5-4-1981

Characteristics and Practices of Forensics Programs in Oregon Secondary Schools

Gregg T. Sylvester
Portland State University

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Gregg T. Sylvester for the Master of Science in Speech Communication presented May 4, 1981.

Title: Characteristics and Practices of Forensics Programs in Oregon Secondary Schools.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[redacted]

Ben Padrow, Chairman

[redacted]

Robert Vogelsang

[redacted]

Larry Steward

[redacted]

Richard Lindner

Since 1943, six studies have been made of speech education in Oregon public schools. Several make reference to forensics, but none discuss this aspect of speech education in depth. As a result, the role of forensics in the schools has been assumed or denied. With the educational situation as it is, however, it is necessary

that we have a greater understanding of the relationship between forensics and general speech education and language arts education.

This study seeks to provide contemporary information on forensics programs which may be useful in examining this relationship. Included in the study are: 1) the nature and scope of forensics programs, 2) the characteristics and qualifications of forensics directors, and 3) the characteristics of forensics students.

Questionnaires were sent to all member schools of the Oregon High School Speech League. The results of the 1977 and 1980 surveys provide the basis for discussion. The results are compared to note changes between the two years and the possible causes for these changes. Relationships which may exist among program characteristics are also considered.

The results of the study indicate that forensics programs in Oregon secondary schools have stabilized. Large programs, both in terms of the the number of participants and budgets, have been eliminated. In the same categories, very small programs have grown. The average program is now budgeted at between two and three thousand dollars, enabling eighteen students to participate in nine forensics tournaments.

While forensics is a competitive activity, the goals of programs, as indicated by forensics directors, do not emphasize this. The most important goal was felt to be the promotion of the personal growth of students. The least important of the ten goals was the improvement of public speaking skills.

Of the survey results, the most marked change occurs in the area of forensics directors. Fewer coaches have bachelor's or master's degrees in speech communication, and more do not even have a norm of fifteen quarter hours in speech as part of their teaching certificate. This can be attributed to the fact that coaches primarily teach in the English departments of their respective schools. After one year of coaching, directors tend to change their school affiliation to their present one, where they have been for five years. A director receives an average of $846.00 in extra-duty compensation for handling the forensics program.

It is possible that changes in survey results are attributable to two principal factors--the economic situation of schools and the Oregon language arts teaching certificate. The economic situation is reflected in budgets which directly or indirectly influence the number of students who can participate and the number of tournaments. The language arts teaching certificate permits non-speech teachers to direct forensics programs, thereby influencing the strength of programs in terms of the quality of performance and the types of forensics events stressed at the schools.

Much of the value of the present study lies in the knowledge that the results may be used as a starting point for further investigations into the status of Oregon high school forensics programs. Research is needed to determine the attitudes of various groups toward forensics, the influence of the forensic director on the emphasis of the program, and the reasons for the comparative success or failure

of forensics programs. When adequate information becomes available, tne proper role of forensics as an integral part of speech communication education in Oregon secondary schools will be able to be fully determined.

CHARACTERISTICS AND PRACTICES OF FORENSICS PROGRAMS IN OREGON SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

GREGG T. SYLVESTER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Portland State University

1981

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Gregg T. Sylvester presented May 4, 1981.

[redacted]

Ben Padrow, Chairman

[redacted]

Robert Vogelsang

[redacted]

Larry Steward

[redacted]

Richard Lindner

APPROVED:

[redacted]

Theodore Grove, Head, Department of Speech Communication

[redacted]

Stanley E. Rauch, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES v

CHAPTER

I PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 1

II DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY 5

III RESULTS OF THE STUDY 7

Nature and Scope of Forensics Programs 8

Characteristics and Qualifications of Forensics Directors 21

Characteristics of Forensics Students 27

Conclusion 32

IV SUMMARY OF THE STUDY 33

V 36

VI IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 38

BIBLIOGRAPHY 42

APPENDIX 44-58

A. 1977 Initial Questionnaire 44

B. Letter of Explanation for 1977 Initial Questionnaire 46

C. Questionnaire Recipients 47

D. 1977 Supplemental Questionnaire 50

APPENDIX PAGE

E. Letter of Explanation for 1977 Supplemental Questionnaire 52

F. 1980 Questionnaire 53

G. Letter of Explanation for 1980 Questionnaire . . . 56

H. Glossary of Forensics Events 57

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	School Classification	8
II	Forensic Instruction	9
III	Size of Forensics Programs	10
IV	Forensics Program Budgets	12
V	Manner of Financing Forensics Programs	14
VI	Tournament Participation	16
VII	League Tournament Participation	17
VIII	O.H.S.S.L. District Tournament Participation	18
IX	O.H.S.S.L. State Tournament Qualifying Schools	18
X	Goals of a Forensics Program	20
XI	Teaching Status of Forensics Directors	21
XII	Education of Forensics Directors	22
XIII	Classes taught by Forensics Directors	23
XIV	Experience of Forensics Directors	25
XV	Compensation Received by Forensics Directors	26
XVI	Amount of Forensics Compensation	26
XVII	Grade and Sex of Forensics Students	27
XVIII	Student Participation by Event Category	29
XIX	Student Participation by Speaking Event	30
XX	Selected Comparisons	37

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of speech communication as a curricular part of secondary education in the state of Oregon has increased dramatically since the first study of speech education was done in 1943. At that time, Walter Eschebeck (2) noted the minor role of speech in the high school curriculum. By 1967, Bolton (1) pointed out that 90 percent of Oregon secondary schools offered speech courses.

The Oregon Department of Education recognized the importance of speech communication when it adopted minimum competencies for high school graduation in 1975. Of the five communication competencies, one involved speaking skills; and one involved listening skills. It was left to the individual school districts, however, to establish procedures for implementing these competencies.

Although it appears that speech communication is now an integral part of Oregon secondary education, one unique aspect of speech is still very much in question--forensics. Of the six studies conducted in the last 38 years on speech education in Oregon secondary schools, all either omit or discuss only minimally the nature of forensics as part of speech communication in the schools. Eschebeck (2), in 1943, emphasized the philosophy of speech education and the need for a greater role for speech in the curriculum. In 1951, Padrow (4-p. 34) revealed that 39% (about 1,250) of the Oregon high school students

participated in forensics contests. No mention is made, however, of whether these contests were speech tournaments or contests sponsored by service organizations. Newbry (3), in 1954, mentions speech only incidentally as a minor aspect of Language Arts in the secondary schools. Schlosser's only reference to forensics in 1955 (5-p. 193) indicates 16.4% of the secondary schools participate in "Interschool Debate, Public Performance." Smith (6) also makes only passing reference to forensics in his study of speech education in 1961. Bolton's study of 1967 (1) discusses tournaments, extra-duty compensation, and the number of schools offering forensics courses.

During 1978 and 1979, the Oregon Speech Communication Association compiled information on instructional methods in speech communication courses. A survey was sent to all junior and senior high schools containing questions in 6 areas of competitive speech. For comparison purposes, unfortunately, the results are unacceptable. According to the surveyor, Bob Withycombe, "I have drawn conclusions from the material based on rough averages, and they may not truly reflect the total situation around the state." (7-p. 5)

All of these studies illustrate the fact that there is a dearth of contemporary information available on forensics. As a result, many people, both in and outside the educational field, do not know what forensics is; of those who recognize the term, most are not fully cognizant of the nature, scope, and status of Oregon high school forensics programs.

In spite of this situation, forensics is endorsed by a number of educational groups as a legitimate school program. The Oregon School Activities Association, the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, and the Oregon School Board Association all list forensics as an approved activity. Unfortunately, an endorsement does not insure understanding of, or survival for, a forensics program. Forensics directors are forced to evaluate and justify the program at their particular schools.

If high school forensics directors are to fulfill their responsibilities as educators and coaches, however, they must have the material necessary for the evaluation and justification of their programs. This study is an attempt to provide this information. The purpose of the study is fourfold:

A. To compile comprehensive, contemporary data on forensics programs in the State of Oregon,

B. To correlate data for efficient use by forensics directors in the evaluation and justification of their respective programs,

C. To ascertain any relationships which may exist among program characteristics examined in the survey, and

D. To set forth possible hypotheses for further research.

Without adequate data, high school forensics directors are faced with the difficult, if not impossible, task of evaluating the forensics program at their respective schools. A director cannot be expected to evaluate how effective his/her program is in terms of the students involved, funding, and the goals and emphasis of the program without some standard or average to use for comparison. Furthermore, as in

most areas of education, forensics directors are hard-pressed to justify the expense of their programs before principals, superintendents, and school boards. As a result, forensics often suffers in school budgets. Budget committees, always money-conscious, follow the rule, "If the expense isn't justified, cut it."

This study will allow speech educators to view the current status of forensics in Oregon. This, in turn, will allow them to better plan for the future of Oregon high school forensics as an integral part of speech education in Oregon secondary schools.

CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

In order to obtain the necessary information on forensics programs, this writer proceeded to develop the method of study. It was decided that the most uniform means of acquiring necessary information was to utilize a questionnaire. This would be sent to forensics directors in Oregon secondary schools.

Questions used in the questionnaire arose primarily from conversations with coaches. They were asked what types of information about forensics programs they would find useful. Questions used in previous studies were also taken into consideration in the development of the questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of twelve questions covering the nature and scope of forensics programs, the characteristics and qualifications of forensics directors, and the characteristics of forensics students (see Appendix A). Space was provided for individual comments. This questionnaire was attached to a letter explaining the general purpose of the study (see Appendix B).

In determining which schools would receive the questionnaire, it was necessary to establish the parameters for which this study would function. The following terms are defined to limit the scope of the investigation.

Forensics programs are those competitive speech activities under the direction of a school-appointed director or coach. These

activities consist of tournaments sanctioned by the Oregon High School Speech League (O.H.S.S.L.). The O.H.S.S.L. is the governing body for high school forensics in the state; any school wishing to compete at the district or state levels must be a member of the league.

Oregon secondary schools are those public schools within the boundaries of the state of Oregon having any of grades 9-12. Private and parochial schools are omitted because they are funded privately and are not restricted in the area from which they draw their students.

This questionnaire was then sent in May of 1977 to those schools belonging to the O.H.S.S.L., which complied with the above definitions. The 115 schools on the 1976-77 O.H.S.S.L. membership list received the questionnaire (see Appendix C).

Schools' responses, particularly those to question #12, and the individual comments provided the basis for a supplemental questionnaire (see Appendix D). With an accompanying cover letter (see Appendix E), this questionnaire was then sent to those schools responding to the initial survey (see Appendix C).

In May 1980, a modified questionnaire (see Appendix F) was developed by incorporating the questions from the two 1977 questionnaires. This was then sent with a letter of explanation (see Appendix G) to all public high schools which were members of the O.H.S.S.L. for the 1979-80 academic year (see Appendix C). It is the results from these three questionnaires which have provided the data for the current study.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

One-hundred fifteen initial questionnaires were sent in 1977. Sixty-seven (58.2%) schools responded. Of these schools, each of which received the supplemental questionnaire, fifty-three (79%) responded. The 1980 questionnaire was sent to 106 schools, with 58 (55%) responding.

It should be noted that twenty-four schools responded to all three questionnaires. Twenty-five schools responded to both 1977 surveys but not to the 1980 survey. Four schools returned the initial 1977 questionnaire and the one in 1980, and nine schools responded to only the first 1977 survey. Eighteen schools were sent only the 1977 questionnaires, for they were not O.H.S.S.L. members during the 1979-80 school year. Fifteen schools which were not members in 1976-77 did receive 1980 questionnaires; of these, twelve responded. The following discussion is based on the responses from these questionnaires.

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF FORENSICS PROGRAMS

Each respondent was asked to classify itself as being urban, suburban, or rural in describing the area from which the school drew its students. No criteria were provided for making this determination; each forensics director was to rely on his/her own perceptions. It was felt

that arbitrary classification or criteria given by this researcher would alter the practical value of the results. School districts traditionally view themselves in relation to 1) those districts surrounding them, 2) similar economies in other districts, and/or 3) geographic similarities with other districts. By allowing schools to draw on the common conceptions of their community in making the classification, forensics directors would be able to evaluate the results as the district would be inclined to evaluate them.

TABLE I

SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION

	Urban	Suburban	Rural
1976-77	11 (16.4%)	19 (28.4%)	37 (55.2%)
1979-80	12 (21%)	13 (22%)	33 (56%)

The classifications generally concurred with the researcher's own impressions of how each school should be grouped. While the percentages do not fluctuate dramatically between the survey years, part of the difference can easily be attributed to two factors: 1) the change in the schools which did not receive either a 1977 or a 1980 questionnaire, and 2) four schools which changed their classification from the 1977 to the 1980 survey. Two of these schools had different coaches at the time of the 1980 survey, which may account for the change in classification. There is no indication from the questionnaires to account for the change in the other two schools' classification. One can only assume that the directors at all four schools perceived the area from which they drew their students to have changed over the three-year period.

The greater difficulty lies in explaining the large number of responses from schools classifying themselves as rural in comparison to the number from urban or suburban areas. It is generally accepted that Oregon is still primarily a rural state, especially outside the Willamette Valley. This, however, does not adequately explain the variation; for a number of schools in areas near other urban or suburban schools did not respond. It is possible that forensics directors were too busy to respond, that they lost the questionnaire, or that they did not wish to provide information on their programs.

The second question asked schools to indicate how forensics was taught at the school.

TABLE II

FORENSIC INSTRUCTION

A. Forensics is strictly extra-curricular.

	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
1976-77	16 (23.9%)	3 (4.5%)	7 (10.4%)	6 (9%)
1979-80	13 (22%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	9 (15%)

B. Forensics is incorporated in a general speech class.

1976-77	4 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
1979-80	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)

C. Forensics is an elective speech class.

1976-77	46 (68.6%)	7 (10.5%)	10 (14.9%)	29 (43.2%)
1979-80	43 (73%)	9 (16%)	11 (19%)	22 (38%)

Those schools having forensics as strictly an extra-curricular activity show a modest decline between 1976-77 and 1979-80. This

corresponds to an increase in the number of schools offering a separate forensics course, from 68.6% in 1977 to 73% in 1980. The questionnaire sought to determine if schools offered more than one course in forensics (i.e. Beginning Forensics and Advanced Forensics). Unfortunately, statement D on the questionnaire was not easily interpreted, so some schools did not select it as their response. Statement C on Table II, therefore, represents the total of the responses to both C and D of this question on the questionnaires. There are a number of possible reasons for the increase in the number of schools offering a forensics class. Schools may be increasing their elective offerings; enough students interested in forensics may have justified the class. The school may have hired a director who felt more competent to teach the class, or budget problems may not have been present to prevent the inclusion of the course in the curriculum.

Schools were then asked to indicate the approximate size of the program by the number of participants in forensics at their respective schools.

TABLE III

SIZE OF FORENSICS PROGRAMS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
0-10	17 (25.4%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (1.5%)	14 (20.9%)
11-20	22 (32.8%)	2 (3.0%)	7 (10.4%)	13 (19.4%)
21-30	13 (19.4%)	5 (7.4%)	2 (3.0%)	6 (9.0%)
31-40	13 (19.4%)	1 (1.5%)	8 (11.9%)	4 (6.0%)
More than 40	1 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
N/A	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

TABLE III (continued)

SIZE OF FORENSICS PROGRAMS

1979-80	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
0-10	16 (27.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.4%)	14 (24.2%)
11-20	25 (43.1%)	6 (10.3%)	2 (3.4%)	17 (29.4%)
21-30	11 (18.9%)	5 (8.6%)	4 (6.9%)	2 (3.4%)
31-40	4 (6.9%)	1 (1.7%)	3 (5.2%)	0 (0%)
More than 40	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
N/A	2 (3.4%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

It appears that the overall size of forensics squads is decreasing. Between 1977 and 1980, programs having between 31 and 40 students decreased 12.5%; and those having more than 40 students were eliminated completely. Small squads (0-10) and medium-large squads (21-30) remained relatively stable. The difference is primarily seen in the substantial increase of medium-sized programs (11-20). In 1977, 32.8% of the schools fell in this category; but by 1980, 43% had squads in this range. A major contributor to this increase was the number of rural schools which increased their squads in this range from 35% in 1977 to 51% in 1980. It may be that budget reductions account for the downward trend in the size of forensics squads in all groups. It is also possible that student interest is down, or that directors chose to reduce the size of their squads.

The fourth aspect of forensics programs dealt with the funding of programs--the amount of and manner of financing the programs. Results were included from the 1975-76 school year in examining the amount of forensics budgets.

TABLE IV

FORENSICS PROGRAM BUDGETS

1975-76	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
$ 0- 200	6 (9%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	5 (7.5%)
201- 500	18 (26.9%)	5 (7.5%)	3 (4.5%)	10 (14.9%)
501-1,000	16 (23.9%)	1 (1.5%)	8 (11.9%)	7 (10.4%)
1,001-2,000	12 (17.9%)	1 (1.5%)	6 (9.0%)	5 (7.5%)
2,001-3,000	4 (6.0%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.0%)
more than 3,000	2 (3.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.0%)
No answer	9 (11.9%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (1.5%)	6 (9.0%)
1976-77				
0- 200	4 (6%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.5%)
201- 500	12 (17.9%)	3 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	8 (11.9%)
501-1,000	14 (20.9%)	2 (3.0%)	8 (11.9%)	4 (6.0%)
1,001-2,000	13 (19.4%)	1 (1.5%)	5 (7.5%)	7 (10.4%)
2,001-3,000	4 (6.0%)	2 (3.0%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)
more than 3,000	3 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.0%)
No answer	16 (23.9%)	1 (1.5%)	3 (4.5%)	12 (3.0%)
1979-80				
0- 200	5 (8.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (8.6%)
201- 500	5 (8.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (8.6%)
501-1,000	14 (24.1%)	2 (3.4%)	3 (5.2%)	9 (15.5%)
1,001-2,000	11 (19.0%)	4 (6.9%)	3 (5.2%)	4 (6.9%)
2,001-3,000	14 (24.1%)	3 (5.2%)	5 (8.6%)	6 (10.3%)
more than 3,000	3 (5.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.7%)	2 (3.4%)
No answer	6 (10.3%)	3 (5.2%)	1 (1.7%)	2 (3.4%)

Analysis of the results is hampered by the large percentage of schools which did not respond for the 1976-77 school year. If one considers all three years together, however, a distinct shift is noted. Schools are improving their budgets; budgets are being established more in the middle three ranges, from $500.00 to $3,000.00, rather than in the extreme categories. This may be attributed to a stabilization of programs or to the effects of inflation.

A school-by-school analysis of the 1975-76 and 1976-77 budgets revealed that 52.2% of the schools stayed in the same range over the two years; 13.4% had the budget amount increased, and 2.3% showed a decrease. Thirty-one and three tenths percent (31.3%) of the schools responded to only one of the two years surveyed.

Between the 1976-77 and 1979-80 school years, however, a dramatic shift appears to have occurred. Less than one-half of the schools chose not to respond in 1980 as did in 1977. At the same time, the number of schools budgeted at $201-$500 dropped 9.3%. With only minor changes seen in given ranges ($0-200, $1,001-2,000, and more than $3,000), these decreases may correspond to an 18.1% increase in the schools in the $2,001-$3,000 bracket.

A comparison was also made of those twenty-eight schools responding to both the 1977 and 1980 surveys. Specific responses from nine schools (32.15%) did not allow for comparison. Nine schools (32.15%) indicated an increase in their budgets, and ten schools (35.7%) retained essentially the same budgets. No school indicated a decrease in the amount budgeted for forensics.

The questionnaire did not specifically attempt to ascertain the reasons for changes in budgets. It may be that the number of students involved in forensics increased, or that budget pressures on the schools lessened. One school that indicated a decrease between the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years attributed this to the defeat of a budget levy by voters and the subsequent closure of the school. By the 1979-80 school year, this institution showed an increase over even the 1975-76 budget amount. Possibly, the mere fact of increased

costs necessitated budget increases just to maintain the same level of the program.

Funding was also examined in terms of the manner of financing forensics. In the following table, the first number indicates those schools receiving funds from the given source; the number in parentheses represents the average percentage of funds those schools receive, and the number in quotes shows the average percentage for all schools in that classification.

TABLE V

MANNER OF FINANCING FORENSICS PROGRAMS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
District monies	56 (87.5%) "73.1%"	9 (84.4%) "69.1%"	17 (83.5%) "74.7%"	30 (90.6%) "73.5%"
Student activities monies	14 (49.6%) "10.4%"	2 (35%) "6.4%"	5 (30%) "7.9%"	7 (67.9%) "12.8%"
Fund raising	16 (31.7%) "7.6%"	4 (42.5%) "15.5%"	9 (25.6%) "12.1%"	3 (35.7%) "2.9%"
NA	5	0	1	4
1979-80				
District monies	43 (77.9%) "57.8%"	10 (71%) "59.2%"	6 (85%) "39.2%"	27 (78.9%) "64.5%"
Student activities monies	19 (63.3%) "29.7%"	5 (60%) "25%"	6 (65%) "30%"	8 (64.1%) "15.5%"
Fund-raising	21 (30.6%) "11.2%"	3 (30%) "7.5%"	3 (33.4%) "7.7%"	15 (30.1%) "13.7%"
NA	6	1	3	2

The percentage of forensics budgets provided by school district monies showed a significant decrease for the years surveyed, down 15.3% from 73.1% in 1977. This decline is accounted for, in part, by the decrease in the number of schools' programs financed entirely by district

monies. These fell from 56.7% of the schools in 1977 to 32.7% in 1980. The difference appears to have been made up largely by the use of student activities monies. This source of funds increased 10.3% to provide 20.7% of forensics budgets in 1980. It is interesting to note that the number of schools funded entirely in this manner increased dramatically during this time period, from 4.5% in 1976-77 to 12.11% of the schools in 1979-80. No schools indicated another source of income for 1976-77 other than those provided on the questionnaire, but in 1980, one school indicated that 5% of its budget came as a donation from the Mothers' and Dads' Club of the school.

One may hypothesize that the taxpayers' revolt and the general economy are being felt by forensics programs. It may also be that state or federally-mandated programs requiring funding are siphoning money from forensics. Unfortunately, as funds for activities are cut back, students must resort to raising funds on their own. But as more groups solicit funds where the dollars aren't available due to the economy, the success of fund-raising activities is minimized. Hence, money generated by the school (i.e. the sale of student body cards) is needed to make up the difference.

The remaining aspects under the nature and scope of forensics programs were surveyed by the supplemental questionnaire in 1977 and by the 1980 questionnaire. Fifty-three schools (8 urban, 16 suburban, 29 rural) responded to the supplemental questionnaire. This will explain the change in figures from previous discussions.

Since forensics is a competitive activity, schools were queried on their participation in forensics tournaments.

TABLE VI

TOURNAMENT PARTICIPATION

	Total		Urban		Suburban		Rural	
1976-77	No.	Avg.	No.	Avg.	No.	Avg.	No.	Avg.
college-sponsored	201	3.79	35	4.37	87	5.44	79	2.72
high school-sponsored	341	6.43	58	7.25	129	8.06	154	5.31
1979-80								
college sponsored	266	4.59	69	5.75	79	6.10	118	3.57
high school-sponsored	288	4.97	70	5.80	72	5.5	146	4.4

During the 1976-77 school year, Oregon high schools attended an average of 10.22 tournaments, 3.79 college-sponsored and 6.43 high school-sponsored. By 1979-80, schools participated in slightly fewer tournaments, an average of 9.56. Several reasons could be cited for this decline. Increased costs of attending tournaments may have forced schools to reduce the number of tournaments they attend, even if they had budget increases. School districts have also been setting mileage limitations which may have prevented schools from attending some meets.

While the overall number of tournaments attended decreased, particularly in the area of high school-sponsored tournaments, the number of college-sponsored tournaments attended showed an increase. A number of factors could have contributed to this increase. First, some schools interpreted college-sponsored and high school-sponsored differently. Some indicated that if the tournament was held on a college campus, they considered it a college-sponsored tournament; others made the determination based on the organization hosting the tournament. Second, several colleges began hosting tournaments, thus affording more opportunities

for participation by schools. Third, some schools, which had not attended particular college tournaments for various reasons, once again began attending those tournaments. Fourth, when faced with decision of which tournaments to attend, some directors may have felt that larger college tournaments provided a better caliber and range of competition as opposed to smaller, high school-sponsored tournaments.

Schools were also asked if they participated in a league-sponsored tournament (Wilco, Metro, etc.) other than the O.H.S.S.L. tournaments. Participation here showed a significant increase between 1977 and 1980.

TABLE VII

LEAGUE TOURNAMENT PARTICIPATION

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	31 (58.49%)	8 (100%)	9 (56.25%)	14 (48.28%)
No	22 (41.51%)	0 (0%)	7 (43.75%)	15 (51.72%)
1979-80	**Total**	**Urban**	**Suburban**	**Rural**
Yes	42 (72.41%)	11 (91.67%)	9 (69.23%)	22 (66.67%)
No	16 (27.59%)	1 (8.33%)	4 (30.77%)	11 (33.33%)

Between 1977 and 1980, participation in a league-sponsored tournament increased 13.92%, from 58.49% to 72.41%. Part of this increase may be due to the sharply rising costs of transportation. League-sponsored tournaments draw participants from a limited area, thus saving schools the expense of long trips. This would be especially noticeable among rural schools which are usually farthest away from colleges hosting tournaments. These schools increased their participation by 18.39%.

The final aspect of tournament participation dealt with O.H.S.S.L. tournaments, specifically the district and state tournaments.

TABLE VIII

O.H.S.S.L. DISTRICT TOURNAMENT PARTICIPATION

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	50 (94.34%)	8 (100%)	16 (100%)	26 (89.66%)
No	3 (5.66%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (10.34%)
1979-80				
Yes	54 (93.10%)	11 (91.67%)	13 (100%)	30 (90.91%)
No	4 (6.90%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)

The percentage of schools participating in O.H.S.S.L. district tournaments remained relatively constant, 94.34% in 1977 and 93.10% in 1980. This is understandable when one considers that respondents were all members of the O.H.S.S.L., and the principal reason for belonging to this organization is to allow participation at the district and state tournaments. At the same time, there was little change in the schools qualifying students for the O.H.S.S.L. state tournament. Table IX indicates the number of schools qualifying students and the average number of students each school had at the state tournament (in parenthesis).

TABLE IX

O.H.S.S.L. STATE TOURNAMENT QUALIFYING SCHOOLS

	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
1976-77	46 (4)	8 (3.38)	14 (4.93)	24 (3.67)
1979-80	48 (5.04)	11 (5.45)	13 (6.38)	24 (4.13)

It might appear that schools qualified proportionately more students to the state tournament in 1980 than in 1977, but this increase is partially explained by the greater percentage of schools qualifying students in 1977, 86.79% as opposed to 82.75% in 1980. Also, two events had been added to the state tournament by 1980 that had not existed in 1977.

The final area to be considered in the nature and scope of forensics programs, but certainly not the last in importance, concerns the goals or objectives of high school forensics programs. On the initial 1977 questionnaire, directors were asked to list what they considered to be the two most important goals of a forensics program. From these responses, a list of ten objectives was compiled and included on the supplemental questionnaire. Directors were then asked to rank these objectives in the order of their importance (1-most important to 10-least important).

This question was omitted from the 1980 questionnaire. Since most of the coaches were at their respective schools during the period of both surveys, it was felt there would be no significant change in the rank ordering.

Table X shows the ranks of objectives and the percentages of schools placing each in that position. In cases of a tie, the goal having the highest percentage for the lower position was placed in that position.

TABLE X

GOALS OF A FORENSICS PROGRAM

A) To promote the personal growth of students (i.e. self-confidence)
B) To develop critical thinking abilities in students
C) To provide a non-athletic student activity
D) To improve public speaking skills of students
E) To provide opportunities for students to develop new friendships
F) To succeed in competitive situations
G) To develop ethical communication attitudes in students
H) To promote group participation in an activity
I) To develop research and investigative techniques in students
J) To improve students' abilities as effective communicators

	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
1)	A (52.8%)	A (50%)	A (43.8%)	A (51.7%)
2)	J (39.6%)	J (25%)	J (56.3%)	J (34.5%)
3)	B (32.1%)	G (37.5%)	B (31.25%)	B (37.9%)
4)	I (20.8%)	B (37.5%)	G (37.5%)	D (20.7%)
5)	G (17.0%)	I (12.5%)	D (18.75%)	I (34.5%)
6)	H (18.9%)	H (25%)	H (18.75%)	G (24.1%)
7)	C (13.2%)	C (12.5%)	I (25%)	H (20.7%)
8)	E (28.3%)	F (37.5%)	E (37.75%)	E (24.1%)
9)	F (22.6%)	E (37.5%)	C (43.75%)	F (27.6%)
10)	D (3.8%)	D (12.5%)	F (43.75%)	C (34.5%)

Schools throughout the state tended to agree on the two most important goals of a forensics program--"to promote the personal growth of students" and "to improve students' abilities as effective communicators". Schools also generally accepted that forensics is not intended to be an activity that stresses competition or socializing, for these goals (E and F) were placed in two of the last three places by all groups. Urban schools felt forensics as a non-athletic activity was more important than did suburban and rural schools. The greatest disparity between the areas concerned the goal of improving the public

speaking skills of students. Urban schools considered this to be least important, while other groups placed it in the upper half of the ranking.

Differences in the rankings could be due to the geographic or economic influences on the program. They might also be the result of the size, competitive success, or budget of the program. The director also may influence the results insofar as he or she is influenced by previous coaches or academic courses taken in preparation for teaching at the high school level. A discussion of these factors as they relate to forensics directors follows.

PART II

CHARACTERISTICS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF FORENSICS DIRECTORS

The second part of this study examined the qualifications of forensics directors, their coaching experience, and salaries paid for directing the forensics program. The first question asked whether directors were full-time or part-time teachers at their respective schools.

TABLE XI

TEACHING STATUS OF FORENSICS DIRECTORS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Full-time	50 (94.34%)	7 (87.5%)	16 (100%)	27 (93.10%)
Part-time	2 (3.77%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.45%)
Non-teaching	1 (1.89%)			1 (3.45%)
1979-80				
Full-time	56 (96.55%)	11 (91.67%)	13 (100%)	32 (96.97%)
Part-time	2 (3.45%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)

The situation appears to have remained fairly stable from 1977 to 1980. The one exception is the non-teaching director in 1977. By 1980, no director was not engaged in teaching. This would account for the slight upward trend in full-time teaching positions.

The second question considered the academic qualifications of forensics directors. Directors were asked their preparation in speech communication.

TABLE XII

EDUCATION OF FORENSICS DIRECTORS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
B.A./B.S.	29 (54.72%)	3 (37.5%)	10 (62.5%)	16 (55.17%)
Master's	11 (20.75%)	5 (62.5%)	3 (18.75%)	3 (10.34%)
Ph.D.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
None	6 (11.32%)	0 (0%)	2 (12.5%)	4 (13.79%)
Teaching Norm	7 (13.21%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.25%)	6 (20.69%)
1979-80				
B.A./B.S.	24 (41.38%)	5 (41.67%)	4 (30.77%)	15 (45.45%)
Master's	10 (17.24%)	4 (33.33%)	6 (46.15%)	0 (0%)
Ph.D.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
None	18 (31.03%)	2 (16.67%)	2 (15.38%)	14 (42.42%)
Teaching Norm	5 (8.62%)	0 (0%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (12.12%)
NA	1 (1.72%)	1 (8.33%)		

Statewide, formal education in speech communication declined among forensics directors between 1977 and 1980. The sharpest decrease was noted in the category of those with a Bachelor's degree, down 13.34%. A significant increase was also seen in those directors who do not have even a teaching norm in speech (15 quarter hours of speech). The number tripled, showing a 19.71% increase between 1977 and 1980.

A number of factors could account for these changes. Directors with advanced degrees in speech have retired or resigned from their positions. Some directors have transferred to other school districts. It is alarming, however, that vacancies apparently are not being filled by those trained in speech. Witness the increase in those directors without a teaching norm in speech. The Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission may have played a major role in this. With the new umbrella "Language Arts" credential, teachers are certified to teach English, Journalism, Drama, and Speech, without having had to take sufficient courses in the latter three to develop expertise. School districts may hire a non-speech major to teach language arts and assign that teacher the forensics program.

With more directors not having degrees or teaching norms in speech communication, it was questioned what classes they taught at their respective schools. Those classes which constitute teaching responsibilities for a double-digit percentage of the forensics directors are provided in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

CLASSES TAUGHT BY FORENSICS DIRECTORS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Forensics	36 (67.92%)	7 (63.63%)	10 (52.63%)	19 (51.35%)
Speech	43 (81.13%)	8 (72.72%)	14 (73.68%)	21 (56.76%)
English	37 (69.81%)	3 (27.27%)	12 (63.16%)	22 (59.46%)
Drama	9 (16.98%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.26%)	8 (21.62%)

TABLE XIII (continued)

CLASSES TAUGHT BY FORENSICS DIRECTORS

1979-80	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Forensics	39 (67.24%)	9 (75.00%)	12 (92.31%)	18 (54.55%)
Speech	43 (74.14%)	12 (100.00%)	10 (76.92%)	21 (63.64%)
English	35 (60.34%)	3 (25.0%)	10 (76.92%)	22 (66.67%)
Drama	7 (12.07%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0%)	6 (18.18%)

It appears that there is little change between 1977 and 1980 in the dominant classes taught by forensics directors. All these classes fall under the label "language arts." This would tend to corroborate the supposition that the change in certification requirements has affected forensics programs. Further evidence is provided by the 6.99% decrease in the number of forensics directors teaching general speech classes. Many school districts have incorporated the state-mandated speaking and listening graduation competencies into the regular English program and are not offering general speech as often, if at all. Aside from the four principal classes taught in Table XIII, forensics directors taught 5 other courses in 1976-77; one worked as a counselor. By 1980, directors taught classes in ten other areas. Part of this could be due to the state of Oregon permitting teachers to teach two periods a day outside their certified area. Of course, some districts ignore this limit, having a teacher conduct anywhere from 3-5 classes outside his/her area. This writer, while being certified in speech communication, teaches four or five

general English classes each semester.

The next question examined the coaching experience of forensics directors. Table XIV represents the average number of years of experience of coaches.

TABLE XIV

EXPERIENCE OF FORENSICS DIRECTORS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
present position	5.13	4.56	6	4.82
past experience	1.81	1.5	2.44	1.55
1979-80				
present position	5.23	5.79	8.38	3.79
past experience	1.28	1.5	1.15	1.26

The results indicate a number of changes having occurred between 1977 and 1980. The average number of years in their present position shows little change from 5.13 years in 1977 to 5.23 years in 1980. This would indicate that a significant number of directors had hired for their position since 1977. In fact, in 1977, only 20.8% were in their first year of coaching; but by 1980, 29.3% were first-year coaches. This correlates to the decline in the academic preparation of forensics directors, fewer with advanced degrees and more not having a teaching norm in speech.

The final aspect of forensics directors to be considered was that of compensation for directing the forensics program. Table XV indicates whether or not directors received compensation.

TABLE XV

COMPENSATION RECEIVED BY FORENSICS DIRECTORS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	49 (92.45%)	8 (100%)	14 (87.5%)	27 (93.10%)
No	1 (5.66%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.25%)	2 (6.90%)
NA	1 (1.89%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.25%)	0 (0%)
1979-80				
Yes	54 (93.10%)	12 (100%)	13 (100%)	29 (87.88%)
No	4 (6.90%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)

The number of directors receiving compensation remained fairly constant over the period surveyed, 92.45% in 1977 and 93.10% in 1980. The high percentage can probably be attributed to forensics being included in the extra-duty section of teachers' contracts with school districts. This may also account for the change in the amount of compensation received.

TABLE XVI

AMOUNT OF FORENSICS COMPENSATION

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
all respondents	$460	$ 750	$ 582	$313
respondents specifying amounts	696 (35)	1000 (6)	931 (10)	477 (19)
1979-80				
all respondents	671	871	999	470
respondents specifying amounts	846 (46)	1045 (10)	1180	620 (25)

Many districts now index extra-duty salary schedules, with increases tied to increases in the base salary in the contract. As basic salaries increase, extra-duty salaries increase.

PART III

CHARACTERISTICS OF FORENSICS STUDENTS

The study finally considered the participants in forensics programs--the students themselves. The first question asked schools to identify forensics students by sex and grade level.

TABLE XVII

GRADE AND SEX OF FORENSICS STUDENTS

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
grade nine (m)	51 (4.39%)	10 (.86%)	32 (2.75%)	9 (.77%)
grade nine (f)	86 (7.39%)	19 (1.63%)	56 (4.82%)	11 (.95%)
grade ten (m)	143 (12.29%)	17 (1.46%)	58 (4.99%)	68 (5.85%)
grade ten (f)	199 (17.11%)	23 (1.98%)	97 (8.34%)	79 (6.79%)
grade eleven (m)	153 (13.16%)	20 (1.72%)	48 (4.13%)	85 (7.31%)
grade eleven (f)	227 (19.52%)	40 (3.44%)	73 (6.28%)	114 (9.80%)
grade twelve (m)	141 (12.12%)	20 (1.72%)	48 (4.13%)	73 (6.28%)
grade twelve (f)	163 (14.02%)	26 (2.23%)	52 (4.47%)	85 (7.31%)
1979-80				
grade nine (m)	47 (4.56%)	26 (2.52%)	10 (.97%)	11 (1.07%)
grade nine (f)	72 (6.99%)	21 (2.04%)	26 (2.52%)	25 (2.43%)
grade ten (m)	121 (11.75%)	26 (2.52%)	46 (4.47%)	49 (4.76%)
grade ten (f)	153 (14.85%)	33 (3.20%)	59 (5.73%)	61 (5.92%)
grade eleven (m)	150 (14.56%)	43 (4.17%)	48 (4.66%)	59 (5.73%)
grade eleven (f)	194 (18.83%)	42 (4.08%)	52 (5.05%)	100 (9.71%)
grade twelve (m)	141 (13.69%)	39 (3.79%)	45 (4.37%)	57 (5.53%)
grade twelve (f)	152 (14.76%)	42 (4.08%)	43 (4.17%)	67 (6.50%)

While it may appear that the number of students involved in forensics declined from 1977 (1163 students) to 1980 (1030 students), this difference is due largely to the nine fewer schools responding to the 1980 questionnaire. By examining the average number of students per school, a very modest increase is noted, from 17.3 students in 1976-77 to 17.7 students in 1979-80.

The survey did not distinguish between junior high schools (up to grade 9), mid-high schools (grades 9 and 10), and 2, 3, and 4-year senior high schools. Some schools also restrict participation in forensics to tenth graders and up. These two factors may account for the great disparity between the number of ninth grade students and the other three grade levels.

Girls tended to dominate the ranks of forensics students at all grade levels in both 1977 and 1980. Girls represented 58.04% of all students in 1977 and 55.44% in 1980. Although this still indicates a substantial majority of girls in forensics, it does show that the number of boys participating in forensics is increasing, a 2.6% increase between 1977 and 1980. This dominance by girls could be due to the relationship between forensics and English in the correct usage of grammar and writing. Girls, in the past, have scored higher in verbal skills on standardized tests on the average; hence, they may choose subjects to be involved with which emphasize these skills, such as forensics. Another factor could be linked to the fact that forensics is non-athletic. In the minds of some male students, forensics may be considered not "macho" enough or only for "the brains" of the school.

Forensics is generally divided into two categories--debate and individual events. The next question sought to determine the percentage of forensics students who participate in either or both of these categories. The number in parentheses in Table XVIII represents the number of schools which have 100% of their students involved in that category.

TABLE XVIII

STUDENT PARTICIPATION BY EVENT CATEGORY

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Debate	5.66 (1)	4.0	1.42	8.59 (1)
Individual Events	70.58 (18)	66.25 (3)	64.00 (3)	75.57 (12)
Both	23.76 (4)	29.75 (1)	34.58 (2)	15.84 (1)
NA	8	3	0	5
1979-80				
Debate	3.31	4.17	2.45	3.29
Individual Events	77.30 (23)	71.66 (4)	55.00 (2)	87.42 (17)
Both	19.39	24.17	42.55	9.32
NA	4	0	2 schools	2 schools

By far, the greatest majority of students participated in only individual events. A 6.72% increase was even noted between 1977 and 1980. This interest in individual events (I.E.'s) could be due to the variety of the events available; it could also be due to a lack of interest in debate, caused by the amount of time debate requires or the cost in supplies and registration fees. An interesting note in these results is the number of schools having 100% of their students involved in one category. By the 1980 questionnaire, only the I.E. category had any schools with 100% of the students involved, and this was a 27.78% increase. Again, this could be attributed to the requirements of participating in debate.

The final question expanded the previous question by determining the number of students participating in specific speaking events. Puppetry was included in the 1977 questionnaire but not on the 1980 form, for efforts to make it a state event had ceased. The move to

accept Puppetry was largely a one-man attempt, and when he retired from active coaching, other forensics directors decided it wasn't necessary to add another event. During the 1978-79 school year, however, Dramatic Serious and Dramatic Humorous Interpretation were added as state events. Since they were national events, their addition would allow Oregon to send not only the National Forensic League District champion but also the O.H.S.S.L. State champion to the National High School Forensic Tournament in these events. As a result, they were included in the 1980 questionnaire. Appendix H provides an explanation of each event. Table XIX indicates the average number of students involved in specific speaking events.

TABLE XIX

STUDENT PARTICIPATION BY SPEAKING EVENT

1976-77	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Oxford Debate	3.09 (8.1%)	3.78 (8.3%)	4.67 (8.9%)	2.16 (7.4%)
Cross-X Debate	2.92 (7.7%)	3.0 (6.6%)	5.22 (9.9%)	1.78 (6.1%)
Lincoln Douglas Debate	1.41 (3.7%)	2.67 (5.9%)	1.89 (3.6%)	.86 (2.9%)
Serious Interpretation	6.05 (15.8%)	6.89 (15.1%)	7.94 (15.1%)	4.92 (16.7%)
Impromptu	2.20 (5.8%)	2.78 (6.1%)	3.44 (6.6%)	1.46 (5.0%)
Humorous Interpretation	4.84 (12.7%)	4.33 (9.5%)	6.78 (12.9%)	4.03 (13.7%)
Extemporaneous	2.11 (5.5%)	2.11 (4.6%)	3.83 (7.3%)	1.27 (4.3%)
A.D.S.	2.22 (5.8%)	1.89 (4.1%)	2.72 (5.2%)	2.05 (7.0%)
Expository	3.92 (10.3%)	4.22 (9.3%)	5.17 (9.8%)	3.25 (11.0%)
Oratory	3.14 (8.2%)	4.00 (8.8%)	3.89 (7.4%)	2.57 (8.7%)
Radio Commentary	2.81 (7.4%)	4.89 (10.7%)	2.83 (5.4%)	2.30 (7.8%)
Poetry	3.45 (9.0%)	5.0 (11.0%)	4.11 (7.8%)	2.76 (9.4%)

TABLE XIX (CONTINUED)

STUDENT PARTICIPATION BY SPEAKING EVENT

1979-80

Oxford Debate	1.24 (3.3%)	1.17 (2.9%)	3.0 (4.7%)	.66 (2.2%)
Cross-X Debate	3.64 (9.7%)	4.92 (12.2%)	9.08 (14.1%)	1.17 (4.0%)
Lincoln-Douglas Debate	1.89 (3.2%)	1.25 (3.1%)	2.85 (4.4%)	.59 (2.0%)
Serious Interpretation	4.47 (11.9%)	3.42 (8.5%)	6.85 (10.6%)	4.45 (15.1%)
Impromptu	2.93 (7.8%)	3.50 (8.7%)	5.69 (8.4%)	1.86 (6.3%)
Humorous Interpretation	4.48 (11.9%)	4.33 (10.7%)	6.77 (10.5%)	4.14 (14.0%)
Extemporaneous	2.98 (7.9%)	3.33 (8.3%)	6.85 (10.6%)	1.52 (5.1%)
A.D.S.	1.72 (4.6%)	1.83 (4.5%)	2.62 (4.1%)	1.52 (5.1%)
Expository	3.0 (8.0%)	3.08 (7.6%)	3.85 (6.0%)	3.00 (10.2%)
Oratory	2.72 (7.3%)	3.17 (7.9%)	4.23 (6.6%)	2.24 (7.6%)
Radio Commentary	2.95 (7.9%)	3.50 (8.7%)	4.31 (6.7%)	2.52 (8.5%)
Poetry	2.92 (7.3%)	3.25 (8.1%)	3.31 (5.1%)	2.62 (8.9%)
Dramatic Serious	1.86 (5.0%)	1.83 (4.5%)	2.62 (4.1%)	1.79 (6.1%)
Dramatic Humorous	1.62 (4.3%)	1.75 (4.3%)	2.38 (3.7%)	1.45 (4.9%)

It is difficult to draw conclusions from the results in debate because students may compete in either Oxford or Cross Examination debate, depending upon which is offered at a particular tournament. The decline in Oxford, however, can especially be attributed to the decline in the number of tournaments offering this style of debate and attempts to eliminate it as a state event. Overall, students participating in debate showed a 3.3% decrease between 1977 (19.5%) and 1980 (16.2%). This corresponds to the results from the previous question, and it is reasonable to assume the same factors, lack of interest, amount of preparation time, or cost, are the causes for these changes.

Of the individual events, the manuscript interpretation events, Serious and Humorous, maintained their popularity during both survey years. Extemporaneous and impromptu speaking, while being the least popular in 1977, exhibited the only significant increases for 1980 among the individual events of 2.4% and 2.0% respectively. The general reduction in the results over the survey period could be attributed to the inclusion of the two dramatic interpretation events.

All speaking events were combined to determine any change in the number of events participated in. No change was noted, with students participating in an average of two events during both 1976-77 and 1979-80.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study are marked by stabilization and consolidation. Although responses to some isolated questions, such as the amount of money budgeted for forensics, noted dramatic changes between 1977 and 1980, the overall characteristics and practices remained relatively constant. It would seem the forensics programs are maintaining their place in Oregon secondary schools. This, in itself, may be an important discovery. At a time when many curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are being curtailed or eliminated at the high school level, forensics programs have not shared the same fate. Funding of forensics has changed, but this has not resulted in a significant change in the nature and scope of forensics programs.

With forensics programs holding their own against the onslaughts of the "back-to-basics" movement and the taxpayer revolt, one can also detect an overall shift to moderation. By 1980, schools generally responded in the middle ranges to questions. Fewer schools stood out as being excessively large and/or expensive or excessively small and/or under-financed. This movement toward the middle might be viewed as a tactical change in much the same manner as political personages moderate their views. Find an area where the least opposition exists and the greatest amount of support can be found. It is far easier for a forensics director to build or maintain a program if the end result would be a program which is "average" or "on par" with other programs around the state.

If one were to attempt any extrapolation of the results of this study to predict the future of forensics programs in Oregon secondary schools, the characteristics of stabilization and consolidation would figure prominently. The old saying, "There is safety in numbers," would adequately express the overall pattern for the near future. Forensics programs should be able to maintain their status as long as the economic and educational movements continue to exist. One should not expect any drastic improvement in the size, budget, or activities of forensics programs. Neither should one expect any significant curtailment of programs. Forensics programs in Oregon secondary will be put on "hold" until such time as the situation in the state and country improves.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

With the outlook for forensics programs being that of maintaining the status quo, it is reasonable to ask, "What is the status quo?" What have been the results of this stabilization and consolidation? In simpler terms, what is the average high school forensics program?

The results of this study provide the information with which one can develop a composite forensics program, a description of the average forensics program in an Oregon secondary school.

COMPOSITE DESCRIPTION OF AN AVERAGE FORENSICS PROGRAM

The average forensics program operates in conjunction with a forensics class at the school. Approximately eighteen students participate in the program, two ninth graders (1 male, 1 female), five tenth graders (2 males, 3 females), six eleventh graders (3 males, 3 females), and five twelfth graders (2 males, 3 females). In all probability, these students only participate in the individual events, although two students may compete in debate. The number of students who participate in each event is as follows:

Oxford Debate . . . . . .1 student
Cross-X Debate. . . . . .2 students
Lincoln-Douglas Debate. . . . . .1 student
Serious Interpretation. . . . . .2 students
Impromptu . . . . . .1 student
Humorous Interpretation . . . . . .2 students
Extemporaneous. . . . . .1 student

A.D.S. . . . . .1 student
Expository. . . . . .1 student
Oratory . . . . . .1 student
Radio Commentary. . . . . .1 student
Poetry. . . . . .1 student
Dramatic Serious. . . . . .1 student
Dramatic Humorous . . . . . .1 student

Students compete in two events at each of five high school-sponsored and four college-sponsored tournaments. Money to allow students to participate in these tournaments comes from a budget of approximately $2,000.00-$3,000.00. Sixty-four percent ($1,280-$1,920) of the budget is provided by District monies; twenty-three percent ($460-$690) comes from Student activities funds, and thirteen percent ($260-$390) is raised by the students.

Using the forensics budget to participate at tournaments permits the forensics director to realize the goals of the forensics program, the most important one of which is the promotion of the personal growth of students. The least important goal is the improvement of public speaking, even though forensics is a part of speech communication education.

The responsibility for handling the program rests with the forensics director. The director, with a bachelor's degree in speech communication, teaches full-time in the English department at his/her respective school. The director teaches forensics, general speech, and English classes. The director probably began coaching in his/her present position after one year of coaching elsewhere. At the present time, the coach has been at his/her present school for five years. For directing the forensics program, the coach receives $846.00 in extra-duty compensation.

With the exception of coaches increasing the length of time they have been in their present position, this is the kind of forensics program which exists in Oregon secondary schools and will exist for the near future.

CHAPTER V

While previous studies discussed only selected aspects of forensics programs in Oregon secondary schools, it is useful to illustrate any changes which have occurred between Padrow's first study in 1951 and this writer's 1980 questionnaire. The following table provides information where comparisons can be made between the 1951 study, Smith's study of 1961, Bolton's study in 1967, and the present study.

TABLE XX

SELECTED COMPARISONS

	1951	1961	1967	1980
Number of schools to which questionnaire was sent	95	219	176	106
Number of schools responding to questionnaire	70	219	160	58
Percent response	74.0	100.0	91.0	55
Schools offering a forensic course	--	2	46	42
Percent of schools offering a forensic course	--	.9	28.9	73.0
Percent of schools participating in tournaments	--	--	57.0	100.0
Average number of tournaments attended	--	--	6.7	9.55
Average extra-duty compensation for forensics	--	--	$273.31	$721.00

In those areas where comparisons are possible, improvements can be noted in the state of forensics programs. Two and one-half times the percentage of schools offered a forensics class in 1980 as did in 1966. This could be due to an increase in the number of students interested in forensics at schools, thereby justifying a class.

The average number of tournaments increased by 2.85 tournaments between 1966 and 1980. Increased budgets may have allowed schools to attend more tournaments. It may be that more tournaments were available for more schools to attend.

The substantial increase in the amount of compensation for forensics can be directly linked to the effectiveness of teachers' associations in negotiating contracts which involve salaries.

Unfortunately, the lack of information and studies on forensics programs makes further comparisons impossible.

CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study provides extensive information on the nature and characteristics of forensics programs in Oregon secondary schools. But like many studies, this information generates many questions for which answers are not provided. These questions, in themselves, would provide the bases for additional studies.

The apparent holding pattern of forensics programs provides an excellent opportunity to search for the answers to these questions. The answers should improve the understanding by educators of the relationship of forensics to speech education and a general language arts education in secondary schools.

The following implications for further research are phrased as questions. They focus on the possible and/or probable causes for some of the results of this study.

I. Is there any difference in how students, forensics directors, administrators, school board members, and the general public perceive the goals or objectives of a forensics program?

Each of these groups has some influence over forensics programs, in curriculum development, personnel and salary policies, or budget determination. The opinions these groups hold and their relative influence can decide whether forensics is "a frill" or an integral part of the educational program. Where groups can agree on the purposes of forensics, the program may have the financial and community support

necessary to exist and grow. Where these groups disagree on the goals, lack of student interest, unqualified or unconcerned directors, "shoestring" budgets, or the actual demise of the forensics program may result. Knowing how these groups feel about forensics is also the first step in any endeavor to improve a forensics program, for one might have to change influential opinions in order to bring about the desired changes. In short, all aspects of a forensics program are dependent upon the perceptions of various interest groups to some degree.

II. To what extent does the forensics director influence the emphasis of the forensics program in terms of speaking events participated in by students?

Year after year, schools are labelled as "debate", or "interp." or "oratory" teams, to be watched and feared by schools without these labels. From this writer's experience, these labels seem to be consistently given to the same schools. Do forensics directors actually stress particular speaking events? They may spend more time teaching those events they competed in themselves or enjoy more. Several coaches have remarked that they do just this. If this is so, is it a situation that needs correcting? One could also wonder if a coach's preference, positive or negative, could affect a student's performance in a given event. The possibility of a forensic director influencing the actual choice of speaking events by students and the quality of their performance exists; the real question is, "To what extent?"

III. What factors contribute to the amount of time forensics directors and students devote to forensics?

Like most competitive activities, to be successful in forensics requires a great deal of practice. There may be a correlation between tournament success and the amount of time devoted to preparation and performance. But not all coaches or students spend the same amount of time on forensics. Why do some forensics directors and students spend more time outside the regular school day on forensics? Attitudes toward forensics may influence the time. Personal satisfaction, monetary compensation, or tournament success could also determine how much time a person devotes to forensics. Knowing what factors contribute to the amount of time forensics directors and students devote to forensics may ultimately help to determine what correlation exists between time and tournament success.

IV. What is the relationship, exactly, of forensics to general speech education and language arts education?

For thirty years, it has been assumed that forensics is a part of speech education. More recently it has been placed under the umbrella term, language arts. Unfortunately, there exists no concise explanation of the relationship that supposedly exists between forensics and these areas. This is why some schools consider forensics a "frill", and others give it a high priority. When the current period of stabilization and consolidation for forensics programs ends, directors will need more to justify the existence of their programs than just the statement, "Other schools also have forensics." An investigation of forensics as a means of utilizing or improving language arts skills in reading, writing, and speaking would allow forensics directors to demonstrate the value of their programs. There would be far less opportunity for criticisms to arise questioning the validity of forensics.

V. What factors contribute to the size of forensics programs?

If one examines the number of students involved in forensics at various schools, it is interesting to wonder why a school has a particular-sized program? Does the enrollment of the school affect the size of the program? To what extend do the director's personality and policies determine the number of students involved in forensics? Does the number of types of school activities available to students influence the size? The answers to these questions may allow better predictions when planning budgets or when hiring a new forensics director.

Further research will provide the information necessary to understand the role of forensics in Oregon secondary schools. The relationship of forensics and language arts can be clarified, allowing for better evaluations and planning. While much may be known about forensics, much more needs to be discovered about the nature, scope, and characteristics of forensics programs in Oregon secondary schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bolton, Gordon; "A Survey and Analysis of the Existence and Extent of Speech Education in the High Schools in the State of Oregon"; unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Speech, Pacific University, 1967.

2. Eschebeck, Walter; "A Study of Speech Education as a Basic Part of the Curriculum for Oregon High Schools"; unpublished M.A. thesis, School of Education, University of Oregon, 1943.

3. Newbry, Burton Cecil; "An Investigation of the Practices and Policies of Teaching the Language Arts in the Secondary Schools of Oregon"; unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Oregon, 1954.

4. Padrow, Ben; "A Study of Speech Education in the Secondary Schools of Oregon"; unpublished M.S. thesis, Department of Speech, University of Oregon, 1951.

5. Schlosser, William: "An Investigation of the Practices and Policies of Teaching Drama, Journalism, Radio, and Speech in the Public Elementary, Junior High Schools, and Senior High Schools in the State of Oregon"; unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Oregon, 1955.

6. Smith, James; "Speech Arts Education in Oregon High Schools, 1961"; unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Speech, University of Portland, 1962.

7. Withycombe, Bob; "Oregon Speech Communication Association Survey Results and Speech Class Offerings in Oregon, 1978-1979"; unpublished Oregon Speech Communication Association study, 1979.

APPENDIX A

1977 INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL NAME _____

1. Responses may be quoted in the final thesis. ___Yes ___No

2. Please send a summary of the results of this survey. ___Yes ___NO

3. How would you classify the area from which your school draws its students? (Circle one) URBAN SUBURBAN RURAL

4. Please indicate the type of forensics program at your school.

   a.____Forensics is strictly an extra-curricular activity.

   b.____Forensics is included as a unit(s) in a general speech course.

   c.____Forensics is an elective speech course.
   Length of course (circle one)
   6 wks. 9 wks. 18 wks. 36 wks. Other-____wks.

   d. Forensics is offered as more than one elective speech course.

5. How many students participate in forensics at your school? (Circle one) 0-10 11-20 21-30 31-40 more than 40

6. Please indicate the number of students participating in forensics by grade level and sex.

Grade seven	___Male	___Female	Grade ten	___Male	___Female
Grade eight	___Male	___Female	Grade eleven	___Male	___Female
Grade nine	___Male	___Female	Grade twelve	___Male	___Female

7. Please indicate the approximate percentage of students who compete in each of the following categories.

   ___% Only Debate ___% Only Individual Events ___% Debate and one or more Ind. Events

8. Please indicate the number of students participating in each of the following events.

__Oxford Debate	__Humorous Interpretation
__Lincoln-Douglass Debate	__Extemporaneous Speaking
__Cross-Examination Debate	__After-Dinner Speaking
__Serious Interpretation	__Expository Speaking
__Impromptu Speaking	__Oratorical Speaking
__Radio Commentary	__Puppetry
__Poetry Interpretation	

APPENDIX A

1977 INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE (CONTINUED)

9. How is forensics funded at your school? Please indicate the approximate percentage.

___% School district budget monies (earmarked for forensics)
___% School budget monies (earmarked by the school for forensics)
___% Student Activities monies
___% Forensics fund-raising monies
___% Other (Please specify) _____

10. Please indicate your forensics budget by circling the appropriate amount.

1975-76	1976-77
$0-$200	$0-$200
$201-$500	$201-$500
$501-$1,000	$501-$1,000
$1,001-$2,000	$1,001-$2,000
$2,001-$3,000	$2,001-$3,000
more than $3,000	more than $3,000

11. Please list what you feel are the two most important goals or objectives of the forensics program at your school.

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

12. Please list any questions which you would like to have answered regarding high school forensics programs.

13. COMMENTS

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF EXPLANATION
FOR 1977 INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

May 6, 1977

Dear Forensics Director,

My name is Gregg Sylvester. I am a graduate teaching assistant in speech communication at Portland State University. As part of my Master's thesis research, I am conducting a survey of forensics programs in Oregon secondary schools.

This is the first comprehensive study of forensics to be done in the state, and so your assistance is vital to the success of this endeavor. Enclosed you will find a questionnaire dealing with forensics programs. Please take a few minutes to answer the questions and return the form to me. Your answers will provide the basis for a supplemental questionnaire to be sent to all participating schools at a later date. Please return the questionnaire to me no later than MAY 23, 1977.

Your answers will remain confidential unless you consent to having your responses quoted in the final thesis. You will find a space on the questionnaire to indicate your desire in this regard.

A summary of the results of this survey will be sent to you upon request. Check the appropriate box on the questionnaire.

Thank you for your prompt attention in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

Gregg T. Sylvester
401 S.E. 30th
Portland, Oregon 97214

P.S. PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE BY MAY 23, 1977. A SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE IS INCLUDED FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE RECIPIENTS

1--sent 1977 initial questionnaire
2--responded to initial questionnaire and sent supplemental questionnaire
3--responded to supplemental questionnaire
4--sent 1980 questionnaire
5--responded to 1980 questionnaire

John Adams HS	1,4,5	Churchill HS	1,2,3,4,5
Aloha HS	1,4	Clackamas HS	1,2,3,4,5
Ashland HS	1,2	Clatskanie HS	1,4,5
Astoria HS	1,4	Cleveland HS	1,4
Baker HS	4,5	Columbia HS	4
Bandon HS	1,2,4,5	Coquille HS	1,2,3
Banks HS	1,2,3,4,5	Corvallis HS	1,2,3
Sam Barlow HS	1,4,5	Cottage Grove HS	1
Beaverton HS	1,4	Crater HS	1,2,3,4,5
Bend HS	1,2,3,4	Crescent Valley HS	1
Benson HS	1,2	Dallas HS	1,2,3,4,5
Bonanza HS	1,2,3,4,5	David Douglas HS	1,4
Butte Falls HS	4	Dayton HS	1,2,3,4
Canby HS	1,2,3,4,5	Douglas HS	1
Cascade Locks HS	4	Eagle Point HS	1,2,3,4,5
Centennial HS	1,2,3,4	Elgin HS	1
Central HS	1,2,3,4	Elmira HS	1,2,3,4,5
Chiloquin HS	1,2,4	Estacada HS	1

APPENDIX C (continued)

Forest Grove HS	1,2,3,4,	Lost River HS	1,4,5
Frnaklin HS	1,4	Madison HS	1,2,3,4
Gilchrist HS	1	Madras HS	1
Gladstone HS	1,2,4	Marshfield HS	1,4
Grants Pass HS	1,2,3,4	Mazama HS	4,5
Gresham HS	1,2,4,5	Mazama Mid HS	1,2,3
Henley HS	1,4,5	McKay HS	4
Heppner HS	4,5	McMinnville HS	1,2,3,4,5
Hermiston HS	1,2,3,4	McNary HS	1,4
Hidden Valley HS	4,5	Medford Mid HS	1,2,3,4,5
Hillsboro HS	1,2,3,4	Medford Senior HS	1,4,5
Hillsboro Mid HS	1,2,3	Milwaukie HS	1,2,3,4
Hood River Valley HS	1,4,5	Mollala HS	4,5
Huntington HS	1	Mountain View HS	4,5
Imbler HS	1,2,3,4,5	Myrtle Point HS	1,2,3
Jackson HS	1,2,4	Neah-Kah-Nie HS	1,2,4,5
Jefferson HS	1,4,5	Newberg HS	1,2,3,4
Junction City HS	1,4	North Bend HS	1,4,5
Klamath Union HS	1,2,3,4,5	North Eugene HS	1,2,3,4,5
Knappa HS	1	North Salem HS	1,2,3
LaGrande HS	1,4,5	North Valley HS	4,5
Lake Oswego	1,4,5	Nyssa HS	1,2,3,4,5
Lakeridge HS	1,4,5	Ontario HS	1,4,5
LaPine HS	4,5	Oregon City HS	1,2,3,4
Lebanon HS	1,4	Parkrose HS	1,2,4
Lincoln HS	1,4	Phoenix HS	1,2,3,4

APPENDIX C (continued)

Pine Eagle HS	1,2,4	Taft HS	1,4
Pleasant Hill HS	1,2,3,4	The Dalles HS	1,2,3
Ranier HS	1,2,3,4,5	Tigard HS	1,2,3,4
Redmond HS	1,2,3,4	Tillamook HS	1,2,3,4,5
Rex Putnam HS	1,2,3,4,5	Umatilla HS	1,2,3,4
Reynolds HS	1,2,3,4	Union HS	4,5
Rogue River HS	1	Vale HS	1,4,5
Roosevelt HS	1,2,3,4,5	Vernonia HS	1,4
Roseburg HS	1,2,4,5	Washington HS	1,2,4
St. Helens HS	1,4,5	West Albany HS	1,2,3,4,5
Sandy HS	1,4	West Linn	1
Scappoose HS	1,2,3	Willamette HS	1
Scio HS	4,5	Willamina HS	1,2,3,4
Seaside HS	1,2,3,4	Wilson HS	1,4
Sheldon HS	1,4	Woodburn HS	1,4,5
Sheridan HS	1,2,4	Yamhill-Carlton HS	1,2,3,4,5
Sherwood HS	4,5		
Silverton HS	1,4		
South Albany HS	1,4		
South Eugene HS	1,4,5		
South Salem HS	1,2,3,4		
Sprague HS	1,2,3,4		
Springfield HS	1,2,3,4,5		
Sunset HS	1,2,3,4,5		
Sutherlin HS	1,2,3,4,5		
Sweet Home HS	1,2		

APPENDIX D

1977 SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL NAME _____

1. What is your teacher status at your school?
   Full-Time___ Part-Time___ Non-Teaching___

2. How many classes do you teach each day?
   ___Forensics ___General Speech ___English ___Social Science
   ___Science ___Other Area(specify)_____

3. How many years have you directed forensics at your present school?
   _____Years

4. How many years had you coached forensics previous to your present position? _____Years

5. What degree(s) do you hold in Speech Communication?
   ___None ___B.S. or B.A. ___M.A., M.S., M.A.T., or M.S.T. ___Ph.D.

6. If you do not hold a degree in Speech, do you have a teaching norm in speech? ___Yes ___No

7. Do you receive "extra duty" pay for coaching forensics? __Yes __No
   If so, $_____

8. Please indicate the number of forensics tournaments your school participated at during the 1976-77 school year?
   College-Sponsored___ High School-Sponsored___

9. Did your school participate at a league tournament during 1976-77?
   ____Yes ____No

10. Did your school participate at the 1977 district forensics tournament?
    ____Yes ____No

11. How many students from your school qualified for the 1977 state tournament? _____

12. Please rank the following objectives in order of your preferences for a high school forensics program. (1-most important, 2-second in importance,...10-least important)

___ a) To promote the personal growth of students (i.e. self-confidence)
___ b) To develop critical thinking abilities in students
___ c) To provide a non-athletic student activity
___ d) To improve public speaking skills of students
___ e) To provide opportunities for students to develop new friendships

APPENDIX D

1977 SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE (CONTINUED)

___ f) To succeed in competitive situations
___ g) To develop ethical communications attitudes in students
___ h) To promote group participation in an activity
___ i) To develop research and investigative techniques in students
___ j) To improve students' abilities as effective communicators

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

APPENDIX E

LETTER OF EXPLANATION
FOR 1977 SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

May 24, 1977

Dear Forensics Director,

I want to thank you for your prompt completion and return of my questionnaire on high school forensics programs. The responses have been most encouraging. I am enclosing a supplemental questionnaire which I would appreciate having you complete and return to me. Many of the questions on this form are based on the suggestions and comments made by forensics directors on the questionnaire I sent to high schools earlier this month. Please take a few moments to complete this form and return it to me by June 11, 1977. I am enclosing a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Again let me thank you for your co-operation in this endeavor. I hope the final results will be of as much benefit to you as they have been to me.

Respectfully yours,

Gregg T. Sylvester

P.S. REMEMBER: Please complete the form and return it to me by June 11, 1977.

APPENDIX F

1980 QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL NAME_____

All responses will be confidential.

1. How would you classify the area from which your school draws its students? (Circle one)
   URBAN SUBURBAN RURAL

2. Please indicate the type of forensics program at your school.

   a.____Forensics is strictly an extra curricular activity.

   b.____Forensics is included as a unit(s) in a general speech course.

   c.____Forensics is an elective speech course. Length of course (circle one) 6 wks. 9 wks. 18 wks. 36 wks. Other ___wks.

   d.____Forensics is offered as more than one elective speech course.

3. How many students participate in forensics at your school? (Circle one) 0-10 11-20 21-30 31-40 more than 40

4. Please indicate the number of students participating in forensics by grade level.

   Grade 7 ____Male ____Female Grade 10 _____Male _____Female

   Grade 8 ____Male ____Female Grade 11 _____Male _____Female

   Grade 9 ____Male ____Female Grade 12 _____Male _____Female

5. Please indicate the approximate percentage of students who compete in each of the following categories.

   _____% Only Debate _____% Only Individual Events

   _____% Debate and one or More Ind. Events

6. How is forensics funded at your school? Please indicate the approximate percentage.

   _____% School budget monies (earmarked for forensics)

   _____% Student activities monies

   _____% Forensics fund raising monies

   _____% Other (Please specify _____)

APPENDIX F

1980 QUESTIONNAIRE (CONTINUED)

7. Please indicate the number of students participating in each of the following events.

_____ Oxford Debate	_____ Lincoln Douglass Debate
_____ Cross Examination Debate	_____ Serious Interpretation
_____ Impromptu Speaking	_____ Humorous Interpretation
_____ Extemporaneous Speaking	_____ After Dinner Speaking
_____ Expository Speaking	_____ Dramatic Serious
_____ Oratorical Speaking	_____ Radio Commentary
_____ Poetry Interpretation	_____ Dramatic Humorous

8. Please indicate your forensics budget by circling the appropriate amount

1979-1980
$0-$200
$201-$500
$501-$1,000
$1,001-$2,000
$2,001-$3,000

9. What is your teacher status at your school?
Full-Time _____ Part-Time _____ Non-Teaching _____

10. How many classes do you teach each day?
_____Forensics _____General Speech _____English _____Social Science
_____Science _____Other Area (specify) _____

11. How many years have you directed forensics at your present school?
_____Years

12. How many years had you coached forensics previous to your present position? _____Years

13. What degree(s) do you hold in Speech Communication?
___None ___B.S. or B.A. ___M.A., M.S., M.A.T., or M.S.T. ___Ph.D.

14. If you do not hold a degree in Speech, do you have a teaching norm in speech? ____Yes ____No

15. Do you receive "extra duty" pay for coaching forensics?
_____Yes ____No If so, $_____

16. Please indicate the number of forensics tournaments your school participated at during the 1979-89 school year?

College Sponsored _____ High School Sponsored _____

APPENDIX F

1980 QUESTIONNAIRE (CONTINUED)

17. Did your school participate at the 1980 district forensics tournament? _____Yes _____No

18. Did your school participate at a league tournament during 1979-80? _____Yes _____No

19. How many students from your school qualified for the 1980 state tournament? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX G

LETTER OF EXPLANATION
FOR 1980 QUESTIONNAIRE

May 8, 1980

Dear Speech Coach,

In May of 1977 I conducted a survey of Oregon high school forensics programs as part of my master's thesis at Portland State University. The responses from coaches around the state was extremely helpful in setting up the first part of the thesis. Now I am conducting another survey to gather information for comparison purposes.

I realize this time of year is busy for all of us so your assistance will be greatly appreciated. Please take a few moments of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. I have also included a self-addressed envelope for your convenience. All responses will remain confidential. Please mail the completed questionnaire by May 27, 1980.

I want to thank you beforehand for your effort on my behalf.

Sincerely yours,

Gregg T. Sylvester
Director of Forensics
Hidden Valley High School

APPENDIX H

GLOSSARY OF FORENSICS EVENTS

After-Dinner Speaking--The student chooses his own subject and develops an original speech to entertain. It should have an undertone of seriousness. The speech must be delivered from memory and shall not exceed six minutes in length.

Expository Speaking--The student chooses his own subject and develops an original speech to inform. The student may use visual aids, excluding projected images, to supplement the exposition. The speech must be delivered from memory and shall not exceed eight minutes in length.

Extemporaneous Speaking--The student selects three subtopics from the year's topic area and is allowed one hour for preparation. The speech must be delivered from memory and shall not exceed seven minutes in length.

Humorous Dramatic Interpretation--The student interprets his own cutting from published printed novels, short stories, plays or poetry. It is to be humorous in nature and in good taste. The student speaks from memory for no more than ten minutes.

Humorous Interpretation--The student interprets his own cutting from either prose or drama. It is to be humorous in nature and in good taste. The student shall read from a manuscript for no more than eight minutes.

Impromptu Speaking--The student selects three subtopics from the year's topic area. The student chooses one and begins speaking immediately without time for preparation. The student shall speak for no more than five minutes.

Oratory--The student chooses his own subject and develops an original speech to persuade. The speech must be delivered from memory and shall not exceed eight minutes in length.

Poetry Reading--The student chooses at least three poems, each of which is at least eight lines long. The poems must be related to and organized around a central theme. The student shall read the poems from manuscripts for no longer than eight minutes.

Radio Commentary--The student chooses his own current event and develops an original news commentary. The speech must be read from a manuscript and shall end between 4.45 and 5.15 minutes.

Serious Dramatic Interpretation--The student interprets his own cutting from published printed novels, short stories, plays or poetry. It is to be serious in nature and in good taste. The student speaks from memory for no more than ten minutes.

APPENDIX H

GLOSSARY OF FORENSICS EVENTS (CONTINUED)

Serious Interpretation--The student interprets his own cutting from either prose or drama. It is to be serious in nature and in good taste. The student shall read from a manuscript for no more than eight minutes.

Cross-Examination Debate--Two students shall comprise each team to debate the year's policy resolution. After each student's first speech, an opponent is permitted to directly cross-examine the speaker.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate--One student shall comprise each team to debate the year's policy resolution. After each student's first speech, the opponent is permitted to cross-examine the speaker.

Oxford Debate--Two students shall comprise each team to debate the year's policy resolution. No direct cross-examination of speakers is permitted.