AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE NUMBER OF SPEAKERS AND SPEAKER POSITION ON THE RESULTS OF INDIVIDUAL EVENTS CONTESTS HELD AT THE 1967 WESTERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION TOURNAMENT

by

Donald Jay Rybacki

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1968

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgement the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Donald Jay Rybacki

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

James W. Davis
JAMES W. DAVIS
Assistant Professor of Speech

July 19, 1968
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the members of the tournament committee at the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament for their assistance, especially Professors Rex Robinson, Robert Boren, Don Douglas, and Paul Winters. The author is especially grateful to Dr. James W. Davis who directed this study. His guidance and advice proved indispensable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study was concerned with the effect of speaker position on a judge's evaluation of the contestants in an individual events contest. A number of rounds containing four, five, and six speakers to which speakers were randomly assigned and in which they were randomly placed in a speaking position were selected from the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament. Each group of rounds containing a different number of speakers were tested with Chi-square to determine the extent to which the distribution of awards conformed to a hypothesized ideal award distribution. Next, the actual award distribution among rounds of various sizes was analyzed with Chi-square to uncover any changes in that distribution. As a result of this analysis, it was concluded that as the number of speakers in a round increases from four to six the effect of speaker position on a judge's decision is diminsihed. Second, that any speaker position effect that does exist is one of recency not primacy. Finally, it was concluded that in the long run the results of individual events contests are not greatly affected by any speaker position bias.

CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM

Forensics tournaments seem to be growing at an unprecedented rate both in terms of participants and actual numbers. The administrative practices common to almost all of these tournaments have been the subject of considerable discussion and controversy among both directors of forensics and their students as well. In the area of forensic practices, perhaps no subject is more controversial than that of the effect of speaker position on a judge's evaluation of the participants in an individual events contest. The research reported here centers on this problem. The purpose of this first chapter is to define certain unfamiliar terms which will be used in the course of this paper, to report what existing articles and empirical investigations have indicated regarding the problem area studied, and to set forth the hypotheses tested in this research.

Definitions

To the outsider or the person unfamiliar with forensics, tournaments may seem to have a language all their own. Once this jargon is mastered, however, the tournament situation becomes much clearer. In the introductory

paragraph of this chapter, many words were used which may be unfamiliar. It is helpful to begin by deciding what is meant by the term forensics. A dictionary definition of the term would lead the reader to believe that forensics is merely "public debate."[1] However, modern forensic activity involves much more than debate. A more accurate description of forensics would be competitive speaking. "Any well rounded forensics program includes many forms of public speaking with different patterns of preparation from impromptu speaking to carefully prepared and often memorized manuscripts."[2] It is in this area of individual preparation and competition, commonly referred to as individual events, that the research described in this paper was carried out. But what are those individual events? "The individuals are those speech events in which one student prepares and speaks by himself. (Italics mine.) He speaks in contest rounds with other students, but he speaks as an individual who has no working relationship with the others."[3]

---

1. Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, (College Edition, 1962), p. 566.

2. James McBath, ed., Argumentation and Debate: Principles and Practices (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963), p. 143.

3. Donald W. Klopf, "Tournament Competition in the Individual Events," Journal of the American Forensic Association, III (January, 1966), 33.

Another term used in forensic activity, and in the preceding definition, is contest round. This term, and its synonym section, is used extensively. At any given time, several contest rounds or sections will be taking place at a forensics tournament. In each round there will be a specified number of contestants who speak in an order that has been predetermined by the tournament director. Observing each contest round is a single judge or a panel of judges. They are also assigned by the tournament director. After each contest round has been completed, the judge ranks each contestant in terms of how well he did in comparision to the other speakers in the round. He assigns the rank of first to the speaker who he felt did the best job, the rank of second to the next best and so on through fourth place.[4]

The reader who is unfamiliar with forensics tournaments may find it confusing that when there are as many as six or seven contestants in a round only first through fourth positions are awarded. However, this is generally standard tournament practice. After the judge has determined which speakers are to be awarded the first, second, and third positions, he then ties all of the remaining speakers for fourth place.

---

4. Donald W. Klopf and Carroll Lahmann, Coaching and Directing Forensics (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Corporation, 1967), pp. 58-69 and Paul Hunsinger and Roy Wood, Managing Forensics Tournaments (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Corporation, 1967), pp. 44-46.

A final term which requires clarification is one which appears in the literature[5] concerning individual events contests. That term is ordinal position. The author of the particular article in question offers no specific definition of what he means by the term ordinal position, but the generally accepted meaning of the term is the position which the speaker occupies in the prearranged speaking order of a round. Is he first to speak, second, third? The ordinal numbers are those numbers which "express order or succession, specifically a number in a series."[6]

These are the terms which the existing literature dealing with the problem of the effect of speaker position on a judge's evaluation of the participants in an individual events contest uses. In the section which follows, a brief history of the development of forensics tournaments will be given, and the literature pertaining to the problem studied shall be examined.

Background

Although speech is probably as old as the first man, and arguing verbally perhaps as old as the second, the forensics tournament is largely a twentieth century

5. Samuel Becker, "The Ordinal Position Effect," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 217-9.

6. Webster's New World Dictionary, p. 1032.

development. As nearly as can be determined, the first debate tournament was held at Southwestern University, in Winfield, Kansas, on March 14-16, 1923.[7] Even the, individual events contests were not an important part of the forensics tournaments. In fact, the individual events were often excluded. "Originally, debating was the primary contest at tournaments."[8]

Today, while there are few tournaments which are devoted entirely to competition in individual events, more and more intercollegiate debate tournaments are including contests in such diverse events as salesmanship and radio speaking. Of course, the more familiar individual events of extemporaneous speaking and original oratory are used more often. During the academic year 1962-1963, 28 per cent of all intercollegiate forensics tournaments included competition in one or more individual event.[9]

An even more recent development on the forensics scene is the publication of books devoted entirely to the problems of running a forensics tournament or directing a forensics program. Such books can provide considerable aid

---

7. Egbert Roy Nichols, "A Historical Sketch of Intercollegiate Debating," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (April, 1937), 272.

8. McBath, ed., Argumentation and Debate, p. 331.

9. Donald W. Klopf, "Practices in Intercollegiate Speech Tournaments," Journal of the American Forensic Association, I (May, 1964), 51.

to the person just starting out as a director of forensics or a tournament administrator since they outline the commonly followed procedures.

When the question of administrative practices for individual events contests is discussed, these books seem to agree on one particular principle. That principle is that the contestants should speak in a different ordinal position each round. "The speaking order of the contestants should be juggled so that speakers are not always in the same position."[10] Or, as a different author states, "no speaker should be allowed to speak both first and last, inasmuch as these are extremely controversial positions."[11]

The most obvious question which the reader might ask is why are those position controversial? Do these two speaking positions have some effect on a speaker's chances of doing well in the round? Unfortunately, the authors provide no answers to these questions. There is, of course, the inference in both statements that speaking position can have an effect on the outcome of an individual events contest. If this is so, then the authors provide the would-be tournament administrator with no empirically proven method for moving speakers from position to position in an attempt

---

10. Hunsinger and Wood, Managing Forensics Tournaments, p. 46.

11. Klopf and Lahmann, Coaching and Directing Forensics, p. 69.

to overcome this effect. In the hope of finding this material elsewhere, journal articles relating to the problem were examined.

The concern of the speech profession for assuring fair judging at forensics tournaments is by no means limited to recent times. Prior to 1920, the problem of judging was one of the major topics discussed and debated in the journals. Typical of that period is an article by Robert West describing and evaluating various methods of judging an individual events contest. He came to the conclusion that the fairest method for evaluating contest performances was to have each judge assign a rank to each speaker rather than assigning each a grade expressed in terms of a percentage.[12]

Two years later, West published another article which dealt more directly with the question of concern to this research, the effect of speaker position on a judge's evaluation of the contestants in an individual events round. For his experiment, West used ten speakers selected at random from a college speech class. Each student presented a short speech, and after all ten were finished they were rated by a panel of judges. In this case, the judges were the remaining members of the speech class. The judges were

---

12. Robert West, "Methods Used in Computing Contest Scores," Quarterly Journal of Speech, V (October, 1919), 319-333.

instructed to assign a score of 1 to the speaker they felt did the best job and a score of 25 to the speaker they felt did the poorest job. The remaining eight speakers were to be arranged along a continuum from 1 to 25 depending upon how well or how poorly they did. Interestingly, this system, in which a low numerical score indicates a good speech and a high numerical score indicates a poor one, is the one West advised against using in his previous article. As a result of this methodology, the author was unable to apply any tests of statistical significance to his data. However, by summing the ratings of each judge for each speaker position and repeating this experiment using different speakers and judges, West did find that the "second position on the program received the highest total [numerical] ratings and the sixth position received the lowest total [numerical] ratings."[13]

This would tend to indicate that there is a bias associated with speaker position which operates to the disadvantage of those who speak toward the front of the order. Unfortunately, West's findings do not provide a method of correcting the reported effect of speaker position on a judge's evaluation of the contestants in an individual events round. The sole purpose of this study was, as the

13. Robert West and Helen Larsen, "Some Statistical Investigations in the Field of Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VII (November, 1921), 376.

author put it was to determine whether or not "position on the program influences the final report by the judges."[14]

If West's findings tended to indicate a slight trend toward a recency effect in persuasion, then the results of a study by F. H. Lund must be considered to be in almost direct contradiction to them. Lund was concerned with the ability of listener/readers to evaluate two discussions which concerned differing points of view on the same subject. However, his findings have a definite relation to the question under consideration since they involve the problem of the effect of the order of exposure to the material on the evaluators' ability to make a judgement concerning that material. Lund found that, "students having committed themselves after reading the first discussion will remember this rating and tend to be influenced by their desire to be consistent when asked to make another rating after reading the opposing discussion."[15] Relating this conclusion to the problem discussed in this research, a judge who has been favorably impressed by the first speaker on the program may judge the succeeding speakers more harshly. Thus, Lund's findings tend to support a primacy effect in persuasion, as opposed to the recency effect discovered by West.

---

14. Ibid., VII, 375.

15. F. H. Lund, "The Psychology of Belief: IV. The Law of Primacy in Persuasion," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XX (Spring, 1925), 190.

An examination of the journals for the next fifteen years indicated a comparative lack of truly relevant material, either expository or empirical, on the subject of the effect of speaking order on judging. However, an important study by Franklin H. Knower, published in 1940, reopens the consideration of the problem. Knower's research centered on the fact that "speakers speaking in the first or last positions are more commonly ranked in an intermediate rather than a high or a low position; and speakers who are assigned the highest final average rank by the judges most frequently speak in the next to last or some other medial position."[16] This would seem to confirm the recency effect uncovered by West. The fact that the last speaker is often rated in an intermediate position might be explained by the fact that the judge may start to fill out his ballots while the last speaker is still speaking, thus not listening to him with much care. Nonetheless, the author concluded that "the data indicates a pronounced tendency to assign first place to persons speaking fourth, fifth, or sixth."[17] Since it was not the author's intent to derive any method for compensating for any effect of speaker position which he might find, he lumped his data together. That is to say that he

16. Franklin H. Knower, "A Study of Rank-Order Methods of Evaluating Performances in Speech Contests," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXIV (October, 1940), 644.

17. Ibid., XXIV, 643.

combined the results of rounds with as few as four speakers with the results of rounds with as many as nine speakers.

Even with this limitation imposed by Knower's data treatment, it would be possible to use the results which he obtained in his research to develop a formula to compensate for the effect of speaker position if one assumption can be made. That assumption is that the effect of speaker position on a judge's ranking of speakers will remain constant when the number of speakers in the round is either increased or decreased. Nothing in Knower's results would justify such an assumption.

In fact, a study conducted by Harvey Cromwell on the relative effectiveness of the first versus the second argumentative speech in a series tends to indicate that an assumption that the effect of speaker position remains constant is invalid. Cromwell found that when two speeches, judged to be equal in strength, were presented on different subjects there was no statistically significant advantage for either the first or second speech given.[18] From this, it may be concluded that there is no ordinal position effect present when there are only two speakers for the judge to rate. Carl Hovland seems to corroborate this position when he states, in almost complete contradiction to F. H. Lund,

---

18. Harvey Cromwell, "The Relative Effectiveness of the First versus the Second Argumentative Speech in a Series," Speech Monographs, XVII (June, 1950), 105-122.

"the mere act of stating one's opinion anonymously on a questionnaire after hearing only one side of an issue does not significantly reduce the effectiveness of the second side."[19]

Thus, both Cromwell and Hovland seem to deny the existence of a position bias when there are only two speakers. Knower's data indicates that such an effect exists when there are between four and nine speakers. Therefore, it would appear that at some point as the number of speakers is increased ordinal position begins to have an effect. Since this is the case, there is no way of knowing whether or not the effect of speaking position on a judge's evaluation of the contestants in an individual events round is constant.

Since 1950, quantitative investigation into the problem of fair and accurate judging in individual events has been largely overlooked. With the exception of a study of the capability of those outside the speech profession to serve competently as judges at speech contests,[20] Samuel Becker's study of ordinal position effect stands alone.

---

19. Carl Hovland, ed., The Order of Presentation in Persuasion (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961), p. 132.

20. Donald W. Klopf, Diana Evans and Sister Mary Linus de Lozier, "Comparative Studies of Students, Laymen, and Faculty Members as Judges of Speech Contests," Speech Teacher, XIV (November, 1965), 314-318.

The population for Becker's study came from the records of the Northern Oratorical League contest held between 1891 and 1953. Each year this contest was judged by six competent critics, all of whom were speech coaches. Although Becker notes that incomplete results forced him to discard all but twenty-two of the contests conducted during the sixty-two year history of the event, the fact that there were six judges every year meant that a total of 132 independent judgements were rendered. An analysis of these judgements lead Becker to the conclusion that "the variations in rankings [awards] for the ordinal positions one, two, and three were greater than would be expected by chance ... the variations in rankings [awards] for positions four, five, and six were small enough to have been caused by chance."[21]

Although it was not his purpose to derive any sort of formula or method to correct any possible effect of speaker position which he might discover, Becker does acknowledge the desirability of such a device in his suggestions for further research when he states that, "this investigation does not give sufficient basis for the formulation of any sort of corrective formula."[22] One of the factors which would handicap any attempt to create such a formula using his data is the fact that his results apply

21. Becker, "The Ordinal Position Effect," 219.

22. Becker, "The Ordinal Position Effect," 219.

only to rounds with six contestants. Becker suggests that "one might expect the direction and the amount of bias to vary with the number of speakers in a round."[23]

In making suggestions for further research, Becker posited two interesting questions which thus far have gone unanswered. The main reason for this is the fact that it has not been the specific purpose of any piece of research undertaken thus far to pursue either the question of the effect that increasing or decreasing the number of contestants has on any speaker position bias that may exist, or the problem of creating a method for compensating for that bias.

In summarizing the research conducted up to this point on the subject, it appears that its purpose has been to describe a phenomenon peculiar to man's communicative behavior, the effect of position on persuasion. The hypotheses set forth below structure the investigation of that phenomenon which was conducted.

Hypotheses

Before moving to an actual statement of the hypotheses tested in this research, a point of clarification ought to be made. For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that the speakers representing any one speaker position

23. Becker, "The Ordinal Position Effect," 219.

have, in an ideal situation, an equal chance of receiving any award. Therefore, over a period of several rounds, each speaker position should receive about the same number of firsts, seconds, etcetera, if there is no bias created by speaker position effecting the judges' evaluations of the contestants.

The hypotheses tested fall into two groups and seek to answer two basic questions concerning the problem studied. The first group answers the question of whether or not the number of speakers in an individual events round has any effect on the judge's decision as to who shall receive a more favorable award and who shall receive a less favorable award. The second group of hypotheses answers the question of whether or not increasing the number of speakers in a round alters the effect that speaking position has on a judge's decision.

Hypothesis I A. There is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four are awarded the ratings one through four.

Hypothesis I B. There is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through five are awarded the ratings one through four.

Hypothesis I C. There is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which

the speakers representing the speaking positions one through six are awarded the ratings one through four.

Hypothesis II A. There is a significant difference between the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of four are awarded the ratings one through four and the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of five receive those awards.

Hypothesis II B. There is a significant difference between the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of four are awarded the ratings one through four and the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of six receive those awards.

Hypothesis II C. There is a significant difference between the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through five in a group of five are awarded the ratings one through four and the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through five in a group of six receive those awards.

The reason for testing the hypotheses with four, five, and six speakers in a round is that these numbers of contestants per section are the most desirable from the point of view of the tournament director. As Paul Hunsinger and Roy Wood point out in their book on tournament speaking,

"six speakers per section is generally considered the maximum."[24] This view is corroborated in part by Donald W. Klopf and Carroll Lahmann, although they suggest that fewer speakers per section is better. "Five speakers can be accomodated in each section."[25]

This chapter has attempted to explain the problem studied by defining key terms used in the research; by examining previously conducted research; and by advancing hypotheses whose investigation, it is hoped, leads to additional understanding of the problem of the effect of order of presentation on a judge's evaluation of the participants in an individual events contest. Chapter 2 will detail the methodology which was pursued in the investigation of that problem.

---

24. Hunsinger and Wood, Managing Forensics Tournaments, p. 44.

25. Klopf and Lahmann, Coaching and Directing Forensics, p. 69.

CHAPTER 2

PROCEDURE

This chapter deals with the method by which the data reported later in this paper was collected. It does so in four steps: selecting a tournament, obtaining a population, determining a sample, and analyzing the data.

Selecting a Tournament

Since there are literally hundreds of tournaments conducted every year, there was a wide latitude of choice in making a selection. The choice was narrowed to a single tournament in an attempt to insure that any possible extraneous variables such as differing tournament procedure, participation by different students, and judging by groups with potentially divergent standards would be eliminated. In narrowing the number of tournaments and finally selecting one, a list of criteria was drawn up.

First, it was decided that the tournament would have to be large enough to provide a sufficient number of contest rounds to insure a population suitable for analysis. Since it is usually impossible to detect small effects without a sufficient number of cases, a large number of rounds would be essential to conclusive findings.

Second, the tournament would have to provide approximately even competition. Pitting people with a great deal of expertise against those with relatively little would only insure an unfair advantage to the former group. Since it would be impossible to determine whether all of the highly skilled competitors spoke in only one of the ordinal positions or were distributed among all of them, the data might prove misleading in either masking or revealing effects that were not attributable to speaker position alone. By limiting the variable of unevenly matched competition, it was hoped that such a consideration would not have to be made.

An examination of tournaments on the basis of these two criteria resulted in the selection of the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament for the purpose of data collection. This tournament was held at Sacramento State College, Sacramento, California from November 23 through November 25.

The Western Speech Association Tournament is an annual one, and is among the five largest tournaments in the country.[1] By offering contestants competition in four different individual events: extemporaneous speaking, expository speaking, original oratory, and oral interpretation of literature; a large entry is encouraged. Thus, the

---

1. Jack H. Howe, ed., "Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results: 1965-1966," Tucson, Department of Speech, University of Arizona, 1966, p. 46. (Mimeographed)

Western Speech Association Tournament satisfied the first criterion, size.

Since there are several events involving different types of talent, speakers are encouraged to enter their specialty. This means that the participants generally show a high degree of competence in the events in which they participate, a factor indicating relatively evenly matched competition.

Another point concerning the equality of competition was the fact that this particular tournament has a great deal of prestige connected with it. Because doing well at the Western Speech Association Tournament means a great deal to the schools of the western United States, only the very best speakers are sent as representatives to this tournament. In addition, the philosophy of the tournament, that of limiting each school to a delegation of no more than 10 students, further encourages schools to send only their very best speakers. Thus, the atmosphere of the tournament tends to motivate the contestants to do as well as they can. Once again, this tends to have an equalizing effect on the competition, the second criterion for selection.

Finally, the rules of the Western Speech Association Tournament mitigate against the factor of greater experience on the part of one contestant giving him an advantage over his fellow competitors in any given round, since competition in each of the four previously mentioned individual events

takes place on four different levels. Speakers compete only against those speakers whose experience is commensurate with their own. These levels of competition: senior men, senior women, junior men, and junior women; tend to minimize the effects of greater ability or experience on the outcome of the round. On the basis of the foregoing considerations, it was decided that the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament met both criteria for selection: sufficient size and evenly matched competition.

Obtaining a Population

To obtain a population from which a sample could be drawn, it was necessary to collate two sets of diverse materials: a list of all of the speakers in each contest round and the ordinal position in which they spoke, hereafter referred to as the pairings, and a set of the results showing what award each speaker received for each contest round in which he competed.

The procedure followed in obtaining both items and collating them was as follows: Each contestant had a distinct code number which was assigned to him by the director of the tournament. This code number was composed of a one or two digit number followed by a letter followed by another one or two digit number. When the pairings for each round were posted for the contestants to find where they were to speak during the next round, a copy was made of the code

number of each participant in each contest round, noting his speaking position. Each event, division or level of competition, and round in the tournament was entered on a separate sheet of paper which was lined vertically and horizontally. The verticle columns were numbered to represent the ordinal positions and the horizontal rows were numbered to correspond to the sections of the event. The code number of each contestant was entered in the square which corresponded to the ordinal position and section number in which he had competed during that particular round.

For example, Appendix A represents round three in the tournament for senior women's oral interpretation. Examination of Appendix A reveals that speaker 2 B 8 was the first person to speak in section 1. The number four which appears slightly to the right of the code number is the award won by contestant 2 B 8 during the third round of the tournament. It will be discussed more fully in a moment.

Having thus obtained a set of the pairings, it was necessary to get the results for the preliminary rounds. Such results were printed and distributed to the representatives of the competing schools after the completion of the tournament.[2]

---

2. Eighty-five per cent of all tournaments make these results available at the end of the tournament and the rest mail them to the competing schools the following week according to Glyndon D. Riley, "A Descriptive Study of Speech Tournament Procedures in Certain U. S. Colleges." (unpublished MA thesis, Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, 1958), p. 67.

Appendix B is an example of the results sheets that were distributed to the participating schools at the completion of the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament. It is the results sheet for senior women's oral interpretation. Examining the entry in column three for speaker 2 B 8 indicates that in round three she was awarded a '4-A.' The number four indicates the award position which the judge assigned her and the letter A indicates the judge's qualitative evaluation of her performance. The A stands for an average performance.

In every case, the number which appears slightly to the right of the code number designation in Appendix A is the award position that the speaker was assigned by the judge in that particular round. In order to transfer the awards from the results sheet, Appendix B, to the pairings, Appendix A, each speaker was located by code number in the pairings for a specific round, level of competition, and event. The award received for that performance was located in the printed results and transferred to the pairings where it was entered to the right of the speaker's code number.

Determining a Sample

Not all of the contest rounds in the tournament were usable. For purposes of this study, three criteria had to be met for the round to be retained in the sample. The criteria were based on: 1) the number of speakers in the round

2) the random assignment of speakers to that round, and 3) the random assignment of speakers to speaking positions in that round.

In determining whether or not the various contest rounds met the first criterion, the concern was with the number of persons who actually spoke in the round, not the number of persons scheduled to speak. In order for the round to be included in the sample, it was necessary for between four and six speakers to actually have performed and been evaluated for their performance. Thus, if five persons were scheduled to speak in a round and two of them failed to appear, the round was discarded. It is possible to determine whether or not a speaker actually performed since a failure to appear or speak would result in an 'ns' or 'no show' being entered opposite his code number for that round.

It was decided that a truly random sample could be said to exist only if speakers were assigned to sections and speaking position by chance. If speakers were assigned to sections and speaking positions by some prearranged method, the composition of the rounds would vary and the possibility of finding valid results would be reduced. The method chosen as most reliable for determining what went on in the preparation of the pairings at the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament was to ask the persons who were in charge of running the various individual events.

Accordingly, a letter was sent to each asking him if he had used any prearranged method for assigning speakers to sections and speaking positions. A post card was provided for their responses. A copy of the letter and the responding post cards can be found in Appendix C.

The results of this correspondence indicated that all sections of extemporaneous speaking, expository speaking, original oratory, and oral interpretation of literature for tournament Round I were randomly determined. In addition all sections of extemporaneous speaking and expository speaking for tournament Round II and Round III met the assumptions of randomness as well.

It had been hoped that there would be sufficient numbers of non-random rounds to allow a comparision of the effects of speaker position in those rounds with those same effects in randomly determined rounds. However, only some sections of oral interpretation in tournament Round III met the assumptions of non-randomness.

As a result of applying the criteria for selection to the population of rounds obtained at the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament, a sample of rounds with the following composition was obtained: 4 speakers/random assignment, 27 rounds; 5 speakers/random assignment, 87 rounds; and 6 speakers/random assignment, 120 rounds.

Analyzing the Data

The reader will recall that in introducing the hypotheses a basic assumption was made concerning the analysis of the data. That assumption was that each speaker has an equal chance of receiving any award before the round actually commences. It can be reasoned, therefore, that over a given number of rounds the speakers representing the various speaking positions should, in fact, be awarded each different award with equal frequency. Stated differently, the speakers representing the various speaking positions should be rated first as often as they are rated second, etcetera. Since the sample selected included only those rounds in which speakers were randomly assigned, any major deviation from this expected distribution should be attributable to the effect of speaking position on the judge's decision since other extraneous variables have been controlled.

The statistical tool selected to determine the degree to which the sample approximates or contradicts this expected distribution is Chi-square. "This is a statistic appropriate to cases where we have categories of data and hypotheses about the proportions of cases that fall into the various categories."[3] Chi-square tests the significance of the difference between an expected and an observed frequency.

---

3. Paul Games and George Klare, Elementary Statistics: Data Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967) p. 502.

It allows the researcher to make inferences about the similarity or dissimilarity of these frequencies. "Usage of the Chi-square statistic is legitimate as long as the categories are exhaustive and mutually exclusive and the observations are independent."[4] As the reader will discover when he examines the specific methodology employed in treating the data gathered, the assumptions of Chi-square were met by this research.[5] Hypotheses were to be accepted if the Chi-square value was significant at the .05 level.

The hypotheses tested were divided into two groups. The first group was intended to determine the extent to which the distribution of awards approximated the ideal award distribution. The second group was designed to measure the degree to which the actual distribution of awards was changed as the number of speakers was increased. In discussing the specific methodology employed, these same divisions are observed.

Hypothesis I A was concerned with the fact that there is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which the speakers representing the speaking position one through four are awarded the ratings one though four. In order to facilitate comparisions between samples of various sizes, all data were

---

4. Games and Klare, Elementary Statistics, p. 504.

5. A detailed explanation of the uses of and methods for computing Chi-square can be found in Games and Klare, Elementary Statistics, pp. 501-517.

converted to standard scores, percentages. Expected frequencies were computed by dividing 100 by the number of speakers in the rounds in the sample tested, in this case 4. Observed frequencies were computed by summing the total number of awards, first through fourth, won by the speakers representing each speaker position, dividing this number into the frequency of each award, and multiplying the result by 100. For example, assume that the speakers who represented speaker position one won 9 firsts, 5 seconds, 7 thirds, and 6 fourths. The standard score for the first place awards would equal 27, the total number of awards, divided into 9, the frequency of first place awards, multiplied by 100, $\frac{9}{27} \times 100 = 33.33$. Application of Chi-square was made with the rejection of any hypothesis at the .05 level. Similar analysis was carried out with Hypothesis I B and Hypothesis I C. However, since all speakers rated below third are tied for fourth place, the expected frequency of the rating fourth was double that of first, second, or third when there are five speakers in the round, and triple when there are six speakers in the round.

Analysis of Hypothesis II A, which concerned the fact that there is a significant difference between the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of four are awarded the ratings one through four and the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one

through four in a group of four receive those awards, was as follows. In testing this hypothesis, the expected frequencies were the observed standard award frequencies from the previous set of hypotheses, in this case the observed frequencies for four speakers in a round. After removing the results of the fifth speaker, observed frequencies were computed as follows for this hypothesis. Since the frequencyof the rating fourth was double that of first, second, or third when there were five speakers in a round, the number of fourth place awards won by the speakers representing each speaking position was divided by 2. After this had been done, the total number of awards, first through fourth, won by the speakers representing each speaking position was found, and that total was divided into the frequency of each award. That result was multiplied by 100. For example, assume that the speakers representing speaking position one won 10 firsts, 9 seconds, 13 thirds, and 32 fourths. Dividing the number of fourth place awards by 2, and adding the result to the other award frequencies would equal 50. Computing the standard score for the first place awards would result in $\frac{10}{50} \times 100 = 20.00$. Application of Chi-square was made with the rejection of any hypothesis at the .05 level. In addition, the process was repeated with the first speaker being excluded in the second testing. It was hoped that this would give some indication as to whether it is the early speakers or the late speakers who cause the greatest

deviation from the expected frequency. Analysis of Hypothesis II B and Hypothesis II C was carried out in the same manner. However, the number of fourth place awards was divided by 3 in testing Hypothesis II B, and by 2/3 in testing Hypothesis II C.

In summary, Chapter 2 has explained the methodology employed in this study. The problems of selecting a tournament, determining a population, picking a sample, and of analyzing the data gathered have been discussed. In Chapter 3, the results uncovered by this procedure are set forth.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results relating to each of the six hypotheses set forth in Chapter 1 will be presented in as concise a manner as is possible. No attempt shall be made to indicate any conclusions which have been drawn as a result of this material. All conclusions and suggestions for further research shall be made in the fourth and final chapter.

Hypothesis I A. There is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four are awarded the ratings one through four.

As was previously indicated, there were 27 rounds with four contestants which met the assumptions of randomness at the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament. Analysis of the data obtained is reported in Table 1. This analysis indicated that there was, in fact, such a significant difference in awards to the various positions. The Chi-square value was 16.97, great enough warrant accepting the hypothesis, the difference being significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 1

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPECTED AND OBSERVED AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 4 SPEAKERS IN A ROUND

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	25.00[a] 18.52[b] 1.68[c]	25.00 29.63 .85	25.00 25.92 .03	25.00 25.92 .03
Second	25.00 29.63 .85	25.00 14.82 4.14	25.00 25.92 .03	25.00 29.63 .85
Third	25.00 18.52 1.68	25.00 33.34 2.78	25.00 25.92 .03	25.00 22.22 .31
Fourth	25.00 33.34 2.78	25.00 22.22 .31	25.00 22.22 .31	25.00 22.22 .31

[a]Expected frequency
[b]Observed frequency
[c]Chi-square value

$\sum x^2 = 16.97$
C.R.=16.92

Hypothesis I B. There is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through five are awarded the ratings one through four.

In the case of five speakers in a round, there were 87 rounds with five contestants which met the assumptions of randomness at the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament. Analysis of the data obtained is reported in Table 2. This analysis indicated no significant difference. The Chi-square value did not exceed the .05 level of significance, thus this hypothesis cannot be accepted.

Hypothesis I C. There is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through six are awarded the ratings one through four.

There were 120 rounds containing six speakers and meeting the assumptions of randomness at the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament. Analysis of the data obtained is reported in Table 3. As with the preceding hypothesis, no significant difference was found. The Chi-square value of 14.54 did not reach the .05 level of significance. As a result, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis II A. There is a significant difference between the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of four are awarded the ratings one through four and the frequency

TABLE 2

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPECTED AND OBSERVED AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 5 SPEAKERS IN A ROUND

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	20.00 19.54 .01	20.00 20.69 .02	20.00 24.14 .86	40.00 35.63 .48
Second	20.00 19.54 .01	20.00 19.54 .01	20.00 16.09 .76	40.00 44.83 .58
Third	20.00 13.79 1.93	20.00 14.94 1.28	20.00 18.39 .13	40.00 52.88 4.15
Fourth	20.00 22.99 .48	20.00 19.54 .01	20.00 24.14 .86	40.00 33.33 1.11
Fifth	20.00 24.14 .86	20.00 22.99 .48	20.00 19.54 .01	40.00 33.33 1.11

$\sum X^2 = 15.14$
C.R.=21.03

TABLE 3

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPECTED AND OBSERVED AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 6 SPEAKERS IN A ROUND

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	16.67 13.33 .67	16.67 14.17 .38	16.67 15.83 .04	50.00 56.67 .89
Second	16.67 11.67 1.50	16.67 19.17 .37	16.67 15.00 .17	50.00 54.16 .35
Third	16.67 20.83 1.04	16.67 10.83 2.05	16.67 16.67 .00	50.00 51.67 .06
Fourth	16.67 12.50 1.04	16.67 20.83 1.04	16.67 17.50 .04	50.00 49.17 .01
Fifth	16.67 18.33 .28	16.67 18.33 .28	16.67 18.33 .28	50.00 45.01 .50
Sixth	16.67 23.33 2.66	16.67 16.67 .00	16.67 16.67 .00	50.00 43.33 .89

$\sum x^2 = 14.54$
C.R.=25.00

with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of five receive those awards.

This hypothesis was first tested with the results of the fifth speaker removed. Analysis of the data obtained is reported in Table 4. This analysis indicated that there was such a significant difference. The Chi-square value was 30.96, great enough to warrant the acceptance of the hypothesis as being significant at the .05 level.

Testing Hypothesis II A by the removal of the results of the first speaker also produced significant results. Analysis of the data obtained in this manner is reported in Table 5. The Chi-square value was 22.39, great enough to accept the hypothesis as being significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis II B. There is a significant difference between the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of four are awarded the ratings one through four and the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through four in a group of six receive those awards.

Hypothesis II B was first tested by removing the results of the fifth and sixth speakers. Analysis of the data thus obtained is Reported in Table 6. As with the preceding hypothesis, a significant difference was, in fact, discovered. The Chi-square value was 52.55 which was great enough to allow the acceptance of the hypothesis as being significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 4 AND 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 5 (SPEAKER 5 REMOVED)

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	18.52 23.77 1.49	29.63 25.17 .67	25.92 29.37 .46	25.92 21.69 .69
Second	29.63 25.19 .67	14.82 25.19 7.26	25.92 20.74 1.04	29.63 28.88 .02
Third	18.50 18.75 .00	33.34 20.31 5.09	25.92 25.00 .03	22.22 35.94 8.47
Fourth	33.34 26.84 1.27	22.22 24.39 .21	22.22 28.19 1.61	22.22 15.58 1.98

$\sum X^2 = 30.96$
C.R.=16.92

TABLE 5

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 4 AND 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 5 (SPEAKER 1 REMOVED)

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	18.52 25.19 2.40	29.63 25.19 .67	25.92 20.74 1.04	25.92 28.88 .34
Second	29.63 18.75 3.97	14.82 20.31 2.03	25.92 25.00 .03	29.63 35.94 1.34
Third	18.52 26.84 3.74	33.34 24.39 2.40	25.92 28.19 .19	22.22 15.58 1.98
Fourth	33.34 29.79 .38	22.22 28.39 1.70	22.22 21.28 .04	22.22 20.56 .12

$\sum x^2 = 22.39$
C.R.=16.92

TABLE 6

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 4 AND 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 6 (SPEAKERS 5 AND 6 REMOVED)

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	18.52 21.42 .45	29.63 22.76 1.59	25.92 25.44 .01	25.92 30.38 .77
Second	29.63 18.26 4.36	14.82 29.99 15.53	25.92 23.47 .23	29.63 28.28 .06
Third	18.52 31.77 9.48	33.34 16.52 8.46	25.92 25.47 .01	22.22 26.29 .75
Fourth	33.34 18.59 6.53	22.22 30.99 3.46	22.22 26.03 .65	22.22 24.39 .21

$\sum X^2 = 52.55$
C.R.=16.92

Analysis of the data created by removing the award frequencies for the first and second speakers yielded similarly significant results. This analysis, reported in Table 7, indicated a Chi-square value of sufficient size to allow adoption of the hypothesis as being significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis II C. There is a significant difference between the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through five in a group of five are awarded the ratings one through four and the frequency with which the speakers representing the speaking positions one through five in a group of six receive those awards.

As with the two preceding hypotheses, the data were first analyzed by excluding the results of a late speaker, in this case the sixth speaker. The analysis of this data, reported in Table 8, indicated a Chi-square value of 26.34. This value, while not as large as the values obtained in the analysis of Hypothesis II B, was great enough to warrant the acceptance of the hypothesis as being significant at the .05 level.

Removal of the results of the first speaker also revealed a significant difference. The results, which are reported in Table 9, indicated a Chi-square value of 22.60. This value was great enough to allow accepting the hypothesis as being significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 7

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 4 AND 4 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 6 (SPEAKERS 1 AND 2 REMOVED)

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	18.52 31.77 9.48	29.63 16.52 5.80	25.92 25.42 .01	25.92 26.29 .01
Second	29.63 18.59 4.11	14.82 30.99 17.64	25.92 26.03 .00	29.63 24.39 .93
Third	18.52 26.19 3.18	33.34 26.19 1.53	25.92 26.19 .03	22.22 21.43 .03
Fourth	33.34 32.81 .01	22.22 23.43 .93	22.22 23.43 .03	22.22 20.33 .16

$\sum X^2 = 43.06$
C.R.=16.92

TABLE 8

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 5 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 5 AND 5 SPEAKERS IN A GROUPF OF 6 (SPEAKER 6 REMOVED)

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	19.54 16.43 .49	20.69 17.46 .50	24.14 19.52 .88	35.63 46.59 3.37
Second	19.54 14.23 1.44	19.54 23.39 .76	16.09 18.30 .30	44.83 44.08 .01
Third	13.79 25.16 9.37	14.94 13.08 .23	18.39 20.13 .16	52.88 41.63 2.39
Fourth	22.99 14.95 2.81	19.54 24.91 1.48	24.14 20.93 .43	33.33 39.21 1.04
Fifth	24.14 21.57 .27	22.99 21.57 .09	19.54 21.57 .21	33.33 35.29 .11

$\sum X^2 = 26.34$
C.R.=21.03

TABLE 9

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AWARD FREQUENCIES FOR 5 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 5 AND 5 SPEAKERS IN A GROUP OF 6 (SPEAKER 1 REMOVED)

Speaker Positions	Awards			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
First	19.54 14.23 1.44	20.69 23.39 .35	24.14 18.30 1.41	35.63 44.08 2.00
Second	19.54 25.16 1.62	19.54 13.08 2.14	16.09 20.13 1.01	44.83 41.63 .23
Third	13.79 14.95 .09	14.94 24.91 6.65	18.39 20.93 .35	52.88 39.21 3.53
Fourth	22.99 21.57 .23	19.54 21.57 .21	24.14 21.57 .27	33.33 35.29 .11
Fifth	24.14 27.27 .41	22.99 19.47 .54	19.54 19.47 .00	33.33 33.79 .01

$\sum X^2 = 22.06$
C.R.=21.03

The material in this chapter can be summarized by noting two things. First, only when there were four speakers in a round did the observed frequency not coincide with the expected frequency. Second, altering the number of speakers in a round does change the frequency with which awards are distributed to the various speaker positions. The implications which can be drawn from these results are presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

After considering the possible ramifications of the data reported in the preceding chapter, certain conclusions were drawn. These conclusions along with suggestions for further research are offered in this final chapter.

Conclusions

The first conclusion was that as the number of speakers in an individual events round increases from four to six the effect that speaker positions might have on a judge's evaluation of the performances of those speakers seems to be diminished. Hypotheses I A, I B, and I C seem to corroborate this conclusion. These hypotheses, which dealt with the fact that there is a significant difference between the expected and the observed frequencies with which four, five, and six speakers receive the awards one through four, indicated that as the number of speakers was increased the corresponding value of Chi-square actually decreased. As a result, the level of probability at which the hypotheses would be significant fell from .05 for four speakers in a round to .30 for five speakers in a round to .50 for six speakers in a round. This tends to indicate a

decrease in the effect that speaker position has on a judge's evaluation of a series of speech performances.

The second conclusion was that if any effect of speaker position bias does manifest itself in individual events contests it would seem to be one of recency not primacy. That is to say that those speaking later in the round benefit. An examination of speaker position four in Table 1, speaker position five in Table 2, and speaker position six in Table 3 shows that each received more than its share of first and second place awards. A total of 55.56 per cent first and second place awards were won by the fourth speaker in a group of four, the expected frequency being 50.00. Fifth speaker in a group of five received a total of 47.13 first and second place awards, the expected frequency being 40.00. And, a total of 40.00 first and second place awards were won by the sixth speaker in a group of six, the expected frequency being 33.33. On the other hand, speaker position one in each of those tables received less than its share of first and second place awards in two of three cases. With the same frequencies of first and second place awards expected, the speakers representing speaker position one received those awards in the following proportions: first speaker in a group of four, 48.15 per cent; first speaker in a group of five, 40.23 per cent; first speaker in a group of six, 27.50 per cent.

This second conclusion is further corroborated by the results obtained from testing Hypotheses II A, II B, and II C. These results indicated higher Chi-square values from the data with the removal of a late speaker rather than an early one: 30.96 as compared to 22.39 when testing the difference between four and five speakers in a round, 52.55 as compared to 43.06 when testing the difference between four and six speakers in a round, and 26.34 as compared to 22.60 when testing the difference between five and six speakers in a round. This means that in each case the level of probability of the difference being significant was greater when the award frequencies of the early speakers were compared to the control group than when the award frequencies of the late speakers were compared to that group. Those who judge individual events contests should be aware that any bias which might effect their judging because of the ordinal position effect will likely be one of recency, and should try to guard against it.

The third and final conclusion drawn was that in the long run the results of individual events contests do not seem to be greatly affected by any speaker position bias. An analysis of the data indicated that the difference between expected and observed frequencies of awards for five and six speakers in a round was not significant at the .05 level. Of the 359 rounds conducted at the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament, 312 or about 87%

contained either five or six speakers. For the most part, therefore, the rounds held at that tournament were not greatly affected by speaker position bias. By following the suggestions made by the authors of the books on tournament administration concerning the number of speakers that ought to be included in a round, noted in Chapter 1, it would seem that the fears of many competitors, that they were assigned to an unfavorable speaking position, could be overcome.

Suggestions For Further Research

It is hoped, first of all, that this study will be replicated by others concerned with assuring fair and even competition in forensics tournaments since replication is the basis of the scientific method. The sample of rounds with four speakers was extremely small. Although the data for four speakers did meet the assumptions of continuity, the findings should not be considered to be absolutely conclusive. Thus, replication of this study is suggested.

In the course of this research, several additional questions came to light which were beyond the scope and purpose of this study. They merit investigation.

The reader will recall that it was hoped that there would be sufficient non-randomly assigned rounds available to allow an analysis of the effect of speaker position when the competition is extremely close, closer than even the

format of the Western Speech Association Tournament caused it to be. Lack of a sufficient sample stifled that effort. Thus, it would be possible to conduct a study similar this one using the results of the semi-final and final rounds of a tournament, since these rounds bring together those contestants who have demonstrated the greatest skill in the preliminary rounds.

Another suggestion for possible extension of this study is one suggested by Samuel Becker which was not pursued here since it was not within the scope of the design or the purpose of the study. That question is whether or not inexperienced or lay judges are more or less influenced by the effect of ordinal position than their more experienced counterparts.[1] The judges who rendered the decisions analyzed in this study were, for the most part, college trained speech instructors and debate coaches who work continually in and with forensics tournaments. On the high school scene, at less prestigious tournaments, and in areas where it is difficult to recruit professional judges, it is often necessary to turn to townspeople, other faculty members, and even students to fill out the ranks of the judging corps. It would be worthwhile to examine the judging pattern of these people, and how it is or is not affected by speaker position bias.

---

1. Becker, "The Ordinal Position Effect," 219.

APPENDIX A

THE PAIRINGS

Event-Oral Interp.

Level of Competition-
Senior Women

Round-III

Section	Speaker Position					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	2B8 4	54A9 3	52B9 1	37B2 4	7B5 2	93B5 4
2	64A5 1	37B10 2	81B9 3	2A1 4	29B8 4	59B10 4
3	3D7 3	81A1 4	95A2 4	5D3 1	9A10 4	29B7 2
4	84B1 4	64B3 4	16A2 1	61A4 4	10C6 2	17B3 3
5	5D5 4	80A8 2	58B6 4	56B6 3	8B10 1	28B6 4
6	34B9 4	68B5 4	8A3 2	65B7 4	40A2 3	67B3 1
7						
8						
9						

APPENDIX B

RESULTS SHEET FOR SENIOR WOMEN'S INTERP

Code	Rd I	Rd II	Rd III	Code	Rd I	Rd II	Rd III
2A1	1-E	2-S	4-G	52B8	3-E	1-E	1-E
2B8	2-E	4-G	4-A	54A9	3-G	3-G	3-E
3D7	4-F	3-E	3-G	56B6	2-E	4-G	3-G
5D3	4-A	3-G	1-E	58B6	1-G	1-E	4-G
5D5	1-G	3-E	4-G	59B10	2-G	4-F	4-G
7B5	3-A	2-E	2-E	61A4	4-A	4-G	4-F
8A3	4-E	4-G	2-E	64B3	4-G	4-A	4-F
8B10	1-E	2-G	1-E	64A5	2-A	2-E	1-E
9A10	4-G	4-G	4-G	65B7	4-F	4-A	4-G
10C6	4-A	1-S	2-E	67B3	4-G	1-E	1-E
16A2	4-G	3-G	1-E	68B5	4-G	4-G	4-G
17B3	4-A	2-E	3-G	80A8	2-G	4-G	2-E
28B6	2-E	2-G	4-G	81A1	4-E	4-F	4-A
29B7	4-A	4-G	2-G	81B9	1-E	1-E	3-G
29B8	1-E	1-E	4-G	84B1	4-F	4-A	4-A
34B9	4-A	4-G	4-G	93B5	3-E	4-G	4-G
37B2	3-A	4-G	4-A	95A2	4-A	4-G	4-F
37B10	3-G	3-G	2-E				
40A2	4-A	4-G	3-E				

APPENDIX C

LETTER SENT TO AND RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM EVENT DIRECTORS

The following letter was sent to Professor Robert Boren, University of Montana, who ran extemporaneous speaking, Professor Rex Robinson, Utah State University, who ran persuasive speaking, Professor Don Douglas, California Lutheran, who ran expository speaking, and Professor Paul Winters, University of the Pacific, who ran oral interpretation of literature.

December 15, 1967

Dear Professor Boren,

Now that the 1967 Western Speech Association Tournament is past, let me add what certainly must be considered tardy congratulations for the job you did in running the extemporaneous speaking event. I am using the results from the individual events sections as the population for a piece of research concerning the effect of speaker position on individual events. My preliminary analysis of the data I gathered indicates the sheer magnitude of the task you were faced with. This preliminary analysis has also brought to mind two questions.

First, did you consciously try to power-match the second and third rounds on the basis of the preceding round, or were speakers assigned to sections by "the luck of the draw?"

Second, did you have a predetermined method for altering speaking position for any given speaker to assure that he was not always speaking in the same position, or was this a chance situation also?

A reply to both of theses questions would be most heartily appreciated. Thank you in advance for your consideration of these two questions.

Sincerely,
Donald Rybacki

EXTEMP-Prof. Boren

1. I did ☐ / did not ☒ power match the preliminary rounds
2. I did ☐ / did not ☒ alter speaking position according to a predetermined method — however, I always checked to make sure speakers did not have first or last position more than once during the three rounds.

Comments:

PERSUASIVE- Prof Robinson

1. I did ☐ / did not ☒ power match the preliminary rounds.
2. I did ☒ / did not ☐ alter speaking position according to a predetermined method.

Comments: #2--The method used was to list the 1st speaker in Section 1, Round 1, as the third speaker in Sec. 1, Round 2; the 2nd speaker in Section 2, rd. 1, as 4th speaker in sec. 1, rd. 2; the 3rd speaker in Sec. 3, Rd. 1, as 5th speaker in Sec. 1, Rd. 2, etc. Generally I moved in diagonals across the panels to determine both composition and speaking order. Occasional deviation was necessary to avoid pairing people from the same school in a section, but this was the general procedure. When finished, I would check through to see that speaking order was indeed changed, and to make spot adjustments if necessary.

EXPOSITORY-Prof Douglas

1. I did ☐ / did not ☒ power match the preliminary rounds
2. I did ☒ / did not ☐ alter speaking position according to a predetermined method.

Comments:

I tried To Alter Speakers order of Speaking So They would not meet the same people twice & so That no one person would have a first or last speaking position in more Than one round. for the most part however Speakers were assigned by the luck of the draw.

INTERPRETATION-Prof Winters

1. I did ☑ / did not ☐ power match the preliminary rounds
2. I did ☑ / did not ☐ alter speaking position according to a predetermined method.

Comments:

1. I power matched the third round not the 1st or second
2. I used the national Pi Kappa Delta position change method except where there were multiple entries from a single school.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Becker, Samuel. "The Ordinal Position Effect." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 217-219.

Cromwell, Harvey. "The Relative Effectiveness of the First versus the Second Argumentative Speech in a Series." Speech Monographs, XVII (June, 1950), 105-122.

Games, Paul, and Klare, George. Elementary Statistics: Data Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Hovland, Carl., ed. The Order of Presentation in Persuasion. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961.

Howe, Jack H. "Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results: 1965-1966." Tucson, Department of Speech, University of Arizona, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

Hunsinger, Paul, and Wood, Roy. Managing Forensics Tournaments. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Corp., 1967.

Klopf, Donald W. "Practices in Intercollegiate Speech Tournaments." Journal of the American Forensic Association, I (May, 1964), 48-52.

Klopf, Donald W. "Tournament Competition in the Individual Events." Journal of the American Forensic Association, III (January, 1966), 33-36.

Klopf, Donald W.; Evans, Diana; and Lozier, Sister Mary Linus de. "Comparative Studies of Students, Laymen, and Faculty Members as Judges of Speech Contests." Speech Teacher, XIV (November, 1965), 314-318.

Klopf, Donald W., and Lahmann, Carroll. Coaching and Directing Forensics. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Corporation, 1967.

Knower, Franklin H. "A Study of Rank-Order Methods of Evaluating Performances in Speech Contests." Journal of Applied Psychology, XXIV (October, 1940), 633-644.

Lund. F. H. "The Psychology of Belief: IV. The Law of Primacy in Persuasion." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XX (Spring, 1925), 188-195.

McBath, James, ed. Argumentation and Debate: Principles and Practices. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.

Nichols, Egbert Roy. "A Historical Sketch of Intercollegiate Debating: III." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (April, 1937), 259-278.

Riley, Glyndon D. "A Descriptive Study of Speech Tournament Procedures in Certain U. S. Colleges." Unpublished M. A. thesis, Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, 1958.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. College ed. New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962.

West, Robert. "Methods Used in Computing Contest Scores." Quarterly Journal of Speech, V (October, 1919), 319-333.

West, Robert, and Larsen, Helen. "some Statistical Investigations in the Field of Speech." Quarterly Journal of Speech, VII (November, 1921), 375-382.