

Communication Analysis: A Survey Research Report

SUZANNE LARSON*

Communication analysis/rhetorical criticism¹ (subsequently referred to as communication analysis) is a new and growing intercollegiate forensic event.² Generally, a communication analysis is a "meta-communication," a speech analyzing or describing important factors influencing a communication experience. Partly due to the relative youth of the event and partly due to its status as a twig in the family tree of rhetorical criticism, communication analysis has spawned little academic interest until recent years. But even with a growing interest in communication analysis, many competitors have encountered problems interpreting what the event is designed to accomplish and determining the standards used to evaluate the event.

Individuals who have written about communication analysis recognize the problems resulting from not knowing the purposes and standards of the event. McCorkle described what she saw as "a knowledge or opinion gap between speaker and audience/judge."³ Thompson tended to agree on this point and delineated five common problems in communication analysis. First, he wrote, speakers tend to over-emphasize form at the expense of substance; second, communication analysts typically distribute their time

**The National Forensic Journal*, III (Fall 1985), pp. 140-153.

SUZANNE LARSON is Director of Forensics at Southern Utah State College, Cedar City 84720.

The author wishes to thank Sean Patrick O'Rourke who assisted in the collection of data for this study and for reviewing early drafts of the manuscript.

¹The American Forensic Association event is entitled communication analysis, while the National Forensic Association event is called rhetorical criticism. Although they are definitionally somewhat different, both generally are accepted as the same event.

²A review of Jack Howe's compilation of *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results* shows significant growth in offerings of the event at tournaments in recent years. In 1969-70 only eleven tournaments offered some type of criticism event while ten years later 125 forensic tournaments included the event on their roster. See Jack H. Howe and Jack St. Clair, eds., *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results*, Vol. 19 (Long Beach, C A.: 1979-80), p. 19.

³Suzanne McCorkle, "What Place Do Rhetorical Criticism and Communication Analysis Have in the New Forensics Decade?" *The Forensic*, 68 (Fall 1982), p. 19.

poorly; third, speakers demonstrate at best a superficial grasp of the chosen methodology; fourth, no explanation of the reason for choosing a particular method is given; finally, most speakers simply attempt to accomplish too much.⁴

Interestingly enough, both McCorkle and Thompson assumed that the problems in communication analysis lay with the student competitor for not preparing a proper speech rather than with the nature of the event itself. Both authors also assumed that other forensic critics look at the same characteristics of a communication analysis as they do. This assumption has yet to be tested. Furthermore, both authors seem to expect student speakers to know what constitutes a good communication analysis. Yet, limited resources exist for students to discover this information.⁵

Hahn and Gustainis, on the other hand, indicted the tournament practice of rhetorical criticism because it bore "little resemblance to the academic discipline which also goes by that name." They contended that "rhet crit" is not analytical, judgmental, or contextual.⁶ However, these charges assumed *a priori* that the objectives and practices of contest speaking should be equal to the academic discipline of rhetorical criticism.

Benoit rejected Hahn and Gustainis' comparison of tournament rhet crit to the academic discipline of rhetorical criticism. He recognized that competitive rhetorical criticism is simply not professional rhetorical criticism and should not be condemned "for not having fully met standards not meant for their educational activity."⁷ Similarly, Dean and Benoit argued that scholarly and competitive rhetorical criticism are different species: "They are, quite simply put, different games with different rules and different players."⁸

⁴Wayne N. Thompson, "The Contest in Rhetorical Criticism," *The Forensic* 66 (Winter 1981) pp. 17-19.

⁵There are a few articles where competitors can turn for information. See Dan F. Hahn and J. Justin Gustainis, "Rhet Crit: Its Not Rhetorical Criticism," *The Forensic* 68 (1982), pp. 13-17; William L. Benoit, "Response to Hahn and Gustainis," *The Forensic* 68 (1983), pp. 3-5; Kevin D. Dean and William L. Benoit, "Judging Standards in Rhetorical Criticism: A Categorical Content Analysis of Rhetorical Criticism Ballots," *National Forensic Journal* 2 (1984), pp. 99-108; Deborah M. Geisler, "Rhetorical Criticism as an Individual Event: Current Practices and Concerns," *The Forensic* 70 (1984), pp. 1-5; and Brenda J. Logue, "In What Ways is Argument Applied in the Prepared Speech Events?" *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation*, George Ziegelmüller and Jack Rhodes, eds., (Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1981), pp. 384-94.

⁶Hahn and Gustainis, pp. 13.

⁷Benoit, pp. 3-5.

⁸Dean and Benoit.

The blame for some of the problems in communication analysis has been heaped on the shoulders of coaches and judges. Hahn and Gustainis, and to some extent McCorkle, believed that the problems in communication analysis exist because judges and coaches do not understand rhetorical criticism and can not coach or judge the speeches they hear.⁹ Basing their judgment on personal experiences and observations, Hahn and Gustainis asserted that a polished, well-delivered speech frequently is rewarded more favorably than a speech with superior content.¹⁰

Regardless of who is to blame for the problems in communication analysis, the student for not properly preparing the speech, the coach for not fully understanding rhetorical criticism, or the judge for expecting too much in a ten-minute speech, the fact still remains that students who compete in the event can not find a set of guidelines directing their composition of a communication analysis speech. At this point, no research has quantified the goals of communication analysis and the standards for evaluating communication analysis. Instead, students find many contradicting opinions and assumptions.¹¹ Since there appear to be some fundamental pedagogical questions raised concerning the event, additional research on communication analysis is desirable, especially research which evaluates the goals and standards for the event.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was to conduct a survey of competitors and judges attending the April, 1983 American Forensic Association National Individual Events Tournament held in Ogden, Utah on the campus of Weber State College. A survey of the opinions of judges and competitors seemed to be an excellent starting place in order to better understand the necessary and sufficient conditions for competing effectively in communication analysis. Two research questions were posed: (1) What are the important dimensions used to evaluate communication analysis? (2) Are these dimensions the same for judges and competitors?

INSTRUMENT DESIGN AND ADMINISTRATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

The final survey instrument was generated through two separate projects. First, an initial questionnaire was completed by critics

⁹Hahn and Gustainis, pp. 14-5; see also McCorkle, p. 19.

¹⁰Hahn and Gustainis, pp. 16-7.

¹¹See Norbert H. Mills, "Judging Standards in Forensics: Toward a Uniform Code in the 80s," *National Forensic Association Journal*, 1 (Spring 1983), p. 19.

and competitors at two of the nine AFA-NIET district tournaments.¹² A total of 36 surveys were completed by the competitors and the critics. The purpose of the initial survey was to generate the questions for the final questionnaire.

On the initial survey, respondents were asked to list the criteria they felt were important when judging (or writing) a communication analysis. Next, the respondents were asked to mark which criteria on their list applied specifically to communication analysis as opposed to other competitive individual events. Finally, the subjects were asked to list the similarities and differences between a communication analysis speech and a rhetorical criticism paper.

Based on the initial questionnaire, the most frequently listed criteria were selected for the final survey instrument. Analysis of the first survey revealed 15 dimensions which critics and competitors felt were important when evaluating (writing) a communication analysis speech. The criteria included: in-depth analysis, organization, significance of topic (subject matter), language choice, explanation of the analytic method, effective delivery, justification of the rhetorical importance of the event being analyzed, use of outside sources for proof or documentation, critique of the usefulness of the analytic method, justification of the analytic method used for analysis, proper support (illustration) material, an appropriate analysis, justification of the topic selected, an outline of the unique insights on the topic discovered through the analysis, and reliance on a script. Although language choice, effective delivery, and use of documentation are useful dimensions when evaluating other competitive forensic speeches, the judges and competitors felt these dimensions also held special significance for communication analysis.

The second method used to generate the dimensions on the final survey instrument was a review of the communication analysis ballots filled out by critics at the AFA-NIET District I tournament held at Fresno, California. Sixty-four ballots were checked in order to verify the importance of the dimensions generated from the analysis of the first survey. All 15 dimensions were mentioned frequently on the ballots reviewed. Based on the ballot review, one final dimension—an objective analysis—was added to the list bringing the total to 16 dimensions for the final survey instrument.

¹²District 1 (California) and District 2 (Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana) were the two districts surveyed. The District 1 tournament was held in Fresno, California on the campus of the California State University March 19-20, 1983. The District 2 tournament was held in Walla Walla, Washington on the campus of Whitman College March 19-20, 1983.

The 16 dimensions were then phrased into declarative sentences and a seven-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, was printed below each dimension. In addition to the 16 dimensions, the final survey instrument contained five open-ended questions: What is the purpose of communication analysis? How well are speakers meeting the purpose of communication analysis? How can the event of communication analysis be improved? What are the similarities between a communication analysis and a criticism paper? What are the differences between a communication analysis and a criticism paper?

The final survey was administered to competitors in communication analysis and judges critiquing speeches at the 1983 AFA-NIET. Three-hundred-and-seventeen students from 80 universities and colleges within the United States competed at the tournament. Surveys were given to the 30 competitors in communication analysis during the first round of competition in communication analysis by one of the two judges evaluating their speeches. The judge was given written instructions to give a copy of the survey to each competitor and either collect the form from the competitor or have the competitor return the survey to the information table.

All critics judging in the fourth round of the tournament had a survey attached to their ballot. Critics not judging in round four but evaluating speeches in round five had a survey attached to their fifth round ballot. The judges were requested to complete the survey and return it to the information table (ballot table) at the tournament. The survey was administered on the first day of the three-day tournament in order to give respondents sufficient time to complete the survey.

A total of 64 surveys were returned which were completed properly. Students completed 22 surveys, a return rate of 73% and critics filled out 42, a return rate of 42%. All responses to the open-ended questions were coded using the technique of tri-validation. The tri-validation procedure involves three people reviewing all of the open-ended responses, discussing the response, and then agreeing on how the responses should be coded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Twelve of the 16 statements evaluated by judges responding to the survey received a mean of at least 5.0 (see Table 1). Of the 16 statements evaluated by the judges, nine statements had a mean score of 6.0 or higher. The statement "A student should explain properly the analytic method used in the analysis" received the highest score with a mean of 6.63. Two questions, "A speaker

should use outside sources for proof or documentation" and "A clear organization is important in communication analysis" followed closely with a mean of 6.52 and 6.48 respectively. Similarly, organization and the proper use of documentation were evaluated favorably. The statement "A student should analyze appropriately the topic in communication analysis" received a score of 6.31 while the statement "Proper support (illustration) material is important in communication analysis" scored equally well with a mean of 6.19. Judges, therefore, placed importance on organizing and use of evidence when explaining a communication phenomenon. "Effective delivery is important in communication analysis," and

TABLE 1
MEAN SCORES AND RANKINGS OF
COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS DIMENSIONS

MEAN SCORES AND RANKINGS			
Dimensions	Judge	Competitor	Combined
Use of outside sources for proof	6.52 (2)	6.63 (2)	6.56
Appropriate analysis	6.31 (4)	6.67 (1)	6.42
Explanation of the analytic method	6.63 (1)	6.31 (4)	6.42
Clear organization	6.48 (3)	5.95 (6)	6.29
Proper support (illustration) material	6.19(5)	6.32 (3)	6.23
Significance of topic (subject matter)	6.02 (8)	6.00 (5)	6.01
Effective delivery	6.07 (6.5)	5.86 (7)	6.00
Justification of the analytic method	6.07 (6.5)	5.54 (11)	5.89
In-depth analysis	5.90(11)	5.68 (8)	5.82
Justification of rhetorical importance	6.00 (9)	5.50 (12)	5.82
Language choice	5.69 (12)	5.63 (9.5)	5.67
Unique insights	5.95 (10)	5.04 (14)	5.64
Justify selected topic	5.41 (13)	5.18(13)	5.33
Reliance on script	4.76 (14)	5.63 (9.5)	5.06
Critique of usefulness of analytic method	4.80 (15)	4.81 (15)	4.81
Objective (detached) analysis	4.27 (16)	4.36 (16)	4.30

(Number in parenthesis is ranking of the dimensions based on mean score.)

"A speaker should justify the selection of the analytic method in communication analysis" each had a mean score of 6.07. Finally the last two statements receiving ratings above 6.0 were "A speaker should justify the significance of topic (subject matter)," and "A speaker should justify the rhetorical (communication) importance of the event being analyzed" which received a mean score of 6.02 and 6.00 respectively.

Four of the 16 statements evaluated in the survey fell within the range of 5.0 to 5.9. The statement, "Students should note the unique insight on the topics discovered from the analysis" received a mean score of 5.95. "An in-depth analysis is important in communication analysis" scored 5.90, and "Choice of language is important in communication analysis," scored 5.69. The final statement falling in the 5.0-5.9 range, "A speaker should justify the topic selection in communication analysis," scored 5.41.

Only three statements received a mean of less than 5.0. Although judges viewed delivery as an important dimension in giving a communication analysis speech, they rated the statement "Students should rely on a script in communication analysis" less favorably. This dimension received a mean of 4.76. "A critique of the usefulness of the analytic method is important," received a 4.80 mean and "Students need to be objective (detached) when doing a communication analysis," scored 4.27.

Statements receiving a mean of at least 6.0 were perceived as being very important dimensions and, thus, should receive careful attention by students who write communication analyses. The statements falling in the 5.0-5.9 range, likewise, appear to be important dimensions to incorporate into a communication analysis. However, the statements receiving scores in the 4.0-4.9 range appear to be less important requirements and, therefore, students might choose to integrate these objectives if time permits or only after satisfying the other requirements.

Any discussion of standards for evaluating communication analysis would not be complete without discussing the competitors' view. Competitors gave five of the 16 dimensions mean scores of 6.0 or higher; nine of the dimensions received scores of 5.0 or better, while only two dimensions fell within the 4.0-4.9 range. However, an important question arises, Do competitors and judges agree in the ranking of the 16 dimensions?

Judges and competitors' ratings of the 16 dimensions differed in some respects when compared in an analysis-of-variance test. (See Table 2). A significant difference was found on two items: "Students should note the unique insights discovered from the analysis,"

(<.03); and "Students should rely on a script in communication analysis" (<.037). The results of the analysis-of-variance test, therefore, indicates that judges require a competitor to note the unique insights on the topic discovered through their criticism more often, while students place less importance on this point. On the other hand, judges are more liberal than students in permitting competitors to use a manuscript in competition.

TABLE 2

COMPARISONS OF CRITICS AND COMPETITORS RATINGS

DIMENSIONS	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
Use of outside sources for proof	.444	.508
Appropriate analysis	2.109	.152
Explanation of the analytic method	1.697	.204
Clear organization	1.853	.178
Proper support (illustration) material	.160	.691
Significance of the topic (subject matter)	.004	.951
Effective delivery	.324	.571
Justification of the analytic method	1.766	.189
In-depth analysis	.389	.535
Justification of the rhetorical importance of the event	1.604	.210
Language choice	.014	.906
Unique insights	4.946	.030
Justify the selected topic	.335	.565
Reliance on script	4.542	.037
Critique of usefulness of analytic method	.000	.984
Objective (detached) analysis	.038	.845

In order to determine if judges and competitors viewed communication analysis similarly the rank ordering of the 16 dimensions for both the judges and competitors was compared. The mean scores for each of the dimensions were used to determine the ranking. The highest mean score was given a rank of first, the second highest was ranked second, and so on (see Table 1).

A number of conclusions can be drawn from a comparison of the ranking. First, the computation of Spearman's coefficient of rank-order correlation was significant at the .01 level. Competitors and judges, overall then, differed in their opinions as to the rank ordering of the 16 dimensions. The largest differences, at least four rankings, were found on three dimensions, reliance on a script, the

need to justify the analytic method, and noting the unique insights learned from the analysis (see Table 3). Competitors placed more importance on not using a script while judges saw a greater need for speakers to justify the chosen analytic method and noting the unique insights discovered from the analysis.

TABLE 3

COMPARISONS OF CRITICS AND COMPETITORS RANKINGS

DIMENSION	JUDGE	COMPETITOR	DIFF.
Appropriate Analysis	4	1	3
Use of outside sources for proof	2	2	0
Proper support (illustration) material	5	3	2
Explanation of the analytic method	1	4	-3
Significance of topic (subject matter)	8	5	3
Clear organization	3	6	-3
Effective delivery	6.5	7	-0.5
In-depth analysis	11	8	3
Language choice	12	9.5	2.5
Reliance on script	14	9.5	4.5
Justification of the analytic method	6.5	11	-4.5
Justification of rhetorical importance of the event	9	12	-3
Justify the selected topic	13	13	0
Unique insights	10	14	-4
Critique of usefulness of analytic method	15	15	0
Objective (detached) Analysis	16	16	0

Although not as large, other differences in rankings surfaced. An explanation of the analytic method, the dimension with the largest mean for judges, was ranked fourth by competitors. While an appropriate analysis, ranked first by competitors, placed fourth on the judges list. Since all four of these dimensions received means of over 6.0 by both the competitors and judges, speakers should insure that they incorporate the dimensions into their speeches. Even so, the rank ordering does reveal that students and competitors do not

place equal value on each of the dimensions.

Similarly, differences of at least three rankings occurred on the dimensions of significance of the topic, in-depth analysis, clear organization, and justifying the rhetorical importance of the topic. Competitors placed more weight on the first two dimensions while judges ranked the last two higher.

Although significant differences in the rankings of various dimensions surfaced, judges and competitors ranked four dimensions the same. Use of outside sources placed second on both the judges' and competitors' list. Justification of the selected topic ranked thirteenth. Critique of the usefulness of the analytic tool placed fifteenth, and finally, an objective (detached) analysis was ranked last by both the judges and the competitors. Competitors and judges, thus, seemed to agree more on dimensions which were deemed less important.

Respondents, on the other hand, had more difficulty in agreeing on what constituted the goals or purposes of communication analysis. Answers to the open-ended questions on the survey indicated that neither critics nor students agreed as to the purpose of communication analysis. Respondents saw 13 different reasons or goals for competing in the event. Not one of the 13 thirteen responses received a majority (over 50%). The responses mentioned most frequently to the question "What is the purpose of communication analysis?" included: to critically analyze rhetoric (43.8%); to apply a tool to a rhetorical event (20.3%); to show why rhetoric is significant (17.2%); to provide a training ground to study rhetorical principles (14.1%); to judge success/no success of rhetoric (12.5%); and to reveal new insights into rhetoric (12.5%). As can be seen, there was little agreement as to what constitutes the purpose or goal of communication analysis.

The confusion over the purpose of communication analysis might explain why the question "How well are speakers meeting the purpose of communication analysis?" received a low rating. Only 3.1% of those questioned felt that communication analysis deserved a superior rating and 10.9% of those surveyed awarded communication analysis an excellent rating. However, over 62% of the respondents evaluated communication analysis with either a good rating (37.5%) or a poor rating (25.0%).

This low evaluation might be due to a number of reasons. First, the confusion over the purpose of the event might be one explanation. Since respondents had some difficulty determining the purpose of communication analysis, they may have a corresponding difficulty determining whether the event as practiced meets the

goals. This indeed may have been the case since over 14.1% of the respondents failed to answer the question.

A second explanation for the low evaluation of communication analysis might lay with the competitors. Many judges felt that students needed to improve the analysis in their speeches. Justifying their low evaluations, respondents generally saw two weaknesses in the speeches they heard or judged in competition: first, competitors superficially analyze the data; and second, competitors do not apply their method(s) effectively to the facts under investigation. Thus, Thompson's indictment that speakers demonstrate a superficial grasp of the chosen methodology and Hahn and Gustainis' claim that "rhet crit" is not analytical were views commonly held by the competitors and critics who responded to the survey.

A third explanation as to why communication analysis did not receive a favorable evaluation might lay in the confusion between the differences between a competitive communication analysis and a scholarly rhetorical criticism. Responses to the question "What are the similarities between communication analysis and a criticism paper?" revealed that the judges and competitors saw the communication analysis speech and the criticism paper as similar. Specifically, respondents saw the purpose of the criticism paper and communication analysis as the same. Also, respondents indicated that both the paper and the speech relied on similar methods, topics, and documentation. In fact, a few respondents reported that there was minimal if any difference between the event of communication analysis and a criticism paper. As a result, many judges hold competitors to the compositional standards of a professional criticism and evaluate the speeches accordingly.

There were some competitors and judges who did view the paper and speech as different. Responses to the question "What are the differences between communication analysis and a criticism paper?" revealed four differences.¹³ First, a communication analysis is delivered orally where a criticism paper is written. Second, the length of time allotted for analysis differs dramatically since a criticism paper could run as long as thirty pages while a communication analysis is only a ten-minute speech, or about five pages in length. Third, due to the difference in the time allocation, respondents felt the paper and speech differed in type and quantity of analysis. A communication analysis was perceived as being

¹³In all instances Benoit's careful explanation of the differences between a communication analysis and a rhetorical criticism paper were confirmed.

more descriptive and less evaluative than a criticism paper. A criticism paper, on the other hand, employed a greater depth of analysis, and used better documentation (supportive material) than a speaker could. Finally, respondents saw a difference in the requirements for audience adaptation. Competitors in communication analysis have to confront the problem of adapting every round to a changing audience where authors of criticism papers do not have to worry about this requirement as much.

Finally, the third explanation for why communication analysis received such a low rating might be because participants and critics expect more than what is physically possible given the current time constraints of the event. As one respondent noted: "Communication analysis is similar to the oral presentation of a paper at a convention." An oral presentation at a convention can only be a skeletal outline of a much longer and more detailed paper. Likewise, a speaker delivering a communication analysis must also provide only the bare essentials of an analysis and can not afford the luxuries that a longer paper offers.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE EVENT

Even though there was little agreement as to the goals of communication analysis, a number of specific changes might be made which would improve the quality of the event (see Table 4). When asked the question "How can the event of communication analysis be improved?" over twenty suggestions were given by the respondents. The suggestions ranged from changing the rules for the event to improving judging standards. Some of the more popular suggestions offered for improving communication analysis included encouraging more students to participate in the event, providing the competitors with the necessary background in rhetorical and communication theory in order to compete in the event, and lengthening the time limits for the event. In the main, implementation of these suggestions falls on the shoulders of the advisors of forensic programs. Forensic educators need to encourage students to enter the event and, hopefully, with increased participation, the quality of the speeches, in turn, will improve. Forensic advisors, additionally, need to supply their students with better detailed information on how to complete a communication criticism.

Respondents also believed changing judging standards would improve the event. One person thought evaluating a manuscript as opposed to a speech would be a good idea. Others wanted critics to maintain an open and unbiased point of view and apply strict but

TABLE 4
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING
COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS

SUGGESTIONS	TIMES RECOMMENDED
Improving the judging	8
Judges have open attitude	1
Judges follow consistent standards	2
Judges have better knowledge of judging standards	2
Careful judge selection (competence)	3
Improving the coaching	31
Need better coaching	5
Coaches encourage participation	13
Write more journal articles on the event	1
Better education in rhetorical theory	9
Clear up memorized/script confusion	3
Improving the competition	15
Analytic tool (model) fit the event	1
More analysis needed in speeches	5
Justify rhetorical significance	1
Better topics and research	4
Improve presentational skills	4
General problems/changes to improve the event	34
Judge manuscripts	2
Change evaluation format	1
Limit the scope (approaches) to the event	6
Scope too broad	7
Clearly define event	4
Longer time limits	8
Limit event to experienced speakers	2
Offer event at more tournaments	3
Eliminate the event	1

consistent standards when evaluating a communication analysis. In addition to offering suggestions for improving the judging of the event, some respondents felt the purpose and rules for communication analysis were not clear. For example, the difference between rhetorical criticism and communication analysis needed

clarification. Also, there was significant confusion as to whether a script should be memorized or whether it is appropriate to read the speech from a manuscript. Obviously, forensic educators need to clarify the purpose and the intent of the event.

Finally, other suggestions for improving the event were even more dramatic. One respondent wanted only advanced students to compete in communication analysis. Others argued for a limit on the methods (approaches) from which students could choose to complete their analysis and one respondent recommended eliminating the event.

CONCLUSIONS

This study does not purport to establish definitive criteria by which communication analysis must be judged, nor does it claim to provide an exhaustive list of the alternatives available to remedy the ills of the event. Yet the study offers forensic educators and competitors several guidelines for completion of a successful communication analysis. Special emphasis should be placed on using outside sources and sufficient documentation, appropriately analyzing the topic, explaining the analytic method used in the analysis, organizing the speech, and selecting a significant topic when composing a communication analysis. Speakers should discuss the usefulness of the analytic tool only if the specifications noted above have been met and time remains for further analysis. Additionally, critics should strive to create and apply a consistent set of standards when judging communication analysis. Finally, forensic educators need to continue their explorations for creative and innovative means of offering the event which would enhance the student's ability to analyze rhetorical events and the critic's ability to judge the analysis.

This study, therefore, provides but a first step toward an improved communication analysis event. Further progress will be made only if forensic educators and competitors alike continue their efforts to make communication analysis a positive component of the overall forensic experience.