and strategy in a way that endures in the same manner as the practices that have cycled over generations. For these programs, it is important to consider ways to preserve debate's deep structures within a set of choices that do not cycle away from the values and principles embraced by the program.

Support Formats that Codify Desired Practices

One option is to select formats with frameworks that promote specific forms of debate in ways that are enforceable with wins and losses, a central manifestation of debate's deep structures. While any given round can have a judge who selectively ignores a set of rules to be followed as part of his/her adjudication, generally rules serve as frameworks for how *all* debaters display critical thinking and strategy within debate formats. Wins and losses are awarded in any debate format, and wins are earned through competent strategizing and critical thinking. At the same time, programs that desire a balance of these deep structures and presentational style valued by a general audience may be better served by formats that codify such a balance

within the rules they ask judges to enforce. Measures that help safeguard features of formats can range from procedural rules to selectivity in who is allowed to participate in a format's tournaments. These and other steps are utilized by several existing associations and formats.

Existing non-traditional debate formats. The Worlds debate format pairs teams into two person sides, with each side consisting of two different teams defending the same side of the resolution. Results are tabulated in speaker ranks as opposed to wins and losses. No electronic preparation or consultation with anyone other than the two partners is allowed. Rounds reflect argumentation similar to other team formats, while also reflecting approaches to strategy that differ greatly from CEDA, NDT, NPDA, or NFA-LD debate rounds.

Public Forum debate is growing in popularity within the collegiate debate community. Largely mirroring high school public forum, the collegiate format encourages diverse judging pools, has a somewhat limited semester topic announced immediately prior to the term's first tournaments, and determines sides being debated within the round itself. It is possible for a team to debate all their tournament rounds on the same side of the topic. The in-round establishment of positions and rules that prohibit certain arguments from being advocated helps this format strike a balance of presentational effectiveness and strategic advocacy that is not as commonplace in aforementioned debate formats.

Other formats such as National Educational Debate Association debate (NEDA) and International Public Debate Association debate (IPDA) are popular within regions of the country. These formats utilize selectivity in association memberships, strict rules, and non-traditional access to the activity as participants and critics to preserve an approach to debate consistent with the principles upon which the formats were founded.

A collection of rules, placement of judges, and vetting of participating schools allows some smaller formats to endure. To date, those mentioned herein have experienced limited evolution of practices within their activities that challenge the kind of debate intended at their tournaments. Other formats integrate advocacy and argument in less directly competitive formats. Some national and invitational tournaments such as Pi Kappa Delta and Phi Rho Pi offer events such as discussion and student congress that allow competitors opportunities to research, frame arguments, and advocate in competitive speaking contexts. While they reflect less clash and strategy, many elements most would consider central to debate activities are found in these alternative events.

Diversify Your Program's Participation

One important implication of this cyclical evolution within debate communities is the proliferation of opportunities available to pro-

grams. Beyond the growth of competitive opportunities are non-competitive activities to which teams can commit. Competitive trends and opportunities change, despite deep structures that one might think would entrench consistency. As has already been discussed, outcomes of forensic participation, such as critical thinking, are additional deep structures that drive changes in practice. Other outcomes that share the label of deep structures within forensics and debate center on preparation for citizenship. Programs can embrace non-competitive activities as both contributions to their community and meaningful co-curricular experiences that compliment forensic education. Freeman and Rogers (2013) note the value of extending the notion of comprehensive forensics beyond the range of competitive activities to include service. Such commitments help shape the character and vision of programs beyond a narrow view of competition. The obvious challenge is the already difficult task of coordinating traditional forensic activities within limited resources such as time and money. Additionally, the overwhelming majority of forensic programs participate in tournaments in which a measurable outcome is earning awards. Service and non-competitive activities, while valuable ways of promoting critical and strategic thinking, are more difficult to measure as signs of program success. Directors who find these non-competitive activities to be meaningful alternatives to existing competitive debate formats should re-think the long-term implications of maintaining participation within cultures they find to be incongruent with their or their program's goals or mission. Looking at high school participation, Littlefield (2001) reports a variety of benefits to debate participation as reported by high school debaters, ranging from critical skills to social networking. Interestingly, Littlefield writes, "Notably absent in the top ten benefits listed by high school students were items related to winning contests, acquiring trophies or awards, and travel" (p. 87).

Employ Diverse and "Assertive" Judging

Perhaps the most profound implication of deep structure within our debate community is the win and loss assigned at the end of debate rounds. Given the impact this has on debate culture, it is reasonable to look to judging as a means of influencing debate practice. Ultimately debaters seek judges' ballots, meaning they seek to engage in debate practices that are persuasive to those who are likely to judge them. A long-standing dialogue between debate scholars and coach/educators concerns how to manage judging as part of debate tournaments. A deep divide separates those who advocate judges with experience and understanding regarding debate strategy and contemporary practices, and others who call for more diverse judging pools that include critics who may not be familiar with or supportive of current debate practices. Bartanen (1994a), in advocating the use of nontraditional judges in forensic tournaments, posits that "Critics oppose nontraditional judges because such judges do not understand either the structural or situational elements of current forensics practice.

Listeners lacking this knowledge are unqualified contest judges" (p. 249). What Bartanen notes is the impact judging has on the continual reinforcement of deep structures. Beyond the judges within tournament pools, the dialogue also extends to the question of whether or not debate teams should be able to preference the judges to whom they debate, or debate in front of critics who are randomly assigned to rounds. These are central questions because they speak to the person who determines the win or loss. They speak to the person who embodies the deep structure that motivates continued evolution of collegiate debate activities. Paroske (2011), along with Butler (2002), argues for welcoming diverse judging pools in tournament settings that utilize random judge assignments as opposed to mutual preference judging (MPJ) assignments. This randomness would necessitate that teams be flexible in their debating styles in order to adapt to a variety of judge preferences. This increased need to be able to adapt debating styles has the potential to make debaters better able to adapt in debates that may be more consistent with the format and expectations for that specific debate.

An additional way in which judging can impact cyclical evolution in debate is with what some may call interventionist practices. As has been discussed, formats are born out of principles intended to guide their debates. While some formats are more rule bound than others, all endorse a framework for debate as they want it to be. The best way to secure those visions is with wins or losses that, in part, reinforce choices that reflect the intended debate for that format. This adherence to intent means judges must be willing to (1) understand expectations for that debate format, (2) respect principles upon which that format is based, even if there is personal disagreement with them, and (3) make decisions within the debate round that are grounded in the rules/principles/vision of that debate format. This is not always the well-received choice for judges, but it may be the most effective means of preserving the integrity of debate formats intended to remain distinct from others within the broader community.

These ways of incorporating judging into decision making about formats to support are easily enforced or operationalized by tournament and program directors. Tournament directors who choose to influence the in-round displays of deep structures can do so with the way judges are scheduled, who comprises the judging pool, and whether or not hired judges are paid. While it may seem drastic, tournament administrators are blessed or burdened, depending on one's perspective, with shaping a tournament that reflects a particular worldview of the forensic activity. The management of a judging pool that will help reinforce a certain worldview of debate is part of that shaping. Similarly, program directors should make travel decisions that help ensure experiences that reinforce what they deem most appropriate for their students and program. To the extent that budgets and tournament availability allow, programs should support tournaments in which their students can reasonably expect to debate in ways consistent with how they have come to value debate.

Conclusions

Deep structures are ways to understand core values and enduring characteristics of cultures. Collegiate debate bears its own deep structures that help to explain what has become a predictable cycle of evolution that sees programs abandon formats that are no longer congruent with their vision of the activity or program needs to form new organizations and frameworks for debate, only to see their constructed format revert to the practices it originally sought to avoid. This cycle is the debate communities' effort to preserve deep structures of critical thinking and strategizing in ways that win rounds. Scholars and educators have warned the community to learn from cyclical evolutions of the past (Crossman, 1996), yet the hegemony of deep structures drive the community to embrace practices they see as nurturing of these core principles and practices. The meta-analysis of forensic activities is healthy, even when that debate questions the value or ethics of dominant characteristics of the activity. As Burnett, Brand, and Meister (2003) offered a critique of the educational value and justification for common forensic practices, Hinck (2003) rebutted that these practices, while not perfect, remain part of an activity that has tremendous value. The danger of deep structures is they often escape critique or deconstruction that can help cultures grow and avoid problems associated with blindly adhering to core principles. The collegiate debate community endures consistent tension between competing views of what represents ideal debate practice, largely because of a return to practices rooted in deep structures. While the solutions suggested herein are not revolutionary, cyclical evolution continues. Perhaps the greatest value of this analysis is the understanding that debate formats can share deep structures and avoid "reinventing the wheel" with new formats. Uniqueness exists within our debate community. It is time for those who seek it to embrace it.

REFERENCES

- Bartanen, M. D. (1994a). The case for using nontraditional judges in forensic contests. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 30 (4), 248-254.
- Bartanen, M. D. (1994b). *Teaching and Directing Forensics*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Bartanen, M. D. & Frank, D. A. (1994). *Nonpolicy Debate*, 2nd ed. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Bartanen, M. D. & Littlefield, R. S. (2014). *Forensics in America: A History*. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.
- Butler, A. (2002). Community, socialization, and judge inclusivity: Why academic debate should broaden its judging pool horizons. *The Forensic*, 87 (01). 25-33.
- Crossman, M. (1996). The future of academic debate: CEDA's decline and the growth of parliamentary debate. *The Forensic*, 82 (01). 27-33.

- Burnett, A.; Brand, J.; Meister, M. (2003). Winning is everything: Education as myth in forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 21 (01). 12-23.
- Freeman, N. P. M. & Rogers, J. E. (2013). Fostering a climate of comprehensiveness: The pedagogic value of inclusiveness and service education. *The Forensic*, 98 (01). 1-16.
- Hinck, E. A. (2003). Managing the dialectical tension between competition and education in forensics: A response to Burnett, Brand, and Meister. *National Forensic Journal*, 21 (02). 60-76.
- Littlefield, R. S. (2001). High school student perceptions of the efficacy of debate participation. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 38. 83-97.
- McGee, B. R. & McGee, D. S. (2000). Announcing the death of the Cross Examination Debate Association: Ideology and the locus of organizational identity. *The Forensic*, 85 (03). 1-24.
- O'Donnell, T. (2011). A rationale for intercollegiate debate in the twenty-first century. In J. P. Zompetti, Ed. *Reasoned Rationales: Exploring the Educational Value of Debate*. New York, NY: International Debate Education Association, 19-46.
- Paroske, M. (2011). The official language of academic debate. *National Forensic Journal*, 29 (02), 183-203.
- Preston, C. T., Jr. (2006). Debating about debate: A symbolic convergence theory meta-analysis of educational reform movements in intercollegiate competitive debate. *The Forensic*, 91 (01). 15-26.
- Samovar, L. A.; Porter, R. E.; McDaniel, E. R. (2013). *Communication Between Cultures*, 8th ed. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Snider, A. & Schnurer, M. (2006). *Many Sides: Debate Across the Curriculum*, rev. ed. New York, NY: International Debate Education Association.
- Willard, C. A. (1983). *Argumentation and the Social Grounds of Knowledge*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama.
- Willard, C. A. (1989). *A Theory of Argumentation*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama.



The Political Climate as a Barrier to Civic Engagement: Are Students Ready to Engage?

TOMEKA M. ROBINSON, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
 CODY M. CLEMENS, BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
 RACHEL GARNETT, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
 BRANDON JOHNSON, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

Abstract: With tensions in the current political climate continuing to build, being a citizen requires practice. Individuals are forced to exercise the use of staying informed, consume credible data, and implement the civic duty of a well-informed citizen. As educators, it is critical students are taught how to become active participants in the current political climate. The importance is magnified within the realm of forensics. It is important to note students on college campuses struggle from emotional citizenry (Askins, 2016), and are also precarious in the sense that they struggle with stability, identity, and trusting the state and capital (Standing, 2011). It is essential, therefore, that we expand traditional pedagogical practices and allow students the opportunities to step outside the classroom and into the political sphere. This paper will attempt to address the lack of preparedness of our students to engage, while arguing that forensic educators ought to encourage students to become more involved as emotional citizens by embracing an intercultural praxis.

The university and college experience is one of the first opportunities for students to be involved in a community separate from their parents. Additionally, university settings provide an ideal atmosphere for debating new and diverse perspectives. The conglomeration of backgrounds amongst students and faculty can help students engage in discourse that teaches them how to be actively a part of a community (Giles & Eyler, 1994). Learning about their fellow citizens within a niche community can teach students how to be invested in what is happening in their surroundings. Scholars have pointed to the utility of service-learning and civic engagement to promote this sense of community building (Howard, 1997; Hesser, 1995). Howard (1997) defines service-learning as a pedagogical model that intentionally integrates academic learning and relevant community service. Additional studies have noted the efficacy of participating in service during the undergraduate years (Astin et al., 2000; Batchelder & Root, 1994; Hesser, 1995). Service-learning has become part of the larger

TOMEKA M. ROBINSON (Ph.D., Texas A&M University) is an Associate Professor and Director of Forensics at Hofstra University (Hempstead, NY). CODY M. CLEMENS (M.A., Duquesne University) is a Graduate Teaching Assistant, Instructor, and Doctoral Student at Bowling Green State University (Bowling Green, OH). RACHEL GARNETT & BRANDON JOHNSON are both MA candidates in Rhetoric at Hofstra University (Hempstead, NY). Please direct all correspondence to the first author at tomeka.m.robinson@hofstra.edu.

community engagement movement, because the purpose is to give students the necessary tools to become more engaged citizens (Robinson & Clemens, 2014). According to Burch (2013), "community engagement is a systematic, structured, integrative continuum of teaching, research, and service in institutions of higher learning" (p. 266). However, the practice of civic engagement is intrinsically tied to the climate of the greater community, both locally and globally.

Sax, Astin, Korn, and Mahoney (2000) argue that higher education has historically had a role in fostering democracy and citizen participation and providing social value through both its educative function and its production of knowledge—ideally creating a space for students to practice engaging in opposing dialogue and ideas. The 2016 presidential campaign, however, exposed the flagrant polarization of ideologies in America and individual differences were highlighted to separate instead of bring communities together. Since individual differences are being used as a device to dismantle inclusiveness, learning communities are in need of a younger generation who is open minded and willing to engage in discourse and take actions that can bring communities together (Li & Frieze, 2016). Although scholarly debates rage about whether citizen involvement in the United States has declined to crisis levels or is simply taking new and different forms outside electoral politics (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999; Wuthnow, 1999), a consensus has emerged about the need to increase civic participation and strengthen democracy, with universities being called upon to play a leading role. In particular, forensics is an activity rooted in curating spaces for dialogue and is undeniably an avenue for civic engagement. As facilitators of learning, instructors have a unique obligation to demonstrate how to interact and engage polarizing ideas. As a model, the professor demonstrates the balancing of ideas and how to reach a common place among them. As a result, forensics as an extension of the classroom serves as an inclusive forum where ideologies can be validated regardless of student's identity or ideology. The creation of this unbiased space is what gives the university the role as an opinion leader.

College campuses now have more influence over student civic engagement. Some observers have gone so far as to argue that today's research universities will not survive unless they increase their connections to local communities and relate civic engagement, academic research, and teaching more closely to real-world issues (Lerner & Simon, 1998; Overton & Burkhardt, 1999). This push, however, is not just limited to the academic classroom. The call for more service-learning and community engagement has extended into the forensic realm. Hinck and Hinck (1998) assert:

[There is] the need to establish connections between service-learning and forensic programs to strengthen [the] education of students, meet department and university goals in innovative ways, and advance the image of the forensics program, department, and university within the community. (p. 1)

Several scholars have advocated for the use of and effectiveness of community service within forensics as a way to teach social responsibility and to connect our campuses to the greater community (Grace, 2010; Preston & Jensen, 1995; Robinson & Clemens, 2014). However, students may not be ready to engage in some issues and may not see the value in the discussion of them, which creates a disconnect between the new calls on colleges to actively participate and engage as members of a community and student interest. This paper, therefore, will attempt to address the lack of preparedness of our students to engage and argues that forensic educators ought to encourage students to become more involved as emotional citizens by embracing an intercultural praxis.

Literature Review

The social restructuring of American society has not only reshaped the norms of what it means to be a good citizen; it has had a direct impact on how individuals engage in politics. Increasingly, Americans have undergone a variety of changes over the last several decades such as a shift in living standards, occupational experiences, educational changes, generational changes, more women have entered the workplace, and changes within the realm of social diversity. Moreover, individuals are better educated, have access to more information, and tend to enjoy a higher standard of living compared to generations before them (Dalton, 2009). Although these new trends are not necessarily problematic, these trends are changing social and political norms and should not be ignored. As students attend college and engage in the social, political, and working world, they often find themselves in precarious times, meaning they are in an unsteady position while searching for a way to belong and engage in society.

Precarious Times

In today's society, people have access to a variety of media sources from which they can acquire political information (Lemke & Chala, 2016; Ponder & Haridakis, 2015; Storsul, 2014). For example, citizens can obtain information from various political vantage points through radio, television, blogs, newspapers, and social media (Eveland, 2004; Lemke & Chala, 2016; Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 2009; Ponder & Haridakis, 2015; Storsul, 2014). With this, many news organizations have joined the worldwide trend of using social media as the first line of delivering news. However, while there is more access to political information, research shows that young people are losing interest in politics, and trends such as lower voter turnout and less formal affiliations with political parties among young people points to a reluctance for today's students to become politically active (Dalton, 2009; Dahlgren, 2009; Milner, 2010; Storsul, 2014).

Standing (2011) argues that in part, this lack of political engagement can be attributed to the lack of stability and identity amongst