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Issue ownership theory (Petrocik, 1996) posits that each major political party “owns” a set of issues. Many voters tend to believe that the Republican Party is better suited for dealing with certain problems (e.g., national defense, foreign policy, crime) and that the Democratic Party is better able to address other problems (e.g., education, health care, Social Security). Presidential candidates have an incentive to emphasize the issues owned by their party in an attempt to encourage voters to view those issues as more salient. This study applies Petrocik’s theory of issue ownership to presidential primary and general debates. Computer content analysis reveals that presidential candidates devote more debate utterances to their party issues than do their opponents. Democrats (but not Republicans) stress their issues more in primary than general debates. Finally, the proportion of Democratic issues has increased, as Republican issues decreased, over time. This could be an attempt by candidates to adapt to their audience: The Democratic issues which consistently increased (education, health care) were more important to voters as time passed just as the Republican issue (foreign policy) which consistently decreased became less important to voters over time.
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155
Although it would seem assessments of the content of arguments, and especially their rational components, would be at the center of our field, there is not a large body of argumentation research that focuses on such questions. In Manifest Rationality, Ralph Johnson attempts to revitalize the rationalistic examinations of argument. This paper advances Johnson’s theory in two crucial areas. First, a pragmatic theory of truth based on new empiricism is supplied. This pragmatic theory of truth coheres well with the rest of Johnson’s theory and elevates the status of grounds (or evidence) above warrant. Second, an adversarial model, eschewed by Johnson, is re-introduced. This move better accomplishes Johnson’s goal of including commonplace, everyday arguments in the scope of argumentation theory. These modifications to Johnson’s theory should arm critics with the tools to evaluate an argument’s content in addition to its ideological and persuasive features.

Diversity in United States Forensics: A Report on Research Conducted for the American Forensic Association
Mike Allen, Mary Trejo, Michael Bartanen, Anthony Schroeder and Tammie Ulrich
173
The results of a survey of 227 forensics programs about the level of participation by women and minorities are presented. The results demonstrate that gender equity, as indicated by the approximately 50% participation rates seen for both males and females, is evident. About 25% of the participants in forensics are non-European Americans. The number of minority and women participants increases when diversity is used as a criterion to evaluate programs and formal records are kept. Minority participation rates did not differ when comparing debate, individual events, or mock trial activities. Features like the nature of the academic institution (2 or 4-year; primary teaching or research mission; private or public), source of program funding (endowment,
student government, college, department, university), and measures of program success were unrelated to the extent of minority participation.
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DIVERSITY IN UNITED STATES FORENSICS: A REPORT ON RESEARCH CONDUCTED FOR THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION

Mike Allen, Mary Trejo, Michael Bartanen, Anthony Schroeder and Tammie Ulrich

Scholarly advocates for competitive forensics have held a belief in forensics as a source of training in public speaking and critical thinking. A meta-analysis published in Communication Education (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, & Louden, 1999) indicates significant improvement in critical thinking for students participating in competitive forensics. This improvement in critical thinking was found to be more substantial than that derived from a classroom experience in public speaking or argumentation. The evidence that forensics serves a valuable educational purpose provides one justification for continued support of the activity. The future challenge is to enlist and gain participation from underrepresented groups. Wider participation and opportunity would extend educational advantages to more individuals. As a practical matter, the long-term success of forensics requires that its participation rates reflect the changing dynamic of the population.

Many writers have considered issues of diversity in forensics (Baisinger, 1996; Bile, 1999; Friedley & Manchester, 1985; Griffin & Raider, 1992; Loge, 1991; Logue, 1986; Simerly, 1999; Sowards, 1999b). Suggestions and calls for improvement in forensics that would increase the appeal to various groups have been suggested (Billings, 2000; Pineda, 1999; Simerly, Biles, & Scott, 1992). The critical factor is whether the participants that coach, administrate, and organize such activities feel the need to increase and diversify the participation (Frank, 1997; Fugate, 1997; Stepp, 1997a, 1997b).

The structure and practice of forensics has received much attention as a starting place for change. Negative behaviors in forensics, like sexual harassment and racism, have begun to receive much needed attention and redress (Bjork & Trapp, 1994; Stepp, 2001; Sowards, 1999a; Szepasi, 1994). In addition, the issue of finding new ways of motivating a whole new and different generation of participants requires consideration. Alternative formats and evaluations for speaking informed by work in feminism, for example, may provide the potential to encourage more diverse participation (Bartanen, 1995; Beattie, 1996a, 1996b; Crenshaw, 1996; Lowerie, 1999; Madrid, 1996; Stepp, 1996; Wilkins & Hobbs, 1997). A critical examination of the current assumptions about what factors motivate participation and the need to generate alternative rewards should remain an ongoing consideration by persons in the community.

The problems affecting participation include whether success in forensics reflects overt or subde biases that favor particular groups (Brusche & Johnson, 1994; Hayes & McAdoo, 1972; Hensley & Strother, 1968; Hobbs & Hobbs, 1999; Stepp, Simerly, &
Logue, 1994; Rosen, Dean, & Willis, 1978). The perception that groups are favored or that other persons are disadvantaged becomes a major barrier to participation (Hunt & Simerly, 1999; Murphy, 1989). Given that speech events are not objective, but rather, are evaluated by judges can create a perception of bias (Hunt & Simerly, 2000). The composition of the coaching and judging community in terms of gender and ethnicity should receive attention (Legge, 1999; Leonard, 1996). Additionally, consideration should be given to the professional and personal demands that are characteristic of coaching forensics and whether this element limits the diversity of persons serving in such a mentoring role (Pettus & Danielson, 1994).

Educators involved in forensics should be concerned with the perception that the activity is selective and exclusive and therefore does not welcome diverse participants. The first step, however, is a consideration and examination of the empirical indicators of participation and success and an assessment of whether any perception that forensics is not diverse is accurate (Kay & Aden, 1984; Larson & Vreeland, 1985; Williams, McGee, & McGee, 1999).

The focus for most forensic programs has traditionally been the competitive tournament and that particular format may not promote diversity. The use of alternative formats like campus speech contests represent one possibility to increase and diversify participants (Cates & Eaves, 1996). The focus on "multidimensional" forensic programs provides the potential to generate a sense of accomplishment by envisioning more divergent outcomes for program participants (Derryberry, 1996; Hunt, Sarard, & Simerly, 1999). The development of the Urban Debate League (UDL) provides an alternative use of forensic experience to assist in the development of civic improvement for communities (Wade, 1998). Whether these format differences have or will contribute to diversity in forensic participation remains an unanswered question.

The challenge to the community is simply one of adaptation to the changing dynamics of population change. A critical examination should be made of what motivations exist to encourage persons not traditionally a part of forensics to participate (Hill, 1997; Nadler, 1985). The community may be required to alter formats, rewards, content, or style in an effort to create diversity at many levels. The central issue is creating an activity that will attract and retain participants from a population that is manifesting increasing levels of diversity.

This survey of forensics is intended to assess the level of diversity of current participants across the different forms of forensic participation. A central issue in the academy is the transition from a majority white and male college/university student population to one that includes nonwhites and females. The appeal of competitive forensics seen in the participation rates of white males may not be as great to other groups. As the demographics change, the ability of forensics to remain healthy and a viable activity is questionable if it cannot attract persons of color and women as participants. This survey is an effort to provide a snapshot of the forensics community that may serve an informational function to the leadership in forensics. The survey should provide some information about the level of diversity found in forensic programs nationwide.

Previous surveys have examined specific organizations or national championships. Hunt and Simerly (2000) report the findings of Stepp's surveys of the CEDA national championships that found minority participation rates of 15% (1992), 9% (1993), and 14% (1994). In Stepp and Gardner (2001), overall findings as measured at CEDA Nationals indicate that the level of minority participation has been increasing during the decade of the 1990s. The end of the decade saw a high of 19% in 1998, 17% in 1999, and
15% in 2000. Other surveys similarly have examined either CEDA or another national championship (Friedley & Manchester, 1985; Loge, 1991; Logue, 1991). Another set of studies has not examined participation rates but instead focused on whether minority (or women) participants achieved success (Bruschke & Johnson, 1994; Hayes & McDoo, 1972; Rosen, Dean, & Willis, 1978). One survey of 3 individual events tournaments (Billings, 2000) reported a minority participation rate of 27%. However, 41% of the persons responding to that survey did not answer the question about ethnicity, so the author cautions about the possible application of the results. At the current time there is little information about the rate of participation of groups across the panoply of forensics organizations and opportunities. Most surveys are limited to one form of forensics (usually CEDA) and often only one tournament (the National Championships). The percentage of minority participation is usually reported at over 15%.

One problem of measuring participation in forensics is that the activity can take many forms. Debate has several different manifestations with different organizational norms. National Debate Tournament (NDT) is sponsored as part of the American Forensic Association (AFA), but debate is also the province of the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), the National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), and the American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), to name a few examples. The activity of individual events encompasses a range of speaking contests where a single person speaks in some identified manner (impromptu, extemporaneous, oratory, expository, communication analysis), interprets literature (poetry, prose, dramatic, duo, program oral interpretation, reader’s theatre), and can extend to such events as radio commentary, puppetry and storytelling. In spite of its title, this category includes some instances that are not entirely individual activity, as duo and reader’s theatre involve multiple persons. Mock trial (as well as mock mediation) provides a contest that involves a demonstration of public speaking skill, as well as knowledge about legal issues, and preparation in a formalized situation. Some events are held for entertainment and enlightenment, as well as to provide a forum to demonstrate skills that win trophies and scholarships. In addition, outreach activities to community groups, high schools (including summer workshops), civic, and cultural events can also provide a basis for the application of forensic skills to serve the community (Preston, 1997; Preston & Jensen, 1995).

The structure of forensic organizations varies from institution to institution. In some cases, there are multiple and separate organizations that pursue various avenues of forensics located in the same institution. Funding can come from a variety of methods, depending on whether the organization is a student club, or a departmental, college, or university recognized organization. Flexibility and diversity characterize the state of forensics structure across the various colleges and universities. This flexibility involves how the activity is located within the organization, whether as a student club, something run out of an administrative section, or an activity located in a department, such as pre-law, political science, or communication, to name those most commonly encountered.

The challenge for the forensics community is the inclusion of populations that have not been typically considered a mainstream source of support for public address in the academy. Most prevailing views of public address (as well as the participants examined) have reflected focus on white European males and this historical view has generated the perception of dominance by this group to the exclusion or lack of inclusion of other groups (Nance & Foeman, 1993).

The role of affirmative action (in all its guises) has been a central and controversial
issue in higher education. One consideration is to what extent forensic organizations are required to meet these expectations. An ancillary consideration is whether records are kept on this aspect of the organization. A key element in the evaluation of the effectiveness of diversity efforts or the examination of historical trends is a comparison to various historical records. The lack of records makes any assessment difficult to undertake. One would expect that if asked, those forensic groups asked to maintain records about minority participation would generate a higher participation rate.

Another aspect of diversity in forensics is the degree to which there exists diversity in the college and university. A forensics program could not reflect a diverse set of persons if the student body of the college or university demonstrated little diversity. The members of the program come from the pool of available students; if a student body has few persons of color it is unlikely that the level of diversity found among the participants will be substantially larger. In assessments of diversity a necessary comparison should be to the demographics of the general student body. The question is much like the Title IX questions (those about gender participation and opportunities for athletic competition) asked in terms of the rates of participation of various groups.

A central issue is the motivation for a program to increase and maintain diversity in its participants. If diversity is not measured, expected, rewarded, encouraged, or in some other manner considered in terms of accountability, the probability is that diversity will be less likely to occur. Diversity in participation should be more likely when there is an expectation or requirement that this goal be one sought by the program. The higher the level of accountability, the greater is the expectation that the program will probably contain diversity in its participant population.

**METHODS**

**Survey Questions**

The survey begins with a series of questions designed to elicit information about the institution, the nature of funding, the size of the program, and what methods of success are typically considered when assessing the program. A copy of the survey instrument generating the data used in this report appears in the Appendix. The profile of the institution began with the respondent marking all of the relevant features of the institution: (a) research, (b) teaching, (c) private, (d) public, (e) four year, (f) two year, (g) undergraduate, (h) graduate, (i) land grant, and (j) urban. The respondent then indicated the source and relative amount of funding from: (a) university allocation, (b) college allocation, (c) departmental allocation, (d) student government, (e) endowment, and (f) self-financed. The description of the program included what kinds of activities the program engaged in: (a) debate, (b) individual events, (c) mock trial, (d) outreach, and (e) other. The respondents indicated the size of the team from a 1 (tiny) to 10 (huge) size of program.

The next section of the survey asked about the nature of the evaluation of the program. The respondent was asked to rate on a 1 (not important) to 5 (very important) scale the importance of the following to determining the success of the program: (a) number of awards won, (b) number of participants, (c) number of entries at tournaments, (d) qualifying for national championships, (e) diversity of participants, (f) fund raising, and (g) visibility of the program. The respondents were then asked questions about diversity of participants and whether: (a) they kept records relating to diversity of participants and (b) whether diversity of participants was a criteria used in evaluating the success of the program.

Finally, the participants indicated the level of participation by various groups as a per-
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percentage. The respondents indicated the participation based on gender (male or female). Also, the respondents were asked about participation (as a percentage of the program) based on ethnicity (Native American, Hispanic, African American, European American, and Asian American). The second part of this question asked the participants to indicate whether for each group the representation in forensics matched the representation of the general student body. For groups that were not represented proportionately, the participant was asked to say whether the group was over- or under-represented.

Sample

The sample came from the mailing lists from the following organizations: American Forensic Association (AFA), American Mock Trial Association (AMTA), American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA), Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), Delta Sigma Rho-Tappa Kappa Alpha (DSR-TKA), National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), Phi Kappa Delta (PKD), and Pi Rho Phi (junior college forensic organization). This represents a large cross section of the college and university forensic community. The organizations represent a combination of different approaches to the activity, and in some cases a college or university maintained memberships in several of these organizations simultaneously. A total of 227 responses were received out of the 903 surveys mailed out, for a response rate of 25%.

The decision was made to send only one survey to each program when the program was listed as holding memberships in multiple organizations. However, given that a university may have separately run programs for different activities, a separate survey was sent to those programs offered at the same university but located in different departments, organizations, or places in the college/university. For example, a mock trial program may list the director in the political science department while the CEDA contact person is in the communication department. In that case a survey would have been sent to each person rather than allocating only one survey to the institution. Every effort was made to avoid sending multiple surveys to the same person at an institution.

RESULTS

General Descriptive Statistics Gathered about Forensics Participants

Table 1 provides the raw frequencies for the various responses to the individual questions requesting numerical estimates. The description provides that the institutions involved in forensics are primarily four year
(68%), teaching (73%), undergraduate (81%) institutions. The analysis proceeds to consider the relationship of gender and ethnic/racial diversity to the assorted features of the program. The goal was to examine what kinds of elements of a program are related to various measures of diversity.

Approximately 54% of members of debate teams are female while 46% are male. In individual events the figure favors women by a slightly larger margin, with 58% of the members being female and 42% male. This percentage is a bit different for mock trial, where the percentage is 51% female and 49% male. Overall, directors/coaches/advisers report that women are well represented as participants in forensic activities.

The picture regarding ethnic diversity is different. In activities classified as debate the percentage of European Americans is about 70%, while 10% are Asian Americans, 7% are Hispanic, 7% are African American, 2% are Native American, and 4% are termed other/foreign/unknown. Debate activities are dominated by European Americans; however, minority participation is not insubstantial.

In individual events the percentages are similar, with European Americans represented at 71%; Asian Americans make up 12% of the participants, 7% are Hispanic, 5% are African American, 3% are Native American, and 2% are other/foreign/unknown. The results are consistent with the percentages reported in debate participation.

Mock trial participants demonstrate similar statistics, with 74% of the participants being European Americans, while 11% are Asian Americans, 6% are Hispanic Americans, 6% are African Americans, 1% are Native Americans, and 2% fall into the other/foreign/unknown category. This percentage is similar to the level of participation reported in the other types of programs.

The numbers represent a relatively consistent pattern across the broad types of forensic activities. Basically, the majority of participants are European Americans, but there is a substantial portion of non-white participation, as slightly more than one in four persons involved in the activity is a person of color. Gender participation appears to be relatively equitable in terms of the number of participants. While the distribution of participants varied greatly across the programs surveyed, the activity overall appears to have substantial numbers of women involved.

### Institution Description and Participant Diversity

Table 2 contains the correlation matrix with all the associations between the institu-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>European American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are correlations with decimals omitted. **Bold** indicates the correlation is significant at p < .05. N = 227.
tional descriptions and the reported percentage of participants. A positive correlation indicates that the institutional feature is associated with increased levels of participation while a negative correlation indicates lower levels of participation.

The one pattern observed in the data was that females had lower participation rates at institutions considered: (a) research, (b) private, (c) four-year, (d) graduate, and (e) urban. The indication is that the more “exclusive,” expensive, and less focused on the undergraduate teaching experience the institution is, the fewer the female participants in forensics.

The number of Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans was increased when the institution was considered urban. The number of European Americans was significantly diminished in this case. No feature was found to be relevant to the level of participation for African Americans. These results suggest that diversity for several groups is associated with programs found in urban areas and supports the need to develop Urban Debate Leagues.

**Funding Source and Participant Diversity**

The results of the relationship between the source of funding and diversity of the participants are reported in Table 3. The results demonstrate no real sets of associations. While two correlations are significant (male and department, Hispanic and endowment) the probability of Type I error (false positive) is substantial (probability of 5%) when given the large number of tests conducted. The results basically indicate that the source of funding probably generates little impact on the level of diversity of forensics participants.

**Measures of Success and Participant Diversity**

This section considered whether the determinants of program success were related to the participation rates of various groups. The only significant findings indicated that women were more likely to participate if the size of the program in terms of the number of participants was a criterion for success. Men were less likely to participate on that basis but more likely to make up a majority of the program when outcomes like winning awards and participating in national championships was considered. A correlation matrix is found on Table 4.

The only racial difference was found for Asian Americans, whose rates of participation were reduced when the number of participants and/or issues relating to the number of entries was used as a measure of success for the program. This finding may indicate that success, rather than participation, may be more important to this particular group.
TABLE 4.
MEASURES OF SUCCESS AND PARTICIPANT DIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>European American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>−08</td>
<td>−11</td>
<td>−01</td>
<td>−08</td>
<td>−01</td>
<td>−05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Participants</td>
<td>−13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>−21</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>−14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of entries</td>
<td>−09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>−06</td>
<td>−08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>−16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>−03</td>
<td>−01</td>
<td>−04</td>
<td>−08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>−03</td>
<td>−08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>−07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>−10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>−04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>−04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are correlations with decimals omitted.

**Bold** indicates the correlation is significant at p < .05.

N = 227.

However, for the most part, the type of success measured was not a particularly important predictor of the relative participation rates of the various groups. This finding indicates that the structure of the program evaluation per se is not the basis for the rate of minority participation in the current forensic programs.

**Team Size/Diversity Emphasis and Participant Diversity**

The size of teams as reported by the respondents made only a slight impact; the proportion of women showed a slight decline and the number of Asians dropped as team size increased. However, this is not a particularly large effect; it is not consistent with the expected rise in male percentage and is therefore insignificant. The results for this section appear in Table 5.

The issue of whether diversity is formally assessed and records kept was significantly correlated with diversity in participation. The number of women and most minority groups significantly increased, and the number of men and European participants dropped as a percentage when diversity was formally assessed. The results indicate that the largest set of associations occur when diversity is a criterion for evaluation and records are kept.

**CONCLUSIONS**

As a purely numbers issue, the gender gap for forensics competition is probably closed, but the race/ethnic gap still exists. Nevertheless, this gap should not be viewed as alarming as some persons may represent. The level of minority participation could and probably should be improved, but the level

TABLE 5.
TEAM SIZE/DIVERSITY EMPHASIS AND PARTICIPANT DIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>European American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of Team</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>−02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>−18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity used</td>
<td>−25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>−31</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Records</td>
<td>−40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>−03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>−41</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are correlations with decimals omitted.

**Bold** indicates the correlation is significant at p < .05.

N = 227.
of participation of non-European Americans is over 25% of the participants in any given program. This participation is higher than a number of previous percentages reported in earlier studies. However, this percentage is consistent with the survey by Billings (2000), who reported a minority participation rate of 27%. It should be noted that many of the lower percentage participation rate studies represented national championship participation or were generally restricted to one form of forensics, and that those percentages are usually greater than 15%. Minority participation is forensics is substantial.

The sets of associations conducted on various aspects of programs and the level of diversity in their participants demonstrates a few features of interest. Urban institutions demonstrate higher levels of minority participation, probably reflecting their ability to recruit from more diverse student populations. This feature may indicate that the support of Urban Debate Leagues would benefit programs in the long term. The relatively recent formation of the Urban Debate League means that previous surveys were not able to include or consider this form of forensics.

Probably the most important finding is that when diversity is used as a criterion for program assessment and when records are kept, diversity increases. The results indicate that the more diversity is incorporated as a formal element of the program, the more it is likely that minority representation will increase; additionally, there is a corresponding drop in the percentage of European participation reported. The question of whether minority involvement expands the level of participation or trades off against the number of participants cannot be assessed in this report. The key is to focus on the expansion of the opportunity to participate rather than creating a process that favors any particular group.

This report is unable to assess whether diversity in forensics reflects or leads the diversity growing on college campuses. Diverse forensic participation may simply reflect growing diversity on a given college campus or may be leading that percentage. Understanding that forensic programs with large minority participation may indicate an attraction to the activity for that area could be useful in general minority recruitment to college. Part of the problem is that without a target percentage or standard for comparison, one cannot know whether the 25% figure reported represents success or still indicates a gap that needs to be addressed.

One limitation is that this survey is of directors/coaches/advisers of programs and does not directly measure the level of various forms of participation. Any bias, distortion, or incompleteness on the part of the respondents may make these data not fully representative of the activity. Since there are simply no historical artifacts that can be obtained and compared, it is difficult to determine the relative accuracy of this memory. A number of respondents remarked that the rates of participation vary from year to year dramatically, so any yearly estimate may not be reflective of the entire history of the program. This does not mean that the amount of participation in terms of number of entries or success is balanced. A minority participant may go to only one or two “local” tournaments. This would provide evidence of a more diverse program but a lower level of participation across a season and a lower number of total entries by minority participants across a season. What this would mean is that going to a tournament and examining minority participation rates may show a dramatically different total participation rate than when considering overall participation in a program. Additionally, the size of the program was measured in terms of relative size (tiny to huge) and not by the number of actual participants, so exact numbers of minority participants cannot be provided.

There are several features that this report did not consider that should be addressed by the forensics community: (a) graduate school/coaching/teaching issues, (b) re-
source support differences, and (c) success for competitors. A need to develop more diversity in the graduate student assistant and coaching ranks probably exists. There was no survey information collected about the race/gender of the coaches or graduate assistant coaches. The normal expectation is that as the evolution or inclusion of various groups increases, the result would be a natural process that would reflect increased numbers at the levels of coaching/teaching. However, no real information exists on this issue, and that might be the basis for future empirical research. One interesting aspect of recruiting and retention in the forensics community might involve the degree to which leadership in the activity reflects the same expectations of diversity sought for its participants. The issues raised in the review by Stepp and Gardner (2001) about the decline of women coaches over the last ten years indicates a potential problem not considered in this report that may require examination.

The data in this report sheds light only upon the quality of participation and not the quality of resources or success provided to women/minority groups, however, and a gap in these areas may still exist. No effort was made to assess the quality of the participation in terms of success or the emotional reaction of the participants. An activity may be diverse in its overall participation, but the participants of some particular group could be either less successful or treated differently. For example, the National Football League and college football teams in general have included extremely few African Americans playing the position of quarterback, even though the majority of other positions were filled with a significant number of African Americans. This provides an example of an activity that, even though apparently integrated and, in fact, over-represented by one group, still did not necessarily represent a standard of equality because of internal sets of parameters that foreclosed some opportunities within the activity to participants. No data exists in this report to enable evaluation of the potential of this claim; additional research would be required to evaluate this view.

However, the level of forensics participation by minorities is substantial and should not be underestimated when compared to other university and college organizations and activities. The report presents some interesting conclusions about our enterprise and some challenges that we should consider. A central question is to determine which efforts would increase the level of diversity in participation further. The results indicate that some diversity does exist and that significant numbers of forensic participants do not fit the stereotype of the white male; whether this trend can be continued and the horizons of participation broadened represents an ongoing and fundamental challenge to the community.
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APPENDIX: AFA DIVERSITY SURVEY

1. What kind of Academic mission/setting reflects your institution? (circle all those that apply)
   Research  Teaching  Private  Public  4 year  2 year
   Undergraduate  Graduate  Land Grant  Urban  Other: __________

2. What is the source of financing for your Forensic Program? (please provide approximate percentages in blanks if more than one source)
   ___ University Allocation
   ___ College Allocation
   ___ Department Allocation
   ___ Student Government/Activities
   ___ Endowment income (permanent)
   ___ Self-financed—sales, donations, workshops, tournaments
   ___ Other (please specify)

3. What measures are used to evaluate the success of your program? (rate on a 5 most important to a 1 not important scale)
   ___ number of awards
   ___ number of student participants
   ___ number of tournaments/entries
   ___ representation at national championships
   ___ minority and gender diversity
   ___ fund raising ability
   ___ positive visibility in community/campus
   ___ outreach efforts to high schools (workshops, student recruitment)
   ___ other measures (list them and importance)

4. How large would you describe your Forensics Program on a 10 (huge) to 1 (tiny) program? __________

5. If you were describing your program how would you describe the nature of what your program participates in: (rate on a 100% basis; that is, the percentages total 100)
   ___ Debate (which types)
   ___ Individual Events (list types)
   ___ Mock Trial
   ___ Community and School Outreach (list types)
   ___ Other

6. To what extent is the diversity of participants a criteria on which the program is evaluated? (use a 1 important to 5 not important scale) __________

7. Do you keep any formal records on diversity of the participants in your program?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

8. What percentage of your program is: ___ male ___ female
   ___ Native American  ___ Hispanic American  ___ European American
   ___ Asian American  ___ African American  ___ unknown  ___ Other: ___