

Ethics and Evidence Usage: Current 'Codes' in Individual Events

SHERYL A. FRIEDLEY*

John Dewey in the 1920's suggested that moral rules in America were like castles built in air and had little contact with the affairs of everyday life. "What we need," Dewey said, "is to have these moral principles brought down to the ground, through their statements in social and psychological terms All the rest is mint, anise, and cumin."¹

Introduction

In general, Americans in the 1980's appear to be more concerned than ever with the issue of "ethics" and, as John Dewey stated, the need to have ethical principles "brought down to the ground." This surge of interest in studying moral behavior has led to the development of courses in ethical behavior as well as the development of more explicit codes of conduct in business, professional, and educational settings. It seems only appropriate then that we should explore the ethical nature of forensics, specifically, the ethical standards established by the forensic community for use of evidence in individual events competition. For purposes of this review, evidence will be defined simply as

data, consisting of statements of fact or opinion, which may be transformed into proof through the use of reasoning . . . and is usually attributed to a source other than the speaker.²

**The National Forensic Journal*, 1 (Fall 1983), pp. 109-117. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Louisville, Kentucky, November, 1982.

SHERYL A. FRIEDLEY is Assistant Director of Forensics and Associate Professor of Communication at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia 22030.

¹James Hassett, "Is It Right? An Inquiry Into Everyday Ethics," *Psychology Today*, (June 1981), p. 49.

²David A. Thomas, "The Ethics of Proof in Speech Events: A Survey of Standards Used by Contestants and Judges," *National Forensic Journal*, (Spring 1983), pp 1-2.

Evidence of this nature is typically used in the following original speech events found in national competition: persuasive speaking/oratory, informative speaking/expository, after dinner speaking, rhetorical criticism/communication analysis, extemporaneous speaking, and impromptu speaking. These original events usually require the speaker to posit claims which may be supported by evidence attributed to sources other than the speaker. While evidence used to support claims in literature may also be examined, such evidence usage in individual events will *not* be the focus of this article.

Ethical Use of Evidence in Original Speech Events

Most textbooks which focus on the coaching of individual events address the use of evidence in the original speech events from a "qualitative" rather than an "ethical" perspective. Discussion of evidence usage for specific individual events typically includes a description of the types of supporting evidence available as well as traditional tests of evidence credibility. Discussion of the ethical use of evidence in the original speech events is limited almost exclusively to a discussion of plagiarism. For example, Faules et al. "suggest" that the individual events of extemporaneous speaking and persuasive speaking be evaluated in part by "sure use of supporting material"³ and note that writing the original speech should be the primary responsibility of the student rather than the coach;⁴ the authors provide no clearly-defined guidelines for the ethical use of supporting material in the original speech events. Klopff and Lahmart provide a bit more specificity concerning the ethical use of evidence when they note that "not more than 150 words of quoted material should be used and that direct quotes are set off by quotation marks; plagiarism is forbidden."⁵ In both these noted texts on coaching forensics there is no amplification of the term "plagiarism" or the many variations of willful distortion which may be considered unethical for individual events competition. The bulk of evidence usage discussion in these texts focuses on such concerns in debate competition.

While the textbooks on coaching forensics provide little focus on the ethical use of evidence in original speech events, the forensic community as a whole has clearly demonstrated a concern for the ethics issue. The National Developmental Conference on Forensics

³ Don F. Faules, Richard D. Rieke, and Jack Rhodes, *Directing Forensics* (Denver: Morton Publishing Co., 1976), p. 250.

⁴Faules et al., p. 65

⁵Donald W. Klopff and Carroll P. Lahman, *Coaching and Directing Forensics* (Skokie, 111.: National Textbook Co., 1976), pp. 206-207.

at Sedalia brought forensic scholars together for the purpose of identifying common concerns and establishing common goals for the forensic activity. Among several issues addressed, the conferees offered a resolution which introduced the ethical goal of forensics and role of coaches in furthering this goal. The resolution stated the following philosophy:

Forensics should promote adherence to the ethical and scholarly obligation of the advocate, including respect for the integrity of evidence, accurate representation of the ideas of others, and rigorous examination of beliefs.⁶

This resolution specifically encouraged forensic scholars to pursue an understanding of evidence used to make claims in contest speaking (debate and individual events) and urged forensic contestants to present that evidence in an ethical manner. Addressing the issue of evidence usage in both debate and individual events, the Sedalia Conference offered this resolution:

Evidence should be evaluated not by its quantity, but by its quality determined in part by its credibility and audience acceptability. Thoroughness and care must be exercised in finding, recording, and documenting evidence. Advocates should recognize their ultimate responsibility for all evidence they use, whether discovered by them or by others.⁷

The conference report noted that discussion following this resolution focused on the concern for both inappropriate and inaccurate use of evidence. For the most part, the conferees felt that inaccuracies in evidence usage were the result of carelessness or deliberate distortion. Regardless of intent, however, forensic scholars viewed ethical evidence usage as the responsibility of the individual competitor in contest speaking. In addition, the conferees noted that even if the evidence had been commercially reproduced with inaccuracies, the *user*, is still accountable for its ethical consideration in the contest setting.⁸

⁶James H. McBath, ed., *Forensics as Communication* (Skokie, 111.: National Textbook Co., 1976), p. 16

⁷McBath, p. 33

⁸McBath.

EVIDENCE 'CODES' IN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

Since most forensic textbooks do not address the ethical aspect of evidence usage in original speech events extensively, it seems most appropriate to review the guidelines established by two organizations which offer national competition in these events—the National Forensic Association and the American Forensic Association.

National Forensic Association Code of Ethics: The Rules and Ethics Committee of the National Forensic Association proposed an official "Code of Ethics" which was adopted by the organization in Spring, 1979. Although the document represents an attempt to outline ethical guidelines for the individual events speaker, the only section of the code which specifically addresses the use of evidence focuses on the authorship of supporting material. The National Forensic Association codes states the following:

.. . those portions of any research speech which are the ideas or actual words of any other author than the competitor should be credited to the actual author.⁹

While this specific guideline focuses solely on the issue of plagiarism, there is little amplification of the term "plagiarism" or the many variations of willful distortion which may also be considered unethical for contest speaking. Further, the organization offers no specific guidelines for documenting evidence used in the speech; specifically, to what extent source citations should occur in the text of the speech itself. This ethics document governs evidence usage only at "Individual Events Nationals" hosted by the National Forensic Association and the Executive Council of that organization holds the exclusive right to disqualify any student who violates this code.

American Forensic Association Code of Ethics: The American Forensic Association Professional Relations Committee recently revised the "Code of Forensic Program and Forensic Tournament Standards for Colleges and Universities." Article II entitled "Competition Practices" outlines perhaps the most detailed set of ethical standards for evidence usage in contest speaking proposed by any forensic organization. This code, published in June, 1982, focuses on *three* major issues: fabrication, distortion, and plagiarism. The revised text outlines the following definitions and guidelines for the contest speaking in both debate and individual events:

⁹Report of the National Forensic Association Rules and Ethics Committee, adopted at the National Forensic Association's National Individual Events Tournament, April, 1979.

1. Forensics competitors shall not use fabricated or distorted evidence.
 - A. *Evidence* is defined as factual material (statistics and examples, and/or opinion testimony offered as proof of a debater's or a speaker's contention, claim, position, argument, point or case.
 - B. *Fabrication of evidence* refers to falsely representing a cited fact or statement of opinion as evidence when the material in question is not authentic. Fabricated evidence is so defined without reference to whether or not the debater or speaker using it was the person responsible for fabricating it.
 - C. *Distorted evidence* refers to misrepresenting the actual or implied, content of factual or opinion evidence. Distorted evidence is so defined without reference to whether or not the debater or speaker using it was the person responsible for distorting it. Distortions include, but are not limited to:
 - (1) quoting out of context.
 - (2) misrepresenting the evidence so as to alter its meaning.
 - (3) omitting salient information from quotations or paraphrases. ML A Standards will be considered advisory with respect to this standard.
 - (4) adding words to a quotation which were not present in the original source of the evidence without identifying such an addition.
 - (5) failure to provide complete documentation of the evidence (name of author(s), source of publication, full date, page numbers and author(s) credentials where available in the original) when challenged. Debaters and speakers are expected to be in possession of the forms of documentation listed here at the time they used any evidence which was challenged.
2. In individual events which involve original student speech compositions, (oratory/persuasion, informative/expository, after-dinner/epideictic, rhetorical criticism, impromptu, and extemporaneous or other

similar speaking contests), the speaker shall not commit plagiarism.

- A. *Plagiarism* is defined as claiming another's written or spoken words as one's own, or claiming as one's own a significant portion of the creative work of another.
 - B. A speech in individual events competition is considered plagiarized when the student presenting it was not the principal person responsible for research, drafting, organizing, composing, refining and generally constructing the speech in question.
3. Forensics competitors are expected to do their own research.
- A. Persons other than the forensic competitor (undergraduate students, graduate students or instructor/coaches) are not to be charged with the responsibility for doing a forensics competitor's research.
 - B. This provision shall not be construed to prevent coaches or assistants from engaging in limited research designed to:
 - (1) teach research techniques
 - (2) provide limited examples of high school quality research
 - (3) identify areas of research which students should pursue, and
 - (4) provide the coach with the working knowledge necessary to function as effective critic with respect to the debate or speech topics being investigated by his/her students.¹⁰

Thus, this revised code established specific guidelines for governing ethical evidence usage surrounding the issues of evidence fabrication, evidence distortion, and plagiarism. With these guidelines clearly defined, Article V of the code then proceeds to outline the penalties for violators:

3. In instances of evidence distortion and/or fabrication, the judge(s) shall automatically award the decision

¹⁰“American Forensic Association Professional Relations Committee Code of Forensics Program and Forensics Tournament Standards for Colleges and Universities,” *AFA Newsletter*, June, 1982, pp. 12-13.

in the debate to the opposing team and give the offending speaker zero speaker points, noting the violation of the rules of evidence on the ballot as the reason for the judges' decision and points. In individual events, the judge(s) will treat evidence distortion and/or fabrication by giving the offending speaker zero points and by dropping that speaker from the speaker rankings to be assigned at the end of the round. The judge(s) shall note the violation of the rules of evidence on the ballot as the reason for the points and no-rank given.

4. Speakers found guilty of plagiarism will be disqualified from the round in which plagiarism occurred, with zero speaker points and no rank assigned and plagiarism noted on the ballot as the reason for the judge's action.
5. A judge who makes a decision on the basis of evidence distortion, evidence fabrication or plagiarism will immediately report his/her action to the tournament director. The tournament director will, as soon as possible, investigate the incident and determine if the offending speaker should be declared ineligible for further competition, elimination rounds or awards at the tournament. Directors should base such decisions on the severity of the case involved.
6. Tournament directors must report, to the Chair of the PRC, any and all instances of judge decisions granted for reasons of evidence distortion, evidence fabrication or plagiarism. If the Chair receives, in any given academic year, two such complaints involving the same student, the student will be declared ineligible for national competitions or awards sponsored in whole or in part by the AFA for a period of 12 calendar months from the date of the second offense. The student will be informed when notification of the second offense is received. The student has the right to appeal that the penalty should not be imposed, under the appeal procedures outlined in Article IV, Section 4 of the code. Notice of the student's ineligibility for national competitions sponsored by the AFA will appear in the AFA newsletter, with a letter by the AFA President sent to appropriate officials at the offending student's school.¹¹

¹¹AFA Newsletter, p. 14.

Penalties outlined by the American Forensic Association Code of Ethics concerning evidence usage clearly address the student in question and may include implications for the offending student's coach and school. Beyond disqualification from regional and national tournament competition, public notification in the *AFA Newsletter* and to "appropriate school officials" may hold additional ramifications for those who surround the competitor.

Conclusion

The growing concern over ethical behavior and specifically the ethical use of evidence in contest speaking is apparent. Thomas R. Nilson in his book *Ethics of Speech Communication* reinforced the ethical obligations of communicators when he wrote the following:

Every act of speech is essentially a social act, influencing the attitudes or behaviors of the receivers. Therefore, rather than attempting to divide communication into moral and nonmoral, we will think of every communicative act as having an ethical component — as carrying some degree of ethical charge. Virtually every act of speech, then, involves an ethical obligation.¹²

For forensic educators there are three specific ethical obligations which become apparent. First, it is the obligation of the forensic community to outline those "ethical guidelines" of the contest speaker in individual events as specifically as possible. Efforts such as those by the American Forensic Association's Professional Relations Committee to define and specify unethical evidence usage as well as outline specific penalties for such ethical violations in the competitive setting should be applauded. Identifying and encouraging positive, appropriate, ethical behavior as well as identifying and discouraging negative, inappropriate, and unethical behavior in individual events competition is essential if we are to educate our speech competitors on ethical issues. Second, individual events educators must be willing to examine the uses of evidence in the competitive setting to assess the extent of ethical abuses. While debate educators have been willing to undertake such study over the years,¹³ individual events research in this area has been extremely

¹²Thomas R. Nilson, *Ethics of Speech Communication* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1966), p. 12.

¹³See for example Donald Klopff and James C. McCroskey, "Ethical Practices in Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, (January 1964), pp. 5-7; Robert P. Newman and Keith R. Sanders, "A Study of the

limited.¹⁴ Finally, forensic educators and critics must be willing to hold student competitors accountable for their ethical choices concerning evidence usage. While questions of ethical evidence usage are difficult to confront when suspected violations occur, ethical standards become innocuous if they are ignored. As growth in this activity occurs, a heightened awareness of professional and ethical standards upheld by the organizations which support the activity is essential.

Integrity of Evidence," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, (January 1965), pp. 7-13; Keith R. Sanders, "Toward a Solution to the Misuse of Evidence," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, (January 1966), pp. 6-10; James A. Benson, "The Use of Evidence in Intercollegiate Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, (Spring 1971), pp. 260-270.

¹⁴This author could locate only one such study reported by Robert L. Frank in a paper entitled "Use and Abuse of Evidence: NFA Persuasion Finals, 1981" presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Louisville, Kentucky, November, 1982. A revised version of this paper immediately precedes this article.