The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

The Forensic
of Pi Kappa Delta

Expanding the Speech and Debate Competitive Community: A Model for Student-Involved Genesis and Growth

C. THOMAS PRESTON, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH GEORGIA
ALLISON J. BAILEY, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH GEORGIA

Abstract: This paper assesses the founding and building of intercollegiate debate and speech programs without significant departmental or external funding at inception. Utilizing a case study method, this paper explores the creation and expansion of educational debate and speech opportunities at a southeastern United States university. By examining this case study, this paper discovers a growth narrative, fertilized by student demand, which approaches program development with shorter competitions before diversifying into larger competitions similar to the patterns of success enjoyed by the Urban Debate Leagues in starting new programs from scratch. This grassroots, student-led debate program development method applies not only to policy debating as with the urban debate leagues, but also to new intercollegiate programs. Such programs can range from those which specialize in one league or aspect of the speech and debate activities, to those who eventually take a more comprehensive approach as do many programs that join the nation's oldest comprehensive college speech and debate society, Pi Kappa Delta.

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way - in short, the period was so far like the present period. (Dickens, 1859).

In his period, Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* novel was set in a time of ferment and contradictions--a tumultuous world leading up to the French Revolution, as well as into the period that followed it. Sometimes, his writings seem a metaphor for the world of discussing what is good and wrong with various forms of speech and debate competitions. On the one hand, it is the best of times—opportunities abound to compete in whichever speech event or style of debate which certain schools of thought view as the ideal form. On the other, it is the worst of times—this variety has longer days and longer tournaments in order to accommodate so many events. The sheer number

C. THOMAS PRESTON (Ph.D., University of Nebraska-Lincoln) is Professor of Communication at the University of North Georgia (Dahlonega, GA). ALLISON J. BAILEY (Ed.D., Argosy University) is Associate Professor of Education and Communication at the University of North Georgia (Dahlonega, GA). Please refer all questions and comments to the first author at tom.preston@ung.edu.

of debate events – and sponsoring organization – can lengthen the tournaments of those who try to accommodate everybody, and can be overwhelming to both student and faculty newcomers to our activity.

For example, when tournaments began to be the key feature of the Pi Kappa Delta conventions in the 1920s, one fixed topic short double elimination debate format was used, as well as two individual events (oratory and "extempore" speaking) (Norton, 1982, p. 22). Hence, what has grown since then into a comprehensive tournament offering 7 debate and 14 individual events started off small and with few rounds. So in today's best of times-worst of times scenario, Pi Kappa Delta—in order to be comprehensive by today's conception—offers debate of the sort sponsored by several organizations which were established to appeal to various tastes as to what constitutes the most education format of debate over the years: American Forensic Association National Debate Tournament (which sponsors fixed, topic, policy debating) Cross Examination Debate Association (now same topic as AFA-NDT); International Public Debate Association (IPDA) debate; National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) debate; College Public Forum (CPF) debate, United States University (Worlds Format, or British Parliamentary) debate, the National Forensics Association's policy, fixed topic Lincoln-Douglas, or one on one debate, and student congress.

Individual events has also evolved, from only two events in Pi Kappa Delta's early years—designed by Pi Kappa Delta—into a wide variety of events including those offered by the two traditional organizations for speaking events—the National Forensic Association and American Forensic Association—with likely pressures to add the new events offered at the Public Communication Debate and Speech Association Nationals in 2014 (AFA, 2015; NFA, 2015; PCDSA, 2015).

These choices present many opportunities for those whether the ultimate goal of a program constitutes only local competition—or working toward competing either at Pi Kappa Delta's comprehensive national tournaments or one of the many specialty national tournaments within the world of intercollegiate speech and debate competition. On the one hand, Pi Kappa Delta seems to be doing well, with 79 chapters, 513 debate entries including world's, and 1,608 individual events entries including Reader's Theatre, at the 2015 National Convention and Tournament at Athens (Forensicstournament.net, 2015). Although an option for many students, not all colleges and universities sponsor speech and debate programs of any kind. For example, of the 32 institutions listed in the state university system for this study, only 7 offered any form of debate and speech competition (USG, 2015). None of the technical colleges in this same state fielded teams (TCSG, 2015). Furthermore, of the traditional, private institutions, only 7 of 35 schools offer debate and speech competition to their students. The best of times would be that of these 14 schools, the 4 NDT/CEDA programs have remained stable over the past decade, with intermittent participation from two others. And *somewhat* best is

that individual speech events continue; however remaining small in student participation numbers and largely dominated by one program. During the last decade, NPDA debate has surged from one to nine schools participating; IPDA debate in only the past three years has increased from zero to eight. Several tournaments in this state have proven successful in hosting IPDA. CPF debate has also been successful with two schools earning Rupe Grant awards at Pi Kappa Delta during the past two nationals first for participating, and subsequently finishing in the top ten. Participation in World Debate format has recently begun with one school dominating with several Pi Kappa Delta titles in the field of World Debate; in addition, that one school is hosting the United States Universities World Debate Format National tournament in 2016.

With 14 of 88 colleges and universities (excluding on-line institutions such as Kaplan, Phoenix, or Capella; or national institutions such as Devry or Strayer) within this single Southeastern state competing in speech and debate the successes are to be celebrated, such a small percentage may seem to constitute the worst of times—at the very least, growth is still possible. Growth in new programs as well as the number of programs—with six started over the past decade—would be justified by the myriad benefits of all areas of the competitive speech and debate endeavor:

Benefits in Three Types of Debate and Speech Activities

In *Fixed Topic Debating (as in NDT/CEDA, NFA-LD, and Public Forum)*, a chorus of articles—some based on the development of the urban debate league—established critical thinking skills, improved grades, improved debating ability, and increased willingness to argue as benefits of policy debating. For methods as well as studies proving these and other benefits, see Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt & Louden, 1999; Allen, Berkowitz, & Louden, 1995; Anderson, Schultz, & Courtney, 1987; Barfield, 1989; Breger, 1998; Bellon, 2000; Colbert, 1993, 1994; Crenshaw, 1998; Infante & Gordon, 1989; Infante & Rancer, 1982; McCroskey, 1962; Myers, 1998; Preston, 2004; Rancer, Kosberg & Baukus, 1992; Roberto & Finucane, 1997; Sanders, Wiseman & Gass, 1994; Semlak & Shields, 1997; Shields & Preston, 2007; Wade, 1998; and Ziegelmueller, 1998.

Variable topic debating includes the APDA, NPDA, IPDA, and Worlds formats. As APDA (2013) and Johnson (1999) note, these formats suggest three major educational benefits that overlap those in fixed topic debating: 1) improved communication skills which make these formats more accessible to general audience; 2) increased breadth of knowledge across various academic disciplines that a student muse address after a short period of preparation, 3) increased spontaneous thinking skills and 4) increased usage of rational discourse (Kuster, 2003). As some of these formats have evolved, their benefits begin to mimic more the benefits of mixed policy debate. Each form is fluent—and NPDA style varies from region to region.

Individual speaking events help students develop skills that are well recognized by the community: the limited preparation events (extemporaneous, impromptu speaking, and editorial impromptu speaking) help with organization and spontaneous speaking skills; original prepared events (personal narrative, after dinner speaking, informative speaking, persuasive speaking, and rhetorical criticism) allow polish in presentation in each form; and the interpretive/performance events (drama, prose, poetry, duo, slam poetry, mixed and mixed genre) stress presentational skills. The NFA, the AFA, and more recently the PSDA offer various among these events, as local tournaments follow suit. The Hunt (1997) bibliography contains many sources on the benefits of speech events; even Planet Debate (2012) continues to make this case.

All of these events—especially when coupled with debate in comprehensive programs—present quite a smorgasbord for students to hone the skills desired by diverse students. At the same time, the size of the banquet may discourage some from starting programs. But there is hope. Literature has suggested that starting small with just one event has leads either to beneficial programs that concentrate on just one event, as was the case in the inception of the high school urban debate leagues (Breger, 1998; Crenshaw, 1998; Wade, 1990; & Ziegelmueller, 1998). Since the inceptions, thousands of students have benefitted from an activity that had, by the 1980s, disappeared from most inner city high school curricula. Some of these hundreds of programs have remained local; others have produced students competitive at the high school level and some of who have gone on to win national titles. Some have even branched out to offer speech events. The present study explores if a similar, focused approach can also apply to colleges and universities in starting programs with to start any speech or debate competitive program. But given the choices noted above, the person—student or faculty—interested in starting a program has to ask the questions: *Where do I start? And if I do get started, where do I go from there?*

Research Method and Questions

Given the need to make more of these times the best for a broader scope of students, this paper uses a case study approach to illustrate a student-lead, advisor-guided approach toward the development of competitive speech and debate programs at colleges and universities where programs do not currently exist. This study utilizes a case study approach as outlined by Isaac and Michael (1997) in order to address concerns over student-led programs as viable and to describe a model of program development that can be replicated and providing an "in-depth analysis of a given social unit (a debate and speech program) resulting in a complete well-organized picture of that unit" (p. 15). In order to provide this analysis, the investigators chose a debate and speech program which was founded by students and which remains—with limited advisor guidance—as student run. According to Isaac and Michael (1997), the findings of this case study may "pioneer new

ground' in the understanding of how debate programs grow and expand over time providing "fruitful hypotheses for further study". The case study chosen was chosen not only because of a detailed amount of data collected over the years, but also because of the potential for others to replicate some of the unique steps in developing the program as well as some of the traditional methods used. Having chosen this extended case study within its context (which is not uncommon), we sought to address the following research questions in order to gain new ground in the understanding in how to start programs on the *college* level:

RQ 1: From what source did this program originate?
RQ 2: What was the context and how has the context changed, especially with respect to how the new program was able to shape as well as adapt to its environment?
RQ 3: What are the statistics in participation, and why did students choose to join?
RQ 4: What curricular resource became available?
RQ 5: How did financial resources develop necessary to sustain a program?

After these five questions are addressed, recommendations for lessons learned emerge: 1) What stages can a brand new program expect to take place as it develops and 2) What are the limitations and remaining steps? In addressing both the original research and the emergent questions, we gathered statements from students and tracked the numbers of students involved in each of the activities, address how they became involved, and quantified the successes and shortcomings though a triangulation of statistical and qualitative data. These data were collected over a period beginning with the establishment of this program as a club during the 2006-2007 school year through the year 2014-2015.

Extended Case Study

The case study involves an innovative, student-centered approach toward both starting and building new speech and debate programs. Before delving into the case study, it is necessary to note what this study is *not*. Although some of the student-run elements may be instructive, this case study does not involve the sustainment of an existing speech and debate program through hiring a new Director of Forensics where resources already exist. As well, it does not involve the very rare example of a college or university seeking out a Director of Forensics and coaching staff—complete with travel and full scholarship resources—before any students have been recruited. Rather, the study involves how a program can get started at an institution where a program did not exist before (even if there was some sort of program that was discontinued in the distant past). This case study, as implied earlier, involves a longitudinal student over the first 9 years of a new competitive speech and debate program located in the southeastern United States.

Research Question 1: Genesis. The idea to have a debate and speech program at this institution was begun by a student attending the 2005 National Communication Association Convention in Boston to work registration on behalf of the institution's honorary communication society. At this meeting, a student asked over dinner, "I hear of many debate and speech programs at other schools. Why doesn't our school offer one?" After a pause, one of the faculty members at the dinner stated, "Because you haven't formed a recognized student organization. If you do, I would be your advisor." After a year and a half of exploring tournaments and observing various events on the students' own resources, the club was recognized on January 26, 2007. From an original, founding group of five students who hosted an audience debate and attended the state and NFA Speech nationals, the club—now a full-fledged comprehensive program--grew to 80 students competing in debate either on an intramural or intercollegiate basis in 2014-2015; of those, 44 participated in intercollegiate debate with 36 of the 44 winning awards. The team attended the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament in Athens, Ohio where it garnered the excellent sweepstakes in debate by finishing 10th among the 61 schools participating in debate events. This team won the award based on participation in four types of debate: International Public Debate Association, Parliamentary, Pubic Forum, and Congressional. Additionally, the team won an overall excellent award based on participation in both debate and speech events, returning to speech after a three-year hiatus. Hence, the genesis of the program was of the sort capable of resulting in wider intercollegiate competition within the new program.

Research Question 2: Contexts and Development. Students who explored options for competition immediately gravitated toward on-campus and shorter tournaments in order to make the activity capable of attracting students who, like themselves, had never done speech and debate contests before, and who had limited time availability due to work or family commitments. Part of the context during the first year was the existence of shorter, speech tournaments locally. And, as the students asked for more events and gained more financial support every at every additional step they requested (outlined under Research Question 5), the team was able to host its first intercollegiate tournament in January of 2009. At the same tournament, the program collaborated with two other new parliamentary debate tournaments to create the state's first championship tournament in parliamentary debate later in February. At that time, there was only one school in the state which had an established program in parliamentary debate. Hence, not only did the context provide existing one-day tournaments to support, but the program shaped the context by offering intramural and short intercollegiate events, and co-founded a state parliamentary debate league that would offer a budget friendly option that novice students could enjoy. By this time, the program had NFA qualifiers as well as students prepared to attend other national tournaments. Spurred by this success, the institution

provided some funding and debate students began to have successful fundraiser. The local context had plenty of NDT/CEDA competitions, with the local debate teams in the area already having a very long track record of success that included a very long list of NDT and CEDA qualifications, several of which led to national championships. In fact, aside from the four strong programs in fixed topic policy debate at the time, only one other school in the state did parliamentary debate at the inception of the program for this study. But by the 2009-2010 year, a permanent parliamentary debate lead had become well established in the state, with the program of this study being one of the founding members. Two years later, this parliamentary debate league had eight schools, and that number continues to grow as new programs become planted. With NDT/CEDA, however, having only three day tournaments, the student comment, "I cannot get off of work long enough to be away for four days for a three day tournament" was common. The one-day trips to local parliamentary debate tournaments and one-day events tournaments—plus the program's ability to bring in quality teams through hosting a tournament—however, made early growth more possible in those areas. "I was always happy to usually have my Sundays off" was a common comment in a part of the nation where a vast majority of students practiced religious observances on Sunday.

The financial growth in funding for this program, as well as increased fundraising by students, cannot be ignored as part of the environment. The discussion of the finances is addressed below under Research Question 5; but a context that has involved students taking responsibility for formulating their own budgets—and a student involvement office responsive to student success in the club. Since the funds do not come from the department for the program, this case illustrates how a program can thrive financially without depending on whether an administration "cuts" a program.

Finally, the availability of types of events constitutes a major element of context that will reflect growth or decline in certain areas. For example, lack of area demand resulted in a discontinuation of the individual events portion of the program's hosted tournament, and the decline of individual events in the area explain partly the decline in participation. A student initiative to gain an overall sweepstakes award however, which was attained at the 2015 Pi Kappa Delta national tournament, resulted in each student re-entering two individual events. More joined at the state tournament, gaining second place sweepstakes. IPDA became a large hit among programs in the area three years ago, and now, World's Debate format tournaments are becoming both locally available and affordable. These contexts—plus students learning of these opportunities—has spurred student selection of these activities in this student-run program with an activist faculty advisor. Research question 3 addresses why students choose debate and speech.

Research Question 3: Why did Students Join Debate and Speech? Several

factors, which appeared in a sequence, spurred student interest in debate and speech. First, students finding out about other debate and speech programs at the 2005 NCA noted that "I think I can do that," "It sounds like fun," and "These skills can be useful in my career" were common. Some mentioned that they liked to compete, and among those, several mentioned an academic competition team to bring pride to the school. As time went by, those who wished to improve polish in performance opted toward the speech contests; those who were interested in winning arguments and learning how to influence affairs gravitated toward debate. Early on, many students chose both; for example, of the 16 students attending the one-day state speech tournament in 2009, 14 also attended the new one-day state parliamentary debate championship two days later. When looking at the history, the foundation of this program began with the availability of short, one-day tournaments — starting with the state speech tournament, and then with the state debate tournament and local short tournaments such as those in a short tournament debate circuit in an adjacent state, designed for growing novice debate tournaments. As students got a taste of the activity, some dropped out after just the one-day tournaments—but a much greater number either continued to attend one day tournaments which were more friendly for students with work and family commitments—or began to ask to travel a circuit that included not only national, but also longer and intersectional—three day events. In sum, both intramural tournaments and one-day tournaments were the key to sparking interest—when first presented with three-day events for starters, students unfamiliar with debate initially could not see the time in their schedules.

Students have asked to participate in debate based on their personal preferences to debate topics that are exciting, relevant, and of interest to them. In the case of this study, students who have been interested in public debates have later joined debate since the audience debate attracted interest. Also, in 2012, this program gained external support for a Spanish Speaking debate tournament. In this tournament, debate club officers worked with officers of the Latino Student Association to formulate a topic and public forum format that would attract debaters to the first tournament. The DREAM Act was chosen, and the Spanish Speaking tournament started with 17 competitors in its first year. Although the grant program that funded the program the first year expired, the students tapped into resources in the surrounding Latino community to support the tournament—and both LSA and the debate club contributed dollars from their SGA allocations to hold it. The students took over all aspects of scheduling, judge training, and assigning judges to the tournament. By the third tournament in 2014, the number of participants grew to 34, with the early participants taking over all aspects of format, judge training, and administration—the advisor only did the tabulations the last date of the tournament.

There were two unintended, but valuable, consequences and lessons learned from this initially small intramural tournament that

developed into a five round tournament that broke to octa-finals with a guest speaker from the Latino community. First, that which started as a Spanish speaking tournament turned into an outreach to primarily to Latino students, who subsequently competed at intercollegiate tournaments. Second, the students with debate experience and competitive success who could speak Spanish took over this part of the program quickly after it became apparent that the grant program would not continue, working with other university resources to make Spanish speaking debate sustainable. Third, the Spanish Speaking Debate tournament's choice of topics being by and from the Latino community has led to significant political engagement by members who started with the Spanish Speaking Debate in engagement that has brought to the forefront discriminatory voting practices in the community (Stewart, 2015; and Parisi, 2015). The Parisi report from Univision details how four students in the program lead a campaign against an at-large voting system. Such systems, arguable, dilute representation among groups such as the Latino population. As well, some of the civic engagement among alumni and members of this program have resulted in an environmental cleanup in a nearby Latino neighborhood (Silavent, 2015). Finally, the Spanish Speaking intramural program has prompted students to seek out international competitions in both English and Spanish. In other words, this program—which was student driven and now is run by students empowered to form their own partnerships, on their own terms with resources from the grass roots—is almost solely responsible from the program in this study to compete in international World's debate competitions. This opportunity—though not guaranteed to all members for financial reasons—continues to attract more students into the debate and speech activity, as well as all of the other reasons noted above.

As well, those in the study noted that they enjoyed not only the travel involved but also meeting students with myriad economic, social, and political backgrounds. As James Roland (2015) of the Atlanta Urban Debate League noted, the debate activity enables students and community members to talk to each other when otherwise some would never get a chance to meet. Additionally, some of the students are attracted to the idea of competition—particularly if they excel in the introductory, intramural tournament.

Finally, as in any other endeavor, students are attracted by both financial and academic incentives. One key aspect added to the start-up Spanish Speaking Debate was stipends given to students to enroll in the practicum, and to earn additional stipends to accompany speaker awards and elimination round participation at the tournament. This idea was contributed by the Minority Student Affairs office chair for Latino Outreach. Many became interested in debating even though the program studied here continues to be a walk-on program. A full debate curriculum was developed to attract students into a debate curriculum associated with a new four-year communication degree.

With all of these factors in mind, the following charts summarize participation in *intercollegiate* debate over the years. Most notably, Latino participation spiked upwards after the Spanish Speaking program was established; and for one year, the debate program sponsored a mediation tournament sequence that separated off into another club in 2011. As the program grew, participation by students of both genders balanced into somewhat equal numbers. The Black Student Association stressing informal debates in its meetings from 2007-2010 helps to explain the larger African American participation in the earlier years of the program—and although those numbers have not maintained in the competitive team, they do represent the ethnic makeup of the population of northeast Georgia. All in all, students like to debate and perform speeches regarding subjects of interest—and the discovery of that, to a large extent—in addition to starting small and letting students make up their own decisions as to when to go to another level—or language—has driven the following program growth, based on the longitudinal study:

Table 1: Patterns of Intercollegiate Competition over the Years

Debate and Speech Participation

YEAR	Classroom Debate	On campus speech/ debate event	On campus speech/ Debate tournament	One day off campus tournament	Two day off campus tournament	Three + day off campus tournament
2006-2007	0	1	0	1	0	1
2007-2008	0	4	0	1	2	0
2008-2009	0	4	1	2	2	1
2009-2010	0	4	1	3	2	1
2010-2011	0	4	1	3	2	6*
2011-2012	1	4	1	2	2	1
2012-2013	1	4	3	2	3	1
2013-2014	1	4	3	1	3	3
2014-2015	1	2	3	0	4	4

*Skewed due to token Policy Debate Participation by 1 team, as well as two mediation tournaments while mediation was still part of the debate club.

Chart for Demographics for Intercollegiate Participation

YEAR	Male	Female	Caucasian	African American	Latino/a	Asian	Other	Total
2006-2007	5	0	3	0	1	0	1	5
2007-2008	10	3	8	2	3	0	0	13
2008-2009	15	8	8	7	4	4	0	23
2009-2010	18	12	16	6	7	1	0	30
2010-2011	11	19	17	5	5	3	0	30
2011-2012	19	14	22	1	7	3	0	33
2012-2013	18	10	16	2	8	2	0	28
2013-2014	27	16	22	2	17	1	1	43
2014-2015	23	21	22	4	17	0	1	44

Chart of Participation for Type of Intercollegiate Debate and/or Speech Competitions

YEAR	Individual Speech Event Students	Mediation	NPDA	IPDA	Public Forum	Worlds	Fixed Topic Policy	Total**
2006-2007	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
2007-2008	11	0	4	0	0	0	0	13
2008-2009	17	0	16	0	0	0	0	23
2009-2010	20	0	24	0	0	0	0	30
2010-2011	14	12	16	3	0	0	3	30
2011-2012	12	0	24	0	0	0	0	33
2012-2013	0	0	24	3	8	0	0	28
2013-2014	1	0	38	11	8	0	0	43
2014-2015	20	0	35	17	6	6	1	44

**Total is different than columns since some students participated in more than one or more debate and/or speech event.

Research Question 4: Curricula. Once student participation gained enough prominence to show demand for a debate and speech curriculum, the curriculum was developed in two stages—first, a one hour, lower level practicum, added in 2009-2010, offers students one academic credit that could be repeated for three additional semesters. In a second stage, three other courses were added as part of a four year communication and leadership degree concentration first implemented in 2013-2014: one, an advanced one hour practicum for the last four semesters in debate and speech, with some emphasis on coaching; second, a full, three-hour required debate course where students perform debates in two different formats for a semester, and in which an intramural tournament is embedded, with extra credit available for Urban Debate League volunteer judging and similar service learning opportunities; and a final course in the sequence designed as a seminar on how complex debate skills are transferable into the judicial, political, business, and even interpersonal worlds. The last course has made for fascinating conversation for seminars, addressing the "I did forensics—what can I now do with it?" question. Not only the practical experience from debating itself, but also the sequence from the last traditional class in the classroom sequence, have helped students to understand how debate skills are transferable to other endeavors, including civic engagement.

Most public colleges and universities require assessment of core and degree program courses; and this program as part of the state system does assess learning outcomes in courses tied to degree pro-

grams (Section 2.9, USG Board of Regents Policy Manual). Levels of participation and a sampling of ballots from judges could be used to assess the practicum; and Bloom's Taxonomy could be used to assess each course, whether assessment is required or not. Student reviews, ballots, and the assessment tools collected after on-campus activities provided researchers in this case study to assess its success. Within this debate curriculum, the first class in the classroom sequence is a requirement for the organizational leadership track of a communication degree. Consistent with the analysis of Partlow-Lefevre (2012) in assessing debate programs, below is where the required course fits on the department's learning outcomes charts with some of the other required courses in the major:

Table 2. Learning Outcomes

Specific Learning Outcomes	COMM 3050 Intercultural Comm	COMM 3100 Advanced Public Comm	COMM 3200 Conflict Resolution	COMM 3250 Argumentation & Debate	COMM 3510 Small Group Comm
1. Graduates will demonstrate advanced proficiency with oral and written communication on academic or creative work submitted for course requirements.	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓
2. Graduates will demonstrate understanding of and advanced proficiency with the technologies integral to their area of study.					
3. Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of the theories and research methodologies that define the organizational communication discipline.			▓	▓	▓
4. Graduates will demonstrate the ability to apply effective leadership skills in interpersonal and group communication contexts.		▓	▓	▓	▓

Research Question 5: Financial Resources. One of the elements of this program that makes it unique is that funding has both been developed and maintained by the students. Each year, students develop budgets that are submitted for approval with the Office of Student Involvement with a budget committee of the Student Government Association. The budget has grown from the first year steadily from $100.00 in 2006-2007 to $15,100.00 for 2015-2016. Additionally, students have been able to have fundraisers that have garnered from $5,000.00 to $10.000 per year over the past five years. Additionally, the advisor can obtain grants, and recently, a fund was set up within the foundation to provide both an endowment and an account for individual projects for students involved in debate classes. Clearly, it is a hard sell to ask for internal resources to fund, say, a travel budget

of over $100,000.00, and a matching scholarship budget. Such requests are overwhelming for all parties involved. And long, three-day tournaments, if those were the only offering, would have left debate and speech competition unsuccessful at this institution, even on the most local level, due to a small $100 start-up budget provided to new school clubs. But the willingness to start off small and to let the students guide directions and growth as they see fit have allowed a PKD-national competitive program to grow during the first decade. Importantly—even if student government funding never grew—students would be able to do intramural debates as well as local and regional tournaments based on fundraising since the short tournament opportunities either were created by local programs—or developed within the program as was the case in our example. As stated earlier, the benefits of debate and speech competitions even from local, small budget and intramural tournaments offers established transferable benefits.

Suggestions from Answers to the Research Questions

Stages of development in student-demand driven programs that can be replicated. The case study suggests several stages that can be useful in developing new competitive speech and debate programs. How far a program can get depends to some degree on resources available. As well, changes may occur that require a program to go back to a previous stage. And even if a program advances no further than the third stage of development, it has still provided students invaluable experience in competition, leadership, and the development of transferable skills noted previously from debate and speech competition. From what we have observed both in the case study and elsewhere, the stages of building programs from the bottom up include:

Stage 1: The opening "dog and pony" show to colleagues at a school where there is no programs, or encouraging new programs to develop at nearby schools. These demonstrations, which are designed to attract attention, would be similar to those given to start up programs in the urban debate leagues during the 1980s and 1990s. The idea for having a program could at this stage come from a faculty or student member—but these presentations need to be made by somebody versed in at least some aspect of intercollegiate debate and speech. These shows can stress any event or type of debate or speech. They should explain the rules, give a demonstration tape of live demonstration, and stress the benefits of these activities as learning while being fun at the same time. If these succeed in attracting attention, then have training sessions and work closely with new coaches if attempting to plant a new program at a school that does not have a program yet.

Stage 2: Assessing and addressing student demand—or paying attention to student demand. Attend activities where students will hear about debate and speech programs. This can be taking field trips for students to observe various formats of debate and speech, to having student groups attend state, regional, and national communication conven-

tions where debate and speech are discussed. Once students gain some exposure, the next step will be to help any student who asks to form a debate or forensics club so that the club is listed among recognized student organizations. At that point, the program is ready to begin in a way that will initially empower the students to manage their own budget from an early date.

Stage 3: The first intercollegiate competitions. Once the students are ready and have observed, students then select from the local tournaments that the program can afford, depending on the size of the budget. Starting off with a pod of new programs may work even better as the idea is to spur confidence. Doing so will require either creating or attending events that do not cost a hotel expenses, unless at first students are willing to raise money for travel expenses. Again, going from no experience/no program to having a full program can seem overwhelming when we merely list the activities offered. Even if the program remains strictly local, students will be gaining the benefits of competition noted earlier.

Stage 4: Expanding beyond the local circuit. If the students enjoy and wish to go further than local tournaments, expand the program in any direction where there is student demand, considering resources that can be acquired. This can range from evolving into a comprehensive program with the ultimate goal of competing at the National Comprehensive Tournament and/or Pi Kappa Delta Biennial Convention and tournament, to following a schedule that leads to goals related to a specialty in one activity. In turn, this one activity can range from the goal of qualifying for Interstate Oratory in speech, to entering a district circuit of NDT the with goal of qualifying for the national two-person fixed-topic, policy debate program—with CEDA as a second title if the program develops that far. There are successful models where students choose just one of the national associations noted above. If the program gets as far as Stage 4, usually there are more students involved—and hence, more justification for both internal and external fundraising to support the program. Realistically, fundraising needs to start more from the bottom up if students are to be invested in the program.

Stage 5: Developing a curriculum to support the program. Once student demand has been demonstrated to establish a club in this student-driven model, and resources become available to do a sufficient number of competitions, curriculum development in debate and speech becomes a key ingredient toward sustainability—even though participation generated out of courses adds a faculty-determined element to what starts to look like a building-level program. The course development can have two stages. One, develop a practicum sequence so that students receive credit each semester, whether it be in the sample model with lower and upper level practicum, or whether it be more rigorous to justify two hours per semester involved. In speech, it becomes helpful to develop a public speaking course with assignments and extra credit mimicking the AFA or NFA guidelines for the

events (the personal narrative event, for example, provides an ideal, confidence-building first assignment), as well as an advanced level course that perhaps teaches other events, such as after dinner speaking, rhetorical criticism, and interpretive events. This sequence could help and maintain attract speech students. In debate, have a two-class sequence which could be expanded—the first course would be strictly a performance class that introduces students to at least two formats of debating; a second course would be to take skills learned from debating, and apply those skills to how argumentation works in business, in the legislature, in the judicial, and perhaps even in interpersonal communication. This academic emphasis not only helps to sustain program membership, but allows the advisor to add a key pedagogical dimension to the program without taking away from the students' ability to make key decisions on the direction the team will take from day to day. Most of these suggestions work best when the advisor is in the field of communication—but curricula can also be developed in departments of philosophy, political science, or English to support a debate program, if the advisor is in that area.

Stage 6: Developing a variety of funding sources both for the general operation of the team as well as targeted groups. In our extended example, several funding sources have been identified—not all will work based on the regulations of other places, but the key to success is having a program not dependent on a single academic department or just on student involvement (SGA) funding or just from fundraising or a single outside source. A combination of funding support is the next step toward building a program capable of competing on some sort of regional or national circuit on a year-to-year basis. Also, it is essential to tie both internal and external fundraising to the mission of the university. For example, one of the missions of the institution studied here—which contains the military college within the state system—is international engagement, and a stress on teaching strategic languages. A key to building interdisciplinary and community ties to sustain the program has been the Spanish Speaking Debate Tournament— which as noted earlier, led to international competition. As well, to justify on-campus funding and support from student involvement offices, at this stage of development or in later stages, that the program not abandon on-campus intramural opportunities, even as the travel schedule becomes more complex. As funding comes from a variety of sources, so the ability of one funding source to "kill" a program diminishes. In our case, only the students can decide to end the program.

Stage 7: Scholarships funding and selecting students for scholarships. Thus far, the model we have outlined is a pedagogical and student-centered model—the program studied, out of many students during the first nine years, has only traveled one student who was recruited from high schools. And this program last year won 112 awards, with 36 of 44 who competed winning awards. Whether measured by winning or participation statistics, many viable walk-on programs have

achieved some success. After some development, some sort of system of both gaining and distributing scholarships should be established. In the sample studied, the program has reached is only beginning to enter this seventh stage. Once larger scholarships can be established, key questions emerge: First, who decides who gets the scholarship? Should it be many small scholarships or some bigger ones? How should scholarships be used—to attract students who have proven themselves in the college program in which they are competing—or to attract the "best and brightest" from local or even national high school speech and debate circuits? What restrictions are there for student-raised funds being raised for scholarship? And, if faculty distribute the scholarships, how does the affect the student-run pedagogical nature of the program in this model, being sustained as a student run organization? Will students be able to allocate these funds as well as they do travel funds, or will this be a potential source of dissention, or splintering on the team? We do not have the answers to these questions yet—but they will guide future deliberations as such resources are discovered.

Stage 8: Having or hiring a permanent Director of Forensics. If the person developing the new program does not have an official title "Director of Forensics," once the faculty advisor who has created this student-run model of debate program decides to step down or retires, a replacement is needed for institutional sustainability. Hiring a Director of Forensics is essential to maintain any program that has developed beyond Stage 4. Because the program of this case study did not experience a loss of faculty advisor, the real impact is unknown. The assumption could be, however, that without an experienced debate coach, how can the debate program continue? More than likely, the program could fade away over time. Once a steady stream of funds as mentioned in Stage 6 has been established and combined with institutional support to provide payroll dollars and benefits, then attracting a permanent Director of Forensics whose courses are within the Debate and Speech curriculum outlined in Stage 5 can take place. For a program to be sustainable over the long run, a faculty member with excellent experience and a track record related to the goals of the institution would likely prove a necessary ingredient in such sustainability, particularly if a debate and speech curriculum has been established.

In proposing these eight steps, several summary observations become necessary. First, the progression through the stages above demonstrates that a program does not need to achieve all eight stages in order to substantially serve its students. The program being studied in this case is between Stages 6 and 7 after nine years, but is likely to move forward soon. The development of resources in the focal program did follow student demand; and currently, it is in the process of developing Stage 7. Second, the eight-stage model as learned from this case study does not prescribe a time limit for how quickly these stages will develop from institution to institution. Progression through the stages, not time spent in a single stage, is important to building a

sustainable debate program. Third, this model applies to a student-originated program and demonstrates how far a program can go with student-initiation. This model flips the traditional start-up of debate teams where the upper administration decides to hire a Director of Forensics to start a program housed in any department or even in student involvement, and furnishes the program with sufficient scholarship, personnel, and travel resources at inception. That has never happened in the state where the program in this study existed, however—and although it could happen elsewhere, it rarely does. Thus, the model we would suggest here would apply to programs started, or at least inspired, by students and those whose position did not initially involve debate and speech coaching—thereby making this model more achievable by more colleges and universities with limited financial resources.

Suggestions for future research and conclusions. As implied by this case study within the context of successful models for growth of debate programs—particularly within Pi Kappa Delta as well as in general—the limitations suggest areas where questions can be answered through future research. How can programs develop and be sustained when they exist outside of the communication department? For example, students formed a successful parliamentary and policy debate program in the state of the current study which even had a team qualify for a post-districts bid to the NDT—but lacking an active faculty advisor, was not able to gain the necessary financial resources to attend the NDT, or any other national tournament. Second, at the other end of the spectrum, suppose an administrator at some level arranges for a budget sufficient for national circuit travel, office space, scholarships, and graduate assistants? The situation in that instance would be different from a program built from the grass roots as in this eight-stage model. Third, how does a program rooted in student ownership and decision making sustain that level of control even as the course and scholarship dimensions of the program become more prominent—or even if a program enters Stage 8 and creates a Director of Forensics position capable of hiring the very best director? And when hired, how does a Director of Forensics accustomed to a more directive coaching mindset handle the interpersonal conflicts that might arise from students accustomed to being the decision-makers share or to a certain extent give up the reigns? And, what are measurable outcomes where debate benefits students after graduation as a means of assessing the club and program as well as concrete benefits? To what extent should the advisor and later director be directive of where the students go? Reflecting various media studies theories, does the director take a hypodermic needle approach (determining tournaments and events chosen, as well as cases run or social justice projects a program should have), an agenda setting approach (deciding which events to talk to students about while the students decide based on that information), or a uses and gratifications approach where the advisor, after an introductory period that does not overwhelm students and "scare them away," give the club leaders access to COFO

and all of the websites of all of the forensics organizations, and let the students match their interests to a particular circuit.

Overall, forensics and debate has flourished in our state compared to two decades ago. The policy debate programs have remained nationally prominent with no signs of diminishing; a parliamentary state tournament has developed over the past seven years which now breaks regularly to octa-finals rounds and has produced regional and national champions in both several formats of parliamentary debate; and the state individual events tournament has not diminished in size although it revolves mainly around one program. National organizations remain stable or strong. Yet, there is room for improvement—in an ideal world, it seems, monies would be identified to allow for Directors of Forensics and staff to be hired with competitive salaries, scholarship funds provided for a number of students, and sufficient funds be provided for a full travel schedule. Such rarely, if ever, however, occurs. A much more likely scenario exists that starting off small and focused would seem to be a more viable growth if college speech and debate growth takes place as in the high school urban debate league movement. Our model, which can go to eight levels, provides a unique opportunity for growth in a state where among the 74 of 88 schools still not offering any debate or speech activity, the beginnings of programs can take place within this particular context. In this fashion, the scenario and opportunities provided in our valuable activities can argue the best of times more, and the worst of times less, to those enrolled in college both here and elsewhere when it comes to the speech and debate activity. The keys to growing the activity include starting small and being student demand driven with a novice friendly context as a start. Even if the new program does not immediately achieve all eight stages, students with no previous high school experience in debate can walk in and gain greatly even if a program only remains at an early stage and remains local. And when that happens, a student discovers the best of times.

REFERENCES

About CEDA (2014). Cross-Examination Debate Association. Retrieved on May 23, 2014, f From http://www.cedadebate.org/about.

Allen, M., Berkowitz, S., Hunt, S., & Louden, A. (1999). A meta-analysis of the impact of forensics and communication education on critical thinking. *Communication Education, 48*, 18-30.

Allen, M., Berkowitz, S., & Louden, A (1995). A study comparing the impact of communication classes and competitive forensic experience on critical thinking improvement. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, pp., 1-8.

American Forensic Association Website (AFA, 2015). National Individual Events Tournament. Retrieved on August 5, 2015 from http://www.americanforensics.org/catalog/national-individual-events-tournament.

American Parliamentary Debate Association (2015). Retrieved on August 5, 2015 from http://apdaweb.org/about.

Anderson, J., Schuler, D. & Courtney, C. (1987). Training in argumentativeness: New Hope for nonassertive women. *Women's Studies in Communication, 20*, 58-66.

Associated Leaders of Urban Debate (2012). Retrieved on November 12, 2012 from http://www.debateleaders.org/root/flash.shtml.

Bailey, L. (2003). The benefits of debate. Retrieved on November 12, 2012 from http://www.home-school.com/Articles/the-benefits-of-debate.php.

Barfield, K. D. (1989). A study of the relationship between active participation in I\ interscholastic debating and the development of critical thinking skills with implications for school administrators and instructional leaders. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50-09A*: 2714.

Barkley Forum (2014). The Barkley Forum. Retrieved on May 24, 2014 from http://www.emory.edu/BF/.

Breger, B. (1998). Building open societies though debate. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 19*, 66-68.

Colbert, K. (1993). The effects of debate participation on argumentativeness and verbal aggression. *Communication Education, 42*, 206-214.

Colbert, K. (1994). Replicating the effects of debate participation on argumentativeness and Verbal aggression. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 79*, 1-13.

Cram, T. (2012). Putting debate back into debate: Digital debate and evidence. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate, 33(1)*, 134-168.

Crenshaw, C. (1998). Sharing the gift of debate: Notes from the Tuscaloosa Debate League. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 19*, 80-84.

Dickens, C. (1859). *A Tale of Two Cities*. London, England: Chapman and Hall.

Forensics Tournament.net (2015). Pi Kappa Delta National Convention and Tournament Results Retrieved on August 3, 2015 from http://www.forensicstournament.net/PiKappaDeltaNationals/15.

Hunt. S. (1997). A Select Bibliography on Debate Theory. Retrieved on November 12, 2012 from http://debate.uvm.edu/debatebib.html.

Infante, D. A., & Gordon, W. I. (1989). Argumentativeness and affirming communication Style as predictors of satisfaction/dissatisfaction and subordination. *Communication Quarterly, 37*, 81-90.

Infante, D. A., & Rancor, A. S. (1982). Conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 46*, 117-125.

Parisi, Kiarina (2015). Parte 1 Lideres del Futuro. Retrieved on August 5, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uu-wLwCxhP0.

McCroskey, J. C. (1962). The effect of college speech training on academic marks. *Register of the America Forensic Association, 10*, 6-11.

Myers, S. A. (1998). Instructor socio-communicative style, argumentativeness, and verbal aggressiveness in the college classroom. *Communication Research Reports, 15*, 141-150.

National Debate Project (2012). Goals of the National Debate Project: Excellence through debate. Retrieved on November 12, 2012, from http://nationaldebateproject.org/.

Norton, L.E. (1982). The history of Pi Kappa Delta. Retrieved on August 5, 2015, from http://www.pikappadelta.com/docs/The_History_Of_Pi_Kappa_Delta.pdf

Open Society Foundations (2012). Global Debate Initiatives. Retrieved on November 12, 2012 from http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/grants/global-debates.

Parson. D.

Partlow-Lefevre, S.T. (2012). Arguing for debate: Missions, goals and evidence as key components in assessing intercollegiate debate programs. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate, 33(1)*, 31-74.

Planet Debate (2012). Unique advantages of speech and debate activities. Retrieved on November 12, 2012 from http://www.planetdebate.com/blogs/view/1024.

Preston, C. T., Jr. (2004, November). *Debate institute education, urban debate league experience, and fundamental argumentative competence: Impacts on retention and success in first and second-year UDL students*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Preston, C. T., Jr. & Shields, D. C. (2003, October). *The impact of urban debate league training and experience on willingness to argue among high school students*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Debate Educational Association, Dubrovnik, Croatia.

Public Communication Debate and Speech Association (2015). Retrieved August 7, 2015 from http://www.collegeforensics.org/invitations/2014%20CPF%20National%20Tournament.pdf.

Rancer, A. S., Kosberg, R. L., & Baukus, R. A. (1992). Relations between argumentative-ness and belief structures about arguing. *Communication Education, 37,* 37-47.

Roberto,, A. J., & Finucane, M. E. (1997). The assessment of argumentativeness and verbal aggression in adolescent populations. *Communication Quarterly, 43,* 21-36.

Sanders, J. A., Wiseman, R. L. & Gass, R. H. (1994). Does teaching argumentation facilitate critical thinking? *Communication Reports, 7,* 27-35.

Semlak, W. D. & Shields,, D. C. (1977). The effective of debate training on student par-ticipation in the bicentennial youth debates. *Journal of the American Forensics Association, 13,* 194-196.

Shields, D. C. & Preston, C. T. (2007). The urban debate league rhetorical vision. In Frey, L. R. & Carragee, K. M. *Communication Activism: Communication for Social Change,* Creskill, NJ, Hampton Press, pp. 157-184.

Silavent, J. (2015). Stench stirs alliance in Latino area: Activists team up to rid area of foul smell. Retrieved on August 5, 2015 from http://www.gainesvilletimes.com/section/6/article/111086/.

Stewart, B. (2015). Access North Georgia. Dozens turn out to Gainesville City Council meeting to voice opposition for at-large voting. Retrieved on August 5, 2015, from http://accesswdun.com/article/2015/5/308259/dozens-turn-out-to-gaines-ville-city-council-meeting-to-voice-opposition-for-at-large-voting.

TCSG (2015). List of Technical College System of Georgia Institutions. Retrieved on July 25, 2015 from https://tcsg.edu/college_campuses.php).

Urban Debate Value (2012). National Association of Urban Debate League. Retrieved on November 12, 2012 from http://www.urbandebate.org/value.shtml.

USG (2015). List of University System of Georgia Institution. Retrieved on July, 25, 2015 from http://www.usg.edu/inst/.

USG (2015). Section 2.9 Institutional and Program Assessment. University System of Georgia Policy Manual. Retrieved on August 6, 2015 from http://www.usg.edu.

Wade, M. M. (1998). The case for urban debate leagues. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 19,* 60-65.

Williams, D. E. & Hughes, P. C. (2005). Family communication patterns and competitor satisfaction: A national survey of collegiate forensics participants. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 42:1,* pp.19-25.

Ziegelmueller, G. W. (1998). The Detroit experience. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 19,* 85-88.

The Evolution of Extemporaneous Speaking: A Structuration Approach

TOMEKA M. ROBINSON, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
CODY M. CLEMENS, BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
SIERRA ORTEGA, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Abstract: *Forensics, as an activity, is well known for enriching competitors' skills in public speaking, debate, literary performance, as well as increasing their overall knowledge. Increasingly, there has been a demand to demonstrate to parents and administrators that, forensics, as an activity, has educational merit. This merit is in fact pedagogically driven in order to justify the fact that forensics is worthy to include not only in the curriculum, but the budget as well. As forensic scholars, it is our duty to educate and inform audiences with clar-ity and understanding. When specifically considering extemporaneous speaking, there have been many "unwritten rules" that find their way into the competition rooms (Compton, 2004; Cook & Cronn-Mills, 1995; Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Elmer & VanHorn, 2003; Jensen, 1997, 1998). Turning to Giddens (1979), this analyses argues that structuration theory pro-vides a theoretical foundation for exploring the ways in which extemporaneous speaking has evolved within intercollegiate forensics.*

Within the last decade, intercollegiate forensic programs have faced immense external pressure to explain and legitimize the learning outcomes of our activities. Forensic educators have long articulated the need for measuring learning within forensic pedagogy (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, & Louden, 1999; Gernant, 1991; Kelly & Richardson, 2010; Kelly, 2008; Koeppel & Morman, 1991; Kuyper, 2011). In 2010, the National Forensics Association Executive Council's Committee on Pedagogy released a report that outlines the four over-all categories of learning outcomes for forensic participation: 1) *Discipline Knowledge and Skills*, 2) *Communication*, 3) *Critical Thinking*, and 4) *Integrity/Values* (NFA, 2010). Additional studies have attempted to take each individual event and summarize their pedagogical value (Preston, 1991; Rosenthal, 1985; Shields & Preston, 1985).

Also, it is no secret that many forensic coaches serve as professors or instructors within their university departments (Merrell, Calderwood, & Flores, 2015). When it comes to informing forensic

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 Forensics Graduate Teaching Assistant, Instructor, and Doctoral Student at Bowling Green State University (Bowling Green, OH). SIERRA ORTEGA (M.A. Hofstra University) is an MA candidate in Performance Studies at New York University. A previous version of this paper was presented at the 2014 National Communication Association Conference in Chicago, IL. Please direct all correspon-dence to the first author at tomeka.m.robinson@hofstra.edu.

competitors of the norms, rules, regulations, and literary significance of collegiate performances, that responsibility falls into the hands of coaches and educators involved in the activity (Bonander & Marsh, 2015, p. 453). With that being said, coaches will carry what they learn from practice or competitions into the classroom, and vice versa (Merrell et al., 2015). Forensic coaches strive to serve the role of knowing and understanding what forensic competitors need to know about the activity in order to succeed (Bonander & Marsh, 2015), meaning coaches inform forensic competitors of how to make smart choices and what risks are worth taking. Moreover, studies have even assessed the "unwritten rules" that find their way into competition rooms (Compton, 2004; Cook & Cronn-Mills, 1995; Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Elmer & VanHorn, 2003; Jensen, 1998; Jensen, 1997). This analysis defines *unwritten rules* as knowledge and standards set by forensics coaches and educators actively competing that are not necessarily written in the rules and regulations of the activity yet.

This essay specifically focuses on extemporaneous speaking and the conversations and "unwritten rules" that bring attention to the increased emphasis on: 1) providing unique sources (Colvert, 1994) (In this analysis, *unique sources* are defined as non-mainstream credible sources that are up to date and current); 2) the use of the Internet (Voth, 1997); 3) structure and style of the extemporaneous speech (Householder & Louden, 2013; Parrish, 2003); 4) judge preferences (Cronn-Mills & Croucher, 2001); and 5) increasing the use of documentation (Joraanstad, 1989). Very little discussion, however, has focused on the ways and means certain practices have changed within this specific event. This analysis, therefore, argues that Giddens' (1979) structuration theory provides a theoretical foundation for exploring the ways in which extemporaneous speaking has evolved within intercollegiate forensics. (The authors acknowledge that all forensic events have evolved over time in some form, but the purpose of this analysis is to focus merely on the evolution of extemporaneous speaking.)

Giddens' Structuration Theory

Originally stated by Giddens (1979), structuration theory "conceives of social systems as grounded in the practices and behaviors of individuals who constantly (re)create their social systems through structuring activities" (Sommerfeldt, 2012, p. 272). *Systems* are simply similar social practices that are produced and reproduced across time and space through the agency of human actors. Systems can include dyadic interactions, group communication practices, or mass communication. What we find is that neither micro- nor macro- analysis of systems alone is sufficient to explain the process of social creation. Any analysis must be objective and subjective simultaneously. In other words, one must evaluate structures in context of individual or group agency, and agency must be analyzed in context of the structures they exist within (Giddens, 1979; Sommerfeldt, 2012).

Structures impact the opportunities available to the human actors within the system, because they provide the context in which the action occurs (Giddens, 1979). Structure is then both a medium of action and the outcome of specific actions. Giddens (1979) calls this the "duality of structure" (p. 5). It is self-perpetuating and is continually being constituted by the doings of human actors (Giddens, 1993, p. 121). Structure is generally understood to refer to the rules of any given system, or more specifically as "the structuring properties allowing the 'binding' of time-space in social systems" (Giddens, 1984, p. 17). This is what allows structure to take upon its systemic nature. When similar social practices can exist throughout time and space they take on the nature of normalized behavior or routine. It is through our embedded memories, or memory traces, that we carry out this routine (Giddens, 1984; Sommerfeldt, 2012).

Just as actions can perpetuate certain structures, structures themselves impose rules and regulations upon human actors. According to Giddens (1984), *rules* are the "methodological procedures of social interaction" (p. 18; Sommerfeldt, 2012). Rules regulate activities and create normalized interaction. They give human actors ways to organize meaning and give them a sense of ontological security within the system (Giddens, 1984, p. 86). As human actors, we monitor our body, our language, our face work, and other means of communication as a way to establish trust and tact and this guarantees our full integration into our specific corner of time and or space. Rules that are organized into clusters that regulate a given range of activities are called "frames" (Giddens, 1984, p. 87). In association with rules, there are also "*resources* that refer to a transformative capacity" (Sommerfeldt, 2012, p. 273). An example of this is the "command over physical goods such as money (allocative resources), or the ability to command or coordinate the activities of others (authoritative resources)" (Sommerfeldt, 2012, p. 273). After acknowledging the rules and regulations, we frame our actions within specific contexts depending on the systems we are operating inside of.

Originally recognized by Giddens (1984), there are three structures that affect how human actors interact amongst one another within a system. These structures are:

> (1) how actors draw on past experiences and knowledge to constitute meaning (structures of signification), (2) if actors are subject to a normative order that sanctions those meanings or modes of conduct (structures of legitimation), and (3) if resources are employed to create and/or sustain power relationships (structures of domination). These structures may be simultaneously constraining and/or enabling for actors engaging in social relations. (Sommerfeldt, 2012, p. 273)

While pure structuration has become foundational to the sociological understanding of social interaction, many post-structuralists have been critical of the notion of the inseparability of structure and agency. Archer (1995) proposed a new notion of analytical dualism that

maintains that time must be considered when analyzing structure and agency. Mouzelis (1991) argues that *duality of structure* only makes sense in a world where human actors do not question or disrupt the rules. In these situations, rules become fluid and transitional and can be used in a strategic and performative way to shift duality to dualism (Mouzelis, 1991, p. 28).

Structuration theory, therefore, provides an appropriate lens to investigate the evolution of extemporaneous speaking within inter-collegiate forensics. Extemporaneous speaking as an event has changed over the last several years. It has evolved, and there have been many "unwritten rules" brought into the system by the various forensic coaches, judges, and competitors. These "unwritten rules" are not part of the formal system, but as understood through utilizing a structuration approach and reexamining the current system, they may very well become the new normal—innovative normalized behavior that forensic educators and competitors utilize to gain a competitive edge amongst their opponents. Through an examination of the changes that have taken place in the standards for evaluating competitive intercollegiate extemporaneous speaking, we argue that the current rules and norms of the event are embedded in social process, rather than as the result of isolated rational actions.

Extemporaneous Speaking

Production, Reproduction, and Change Over Time

Extemporaneous speaking is one of several limited preparation events that are found at forensic competitions. A competitor is given 30 minutes to research a question, most often about domestic or international current events, and then gives a 5 to 7 minute speech analyzing and answering the question. The most commonly accepted organizational philosophy suggests that competitors begin by stating the question, then provide an answer to the question with two or three numerated main points (Crawford, 1984). Extemp allows speakers to cultivate critical thinking, argumentation, and research skills, in addition to public speaking skills, that offer immense practical benefits for life after competition (Householder & Louden, 2013). When analyzing the current state of competitive extemporaneous speaking, it is important to look at how behaviors have been produced, reproduced, and become normalized behavior over time.

Number and Types of Sources

Judges are rewarding students for the number of sources they are using, as well as the uniqueness of their sources. It is common to see tally marks on ballots as the judges count the number of sources used within the speech. Cronn-Mills and Croucher's (2001) investigation of judges' ballot comments found that a majority of extemp judges tally and comment on the number and frequency of sources cited (p. 8). According to Colvert (1994), if students did not use at least five different sources within a speech, then it did not meet the minimum requirement for a competitive speech; this was in 1994. The number

has gotten even higher with some speeches having as many as 10-15 sources. Brown (2008) has argued that this increase can be, in part, attributed to a judge's desire to have a quantifiable measure of quality in order to make their decision process easier (p. 20). Whatever the reason for this call for an increase in unique sources, this behavior has been reinforced by judges, coaches, and competitors who see a direct relationship between the number of sources within a speech and its competitive potential. This perspective perpetuates the practice.

Covert (1994) argues that access to the internet allowed many extempers to expand their filing system and cite non-mainstream and niche sources in their speeches. Access to these types of online sources has placed continually increased emphasis on unique sources, and the more common weekly publications have started to be looked at with disdain. Schnoor (1994) found that judges seem to reward students for citations that are "more than the usual news magazines." For example, as Brown (2008) has suggested, citing the *Associated Press* can be seen as an obvious and weak choice for a competitor that has internet access and could be, instead, citing *Reuters* or another international press wire service (p. 21). Additionally, experienced judges are asking for more varied sources and students are responding. According to Colvert (1994), "speakers assume that their target audience is demanding arguments supported not only by expert testimony and statistics, but also testimony from the country of origin for the topic" (p.7).

Filing System Changes

Due to the research burden experienced by extempers, much of the initial research is done prior to competition through the creation of research files. This is essentially a collection of recent magazine and newspapers articles on a variety of relevant topics. Often teams will split the work involved in creating research files by assigning each individual exptemper on the team a different topic or region (e.g. global warming policy or Sub-Sahara Africa) to research. The old system of filing involved two methods: (1) a reference card file, which kept the magazines complete, or (2) topic file folders, which had articles from the magazines within them. Most competitors are now exclusively using electronic filing systems.

Voth (1997) notes the shift for his team from tub filing to an electronic system following a tournament invitation that offered electronic extemp as an experimental event. The event description read:

> This event is designed to challenge a student's limited preparation speaking skills in relation to computer technology. It is our belief that such technology is becoming an increasingly relevant part of public speaking preparation in professional life. The event will be run just like regular extemp (30 min. prep time and 7 min. speaking time), but the students will rely on the electronic full text database known as LEXIS/NEXIS for retrieving evidence and support for the speech instead of newspaper and magazine clipping files. Information on using LEXIS/NEXIS is