

2021

## PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS LEADING TO FORENSICS-DRAMA COACHING EFFICACY

Anthony Wooley  
anthony.wooley@lmunet.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lmunet.edu/edddissertations>



Part of the [Art Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Educational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Fine Arts Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Wooley, Anthony, "PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS LEADING TO FORENSICS-DRAMA COACHING EFFICACY" (2021). *Ed.D. Dissertations*. 30.  
<https://digitalcommons.lmunet.edu/edddissertations/30>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Carter & Moyers School of Education at LMU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ed.D. Dissertations by an authorized administrator of LMU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [LMUIR@lmunet.edu](mailto:LMUIR@lmunet.edu).

**Final Dissertation Approval  
Form 11**

**PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS LEADING TO FORENSICS-DRAMA COACHING  
EFFICACY**

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of the doctoral dissertation by

**Anthony R. Wooley**

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by the final examining committee have been made.

Cherie Gained 11/20/2020  
Committee Chair Date

[Signature] 11/20/20  
Committee Member Date

Shelley Burton 11/20/20  
Committee Member Date

[Signature] 11/20/20  
EdD Director Date

Teresa A. Dickull 11-20/2020  
Dean, School of Education Date

**PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS LEADING TO FORENSICS-DRAMA  
COACHING EFFICACY**

**Dissertation**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education  
in the Carter and Moyers School of Education  
at Lincoln Memorial University**

**by**

**Anthony R. Wooley**

**November 20, 2020**

© 2020

**Anthony R. Wooley**

**All Rights Reserved**

## **Dedication**

I dedicate this dissertation, first and foremost, to my long-suffering wife who supported me through this entire process. Secondly, I dedicate this to my parents who taught me the value of education and encouraged me to invest in myself. Finally, I dedicate this to the Burton family, who were imperative to the beginning of my journey of higher education.

## **Acknowledgments**

To properly thank everyone who has contributed to making this dissertation a reality would take a dissertation of its own, so if I came across you over the past three years, thank you, and I am sorry for talking your ear off. I would like to give special thanks to the Chase et al. (2005) team for the work they did on Coaching Efficacy and for allowing me to stand on their shoulders. Thank you to my chief editor and mother for spending countless hours on FaceTime reading and rereading. Thank you to the other members of the “Fab Five,” who allowed me to lean on them and never fall down. Finally, thank you to my dissertation committee and specifically my dissertation chair, Dr. Gaines. Your willingness to spend hours reading and editing pages on forensics-drama gave me hope this work could bring about positive change for the activity in the academic world.

## Abstract

Participation in nonacademic activities that focus on creative skill improvement, like forensics-drama, can increase high school students' intrinsic desire to learn. Intrinsic motivation to learn resulted in academic success at the secondary and collegiate levels and career success at the professional level because the students felt confident in their abilities. Because the forensics-drama coach was the primary factor affecting students' forensics-drama abilities, a greater understanding of the sources of forensics-drama coaching efficacy was required to discover how to better serve the students. Ten forensics-drama coaches in the state of Tennessee participated in this qualitative interpretive study in which they were interviewed to establish the perceived factors that led to forensics-drama coaching efficacy. Four factors were perceived to lead to forensics-drama coaching efficacy: *Experience, Knowledge, Recognition, and Success*. In addition, the three factors that forensics-drama coaches used to define success—*Relationships, Growth, and Winning*—were also found to individually lead to forensics-drama coaching efficacy. This study was a foundational study that could be used as the framework for future studies exploring forensics-drama coaching efficacy.

## Table of Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
Chapter I: Introduction .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	2
Research Questions .....	5
Theoretical Framework .....	5
Significance of the Study.....	7
Description of the Terms .....	8
Organization of the Study.....	9
Chapter II: Review of the Literature .....	11
Teacher Self-Efficacy .....	13
Coaching Efficacy .....	26
Forensics-Drama Coaching .....	34
Conclusion of Review of the Literature .....	43
Chapter III: Methodology.....	45
Research Design .....	45
Role of the Researcher.....	46
Participants of the Study.....	47
Data Collection.....	48
Methods of Analysis.....	50

Trustworthiness .....	51
Limitations and Delimitations .....	52
Assumptions of the Study.....	54
Summary of Methodology.....	54
Chapter IV: Analyses and Results .....	56
Data Analysis.....	56
Research Questions .....	57
Summary of Results .....	79
Chapter V: Discussion of the Study .....	80
Implications for Practice.....	81
Recommendations for Further Research .....	84
Conclusions of the Study.....	86
References .....	90
Appendix A Overview of Forensics-Drama Events .....	102
Appendix B Permission to Use Established Interview Protocol .....	112
Appendix C Interview Protocol for this Study .....	114
Appendix D Informed Consent for Participants.....	117

## List of Tables

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 1 Sources of Coaching Efficacy .....	30
Table 2 Forensics-Dramas Events .....	36
Table 3 Data Sorted in Levels of Coding for Research Question 1 .....	59
Table 4 Data Sorted in Levels of Coding for Research Question 2 .....	70

## **Chapter I: Introduction**

Forensics-drama, though often confused with “a series of scientific disciplines that assist the criminal justice system” (Roux et al., 2012, p. 8), described the grouping of competitive debate, speech, and acting activities at the pre-secondary, secondary, and collegiate academic levels (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015). Merriam-Webster (2020) defined forensics as “the art or study of argumentative discourse” (para. 5). Both forensics-drama and forensics-science derived their names and practices from the rhetoric of ancient Greek and Roman argumentative discourse (Hogan & Kurr, 2017; Ivey, 2017) but have evolved separately over the centuries (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015; Roux et al., 2012).

Researchers studying the positive effects of forensics-drama participation reported students who participated in forensics-drama had increased confidence in social skills and found success in their collegiate and professional careers (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015; Cranston & Kusanovich, 2014; Luong, 2002). According to Rosenthal (1997), the coach of the team affected forensics-drama participation, success, and retention more than any other factor, yet research pertaining to the forensics-drama coach was limited. This research on the forensics-drama coach primarily considered only the collegiate level coach (Baker, 2016; Rutledge, 2006), which left a gap in the literature covering the secondary level coach. According to Myers et al. (2008), the secondary level coaches were at a unique vantage to affect meaningful development in their students because, in many cases in high school, students have progressed past novice but have yet to realize their full potential. I focused on the perceptions of secondary level forensics-drama coach to fill the gap in existing research.

I also followed the example of the Feltz et al. (1999) and Chase et al. (2005) studies investigating the sources of coaching efficacy (CE). Chase et al. (2005) believed a better understanding of CE would lead to the development of successful coaches. Feltz et al. (1999) and Chase et al. (2005) rooted their studies in research covering how self-efficacy affected teachers' classroom success. At the time of this study, I was unaware of any existing research pertaining to forensics-drama CE. In this qualitative interpretive study, I interviewed forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee to identify perceived factors that led to higher forensics-drama CE. I also sought to understand how forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee perceived success because past success was connected to higher CE (Feltz et al., 1999), but forensics-drama coaches did not view success in the same way as athletic coaches (Holm, 2015; Logsdon, 2013; Stolen, 1995). This study laid the groundwork for future research regarding forensics-drama CE.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Teacher self-efficacy (TSE), or a teacher's belief in his skills to effectively lead students, played a large role in the academic success of students (Bandura, 1997; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014). Classroom teachers with high levels of efficacy were more likely to incorporate new classroom practices and attempt challenging pedagogical routines that increased levels of students' intrinsic motivation (Haider & Mushtaq, 2017, Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). According to Ginsberg (2015), intrinsically motivated students valued and engaged in learning and maximized their efforts in achieving learning outcomes. Researchers explored TSE because of its connection to student success and discovered common elements that affected TSE: student motivation, school

climate, administrators, professional development, and collaboration (Garvis et al., 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016).

Similarly, athletic coaches' levels of efficacy were also found to affect athletes' performances (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999; Lee, 2013; McLean & Mallett, 2012; Myers et al., 2008). Students who participated in interscholastic athletics were found to have higher grade point averages, better attendance and discipline records, and lower dropout rates than students who did not participate (Lumpkin & Stokowski, 2011). Athletic coaches with high CE focused on student learning and students' personal growth rather than winning, which not only aided in the students' academic lives but also in their careers because the students were better prepared for life (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016).

Unlike teaching, research was limited regarding CE (Feltz et al., 1999); however, what researchers discovered about CE and athlete success paralleled the findings of TSE and student success. Coaches with higher levels of CE were more successful and were perceived by their athletes to be better coaches than coaches with low levels of CE (Brailsford, 2015; Feltz et al., 1999; Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016). Feltz et al. (1999) suggested a greater understanding of sources and perceptions of CE was required for coaches to better train their athletes. Researchers' exploration into the understanding of efficacy levels for teachers and coaches suggested the necessity to understand forensics-drama CE, so like high efficacy teachers and athletic coaches, forensics-drama coaches could better serve their students.

Researchers claimed high school students who participated in forensics-drama competition reported higher confidence in social skills than

students who did not participate in forensics-drama (Beall, 2002; Littlefield, 2001; Minch, 2006; Moe, 2003). According to Goodwin (2011,) participation in nonacademic activities that focused on creative skill improvement, like forensics-drama, increased students' intrinsic desire to learn. The students' dedication to their events along with attaining advanced social skills resulted in academic success at the secondary and collegiate levels and career success at the professional level because the students felt capable and experienced a loss of self-consciousness, which resulted in the students pursuing academic or career opportunities that they may have otherwise avoided due to fear of failure. (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015; Cranston & Kusanovich, 2014; Ginsberg, 2015; Luong, 2002).

Researchers identified the forensics-drama coach as a primary source of student growth, success, and retention in the forensics-drama discipline (Derryberry, 2005; Holm, 2015; Stolen, 1995). Research pertaining to the forensics-drama coach was limited, despite the importance of forensics-drama competition to the secondary student and the important role the coach played in student success (Baker, 2016; Rosenthal, 1997). At the time of this study, I was unable to locate any research pertaining to forensics-drama CE. Given the gap in research pertaining to forensics-drama CE, the purpose of this study was to identify perceived factors that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE from the perspective of forensics-drama coaches in the state of Tennessee and to create a framework for the understanding of forensics-drama coaches' perceptions of success.

## **Research Questions**

I formed governing questions based on the theoretical framework to identify perceived factors that contributed to higher levels of forensics-drama CE. I used research questions to determine what perceived factors led to the formation of forensics-drama CE. I also sought to determine a working definition of forensics-drama coaching success to guide the reader toward an understanding of the differences between forensics-drama and athletic success. A greater understanding of forensics-drama CE could help all forensics-drama coaches improve their instructional techniques and result in greater student success in their academic and professional careers.

### ***Research Question 1***

According to secondary school forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee, what perceived factors led to higher levels of forensics-drama coaching efficacy?

### ***Research Question 2***

According to secondary school forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee, what were the perceived factors of a successful forensics-drama coach?

## **Theoretical Framework**

At the time of this study, I was unaware of any studies investigating the impact of forensics-drama CE; however, the forensics-drama coach was likened to both the classroom teacher and the athletic coach (Rutledge, 2006). As a result of the lack of research on the forensics-drama coach, I examined literature pertaining to the TSE and CE. TSE was rooted in the framework of Bandura's (1986) self-efficacy theory (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy was the extent to which a person believed in his own abilities to produce a desired result. In education, researchers have used Bandura's (1986) theory of self-efficacy as the framework for a broad body of research because the level of TSE was congruently connected to student intrinsic motivation and success (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). Teachers with high TSE increased student intrinsic motivation, which led students to maximize effort, value learning outcomes, and engage in their work both as students and professionals later in their lives (Ginsberg, 2015; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016).

Researchers investigating CE looked to the TSE frameworks and applied Bandura's (1986) self-efficacy theory to the investigation of CE (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999; Myers et al., 2008). Chase et al. (2005) defined CE as the extent to which coaches believed they had the capacity to affect the learning and performance of their athletes. Understanding athletic CE was important to this study because, like forensics-drama competition, coaching students to compete in win/lose events measured success differently than how classroom teachers measured students' academic success (Myers et al., 2008). Coaches with higher levels of CE focused on student growth, which better prepared students for higher levels of academia and their professional lives (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016).

I followed the example of TSE and CE researchers and employed Bandura's (1986) theory of self-efficacy to establish the framework of this study. I focused specifically on self-efficacy as the framework for this research because teachers with high TSE and coaches with high CE levels helped students generate higher levels of intrinsic motivation, which led to student success in academia and

life (Bandura, 1986; Brailsford, 2015; Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Haider & Mushtaq, 2017; Lee, 2013; Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; McLean & Mallett, 2012; Myers et al., 2008; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014).

### **Significance of the Study**

I diverged from the contemporary studies concerning self-efficacy by introducing the importance of the forensics-drama coach to the wellbeing of students' academic careers. Traditional studies of academic efficacy primarily dealt with the classroom teacher (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Feltz et al. (1999) began a preliminary search for sources of CE and created an efficacy scale specifically for coaches. Chase et al. (2005) used the findings of the Feltz et al. (1999) study to draft a deeper understanding of sources of CE.

At the time of this study, I was unable to locate existing research pertaining to the sources of forensics-drama CE. Previous outcomes similar to the objectives of this study regarding TSE and CE endorsed the need for academic research pertaining to the effect of self-efficacy on teaching and coaching (Bandura, 1997; Chase et al., 2005; Feltz, et al., 1999; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014). The results of the comparable studies were explored by researchers to assist teachers and coaches with their endeavors to guide student and athlete improvement.

Administrators, both in schools with existing programs and institutions considering implementing a forensics-drama program, and forensics-drama coaches benefitted from this study by understanding how current forensics-drama coaches perceived factors that affected forensics-drama CE. At the time of this

study, there was not an existing model to establish forensics-drama coaching success, so I requested the participants provide their own definition of success to help guide the research. The findings served to illustrate important efficacy factors on which new and struggling forensics-drama coaches could focus to better improve their self-efficacy and ultimately better serve their students. Administrators could use the findings to facilitate forensics-drama coaches' growth, which could result in greater student success.

### **Description of the Terms**

The purpose of the description of terms was to provide the reader with a clear definition of the terms in this study and to specifically describe how each term was used in relation to the research questions and data collection process.

#### ***Forensics-Drama***

For the purposes of this study, forensics-drama was defined as the competition-based activity consisting of three major categories: debate events, speech events, and acting events.

#### ***Forensics-Drama Coach***

For the purposes of this study, I defined forensics-drama coach as a teacher in Tennessee who assisted secondary students in the formation of forensics-drama skills, organized participation in competitive tournaments, and helped guide students in achieving specific goals. The forensics-drama coach's additional responsibilities (e.g., tracking attendance, reporting grades, planning lessons) reflected similar expectations of teachers and athletic coaches in the public and private educational establishments.

### ***Forensics-Drama Coaching Efficacy***

For the purposes of this study, I utilized and amended the Chase et al. (2005) definition of CE to define forensics-drama CE as the extent to which forensics-drama coaches believed they had the capacity to affect the learning and performance of their forensics-drama students. I applied the theories of Bandura (1986) and Feltz et al. (1999) to suggest forensics-drama coaches with higher levels of forensics-drama CE would better prepare their students for collegiate and professional life by increasing their students' intrinsic motivation to learn and grow.

### **Organization of the Study**

In this chapter, I introduced the concept of forensics-drama CE and explained the problem addressed by this study. I outlined the questions explored in this study and explained the theoretical framework that guided the research before describing the role this research played in the existing body of literature. I then defined the pertinent terms used in this study.

In Chapter II, I provided a review of the existing related literature pertaining to TSE and CE. The chapter concluded with an outline of the current body of literature regarding forensics-drama's history in education, forensics-drama's coaching responsibilities, factors affecting forensics-drama success, and the benefits of forensics-drama participation. Following the review of literature, in Chapter III, I provided a description of the research design, the role of the researcher, and the sample of the study. I then overviewed the methods for data collection and analysis and continued with the outline of the study's

trustworthiness, limitations, and delimitations. I concluded Chapter III by detailing the assumptions of this study.

In Chapter IV, I analyzed the data collected for each research question and provided a brief summary of the results. The results of the study were discussed in greater depth in Chapter V. Chapter V was the final chapter in this dissertation, and I drew conclusions about the research questions based on the data collected. I provided implications for practice and further research and concluded the chapter with recommendations for further study.

While Chapter I provided an introduction to this study, a comprehensive review of TSE, CE, and forensics-drama was required to gain a greater appreciation for the significance of this study. I provided this information in the following Chapter II, which focused on clarifying all themes presented in Chapter I.

## Chapter II: Review of the Literature

Since the 1970s, researchers have studied the important role self-efficacy played in individuals' professional success (Bandura, 1977, 1986; Feltz et al., 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Teachers and athletic coaches with high levels of efficacy increased students' intrinsic motivation to improve, which benefited the students through their academic and professional careers (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). As forensics-drama coaches performed the dual role of teacher and coach (Rutledge, 2006), a better understanding of forensics-drama CE should be researched to affect positive change in new coaches so the new coaches could better serve their students (Bandura, 1997; Kleinjan, 2014). At the time of this study, I was unaware of any existing studies examining forensics-drama CE. I interviewed forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee in this qualitative interpretive study to discover the perceived factors that led to forensics-drama CE and to create a framework for the understanding of the forensics-drama coaches' perceptions of success.

According to Merriam-Webster (2020), forensics was "the art or study of argumentative discourse" (para. 5). For the context of high school speech and debate, the argumentative discourse was at the heart of the activity. Forensics-drama originally began with different forms of debate (NSDA, 2020), then added speech events, and finally included interpretation and acting events. The amalgamation of activities known as *forensics* has improved the academic wellbeing of its participants since its inception (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015; Derryberry, 1991; Stolen, 1995).

In this literature review, I introduced the importance of studying forensics-drama CE by thoroughly outlining the literature covering TSE, CE, and what was known about forensics-drama coaches. The TSE section of this literature review was divided into factors that affected the creation of professional TSE and elements that affected TSE to generate a prediction of what factors might affect forensics-drama CE. Research into CE was still in genesis (Brailsford, 2014; Myers et al., 2008), and I used the work of Feltz et al. (1999) and Chase et al. (2005) to guide the creation of this research study. Chase et al. (2005) utilized a purposeful sample of 12 coaches from the Feltz et al. (1999) study who were willing to participate in a 45-minute telephone interview. The 12 represented diversity in age, race, and years of experience, so the researchers could obtain a comprehensive data set (Chase et al., 2005). Chase et al. (2005) created questions based on the Feltz et al. (1999) study to ascertain sources of CE, and I received permission from Chase et al. (2005) to slightly alter and use those interview questions to create an understanding of forensics-drama CE. In this literature review, the CE section outlined the sources of CE and the few studies that addressed factors that affected CE.

Bandura's (1986) work with self-efficacy created the framework of studies involving TSE and CE and will be used as the framework of this study. As forensics-drama coaches were both teachers and coaches (Rutledge, 2006), a thorough investigation of TSE and CE was necessary to understand the role a forensics-drama coach played. The literature review concluded with a synthesis of what was known about the forensics-drama coach to show the importance of the

coach and the importance of the forensics-drama activities to students to justify the necessity of this study.

### **Teacher Self-Efficacy**

Researchers identified TSE as the belief a teacher had in his instructional abilities to affect positive student achievement outcomes (Bandura, 1997; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014). As student success should be the primary objective for educators, TSE played a large role in the classroom (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012). The higher the TSE, the more confident the teacher was in taking on classroom challenges; therefore, the teacher had a higher likelihood of classroom practices that led to greater academic success for the students (Haider & Mushtaq, 2017).

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2016) studied TSE and stress as predictors of teacher engagement, teacher emotional exhaustion, and teachers' motivation to leave the education profession. These potential stressors included "discipline problems, time pressure, low student motivation, conflict with colleagues, lack of supervisory support, value conflict, and student diversity" (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016, p. 1795). Of the seven stressors, time pressure, low student motivation, lack of supervisory support, and value conflict were significantly associated with TSE and stress. Low student motivation, value conflict, and lack of supervisory support were negatively correlated with TSE. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2016) defined value conflict as "the feeling that the prevailing goals and values at the school are not in accordance with the teachers' personal values" (p. 1796). The researchers reported as the goals of the institution moved farther from the goals of the teacher, TSE decreased. This aligns with other research regarding TSE and

school climate (Aldridge & Fraser, 2016; Garvis, 2012). Time pressures increased the teachers' stress but did not affect TSE. The researchers reported there were weak to moderate correlations between the stressors, which implied the stressors should be independently studied and were not necessarily confounded to each other.

This literature review used the recommendation of Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2016) to independently review the effects of student motivation, school climate, and administrators on TSE. While reviewing the literature, professional development and collaboration also affected TSE (Garvis et al., 2011) and were included in this review. These four factors, along with the literature pertaining to the formation of TSE, created the base of understanding for forensics-drama CE.

### ***Formation of Teacher Self-Efficacy***

College and university educator preparation courses played the first role in creating TSE, and that sense was solidified in the first three years of a teacher's career (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011). According to Garvis and Pendergast (2011), once a teacher's sense of self-efficacy was formed in the developmental years of the teacher's career, those opinions were resistant to change. Mastery of a content related directly to a teacher's perceived ability to teach that content (Menon & Sadler, 2016). This perceived ability translated to higher TSE in the teacher's first years of teaching, and consequently, the teacher's mastery of the subject grew because more time was spent teaching that subject.

According to Garvis et al. (2011) arts education was a compulsory curriculum component in elementary schools in Queensland, Australia. The Ministerial Council for Education, Employment, and Youth Affairs broke the arts

into five components: dance, drama, media, music, and visual arts. Garvis et al. (2011) concluded there were three areas that had the largest effect on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy: the supervising teacher practice, the supervising teacher feedback, and the value of arts as a subject viewed by the participant. A new teacher's sense of self-efficacy was affected by how a mentor teacher felt about a topic, as well as how the mentor teacher critiqued and corrected the novice teacher (Swan et al., 2011). The finding regarding the value of arts was specific to Garvis et al.'s (2011) research and was not universally applicable to all novice teachers, but the importance of understanding the educators' perspectives of their value of the arts, as compared to core subjects, was necessary to better understand sources of forensics-drama CE. At the time of this study, there were no specific endorsements required in Tennessee to teach or coach forensics-drama (Tennessee Department of Education, 2020).

Swackhamer et al. (2009) suggested if a novice teacher felt more comfortable with a subject, there could be a positive correlation on TSE. Garvis and Pendergast (2011) explored the assumption that novice teachers had higher TSE in subjects that teachers were more comfortable teaching. The researchers investigated the "perceived levels of early childhood teachers' self-efficacy in the teaching of arts education (i.e., dance, drama, music, visual arts and media) compared to the teaching of English and Maths" (p. 6) and found teachers had higher TSE for teaching English and math. The teachers spent more time in college preparing to teach English and math, and those teachers had stronger content knowledge in English and math than in the arts. The finding paralleled

Menon and Sadler (2016), who suggested in-depth understanding of a content was necessary to develop efficacy.

Similarly, novice teachers spent more time in their classrooms on content about which they had the greatest knowledge. Garvis and Pendergast (2011) asserted novice teachers spent more time and had higher motivation to teach content areas where they had the greatest self-perceived competence. Swackhamer et al. (2009) claimed the motivation was directly related to the teachers' content knowledge. This motivation and time was imperative for novice teachers and showed the importance of schooling and teacher support for positive TSE for new teachers. According to Menon and Sadler (2016), teachers who entered the field with high TSE transitioned from teacher training to the classroom more effectively than teachers with low TSE.

Garvis (2012) specifically studied TSE in music, math, and English, as TSE pertained to beginning general education teachers. The researcher found TSE for teaching music decreased between the first and third year of teaching, while TSE for math and English increased. Bandura (1997) suggested TSE beliefs were created by mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. Garvis pointed to Bandura (1997) to conclude the reason for the difference between high TSE in teaching math and English was due to the importance placed on the subjects as compared to music. Milner (2002) suggested the context of a teacher's work environment guided TSE, and teachers would improve in the areas where importance was placed while ignoring areas in the curriculum that were not reinforced by extrinsic factors. That highlighted the importance of understanding the effect of extrinsic factors on TSE (Milner, 2002).

According to Mojavezi and Tamiz (2012), teachers with high TSE implemented educational innovations and utilized classroom management techniques and teaching methods that encouraged student autonomy, where teachers with low TSE were reluctant to incorporate student-centered teaching models within their lessons. The researchers showed student autonomy increased student achievement because the students had higher intrinsic motivation to accomplish academic challenges as opposed to teachers relying on extrinsic pressures to force the students to comply. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2014) claimed competence and autonomy were required to maintain intrinsic motivation, and teachers' need for autonomy was as required for student success as student autonomy. Perceived teacher autonomy was positively related to high TSE, teacher job satisfaction, and reduced feelings of burnout (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014), and as the research had shown, these factors were widely set in the first years of a teacher's career (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011).

### ***Factors Affecting Teacher Self-Efficacy***

Not all factors affecting TSE generalized to one category, and each factor should be addressed individually to fully understand TSE and better prepare teachers for their profession (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). It was important to understand the factors that affected TSE because, based on Bandura's (1977) concept of efficacy, the factors that affected TSE might also affect forensics-drama CE.

**Student Motivation's Effect on TSE.** TSE and student achievement were cyclical in nature, meaning as TSE positively affected student achievement, the greater achievements of the students created a higher sense of TSE (Kelm &

McIntosh, 2012). Mojavezi and Tamiz (2012) investigated the impact of TSE on students' motivation and achievement and concluded as TSE increased, student extrinsic motivation decreased and student intrinsic motivation increased. Students gained intrinsic motivation through situational interest created by their teachers who made students excited about learning new concepts (Wiesman, 2012). High TSE teachers believed extra instructor effort and appropriate teacher intervention techniques could inspire unmotivated students to achieve, when low TSE teachers thought they could not rouse student success if students were poorly motivated (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012).

Kelm and McIntosh (2012) researched the effects of the school-wide positive behavior support (SWPBS) program on TSE. The researchers discovered a statistically significant effect of SWPBS on TSE but also cited higher student academic success at the SWPBS schools than at the traditional schools. The researchers claimed the academic success came as a result of the implementation of SWPBS because teachers had more time to focus on instruction instead of spending time disciplining students. According to Wiesman (2012), teachers who used innovative teaching strategies and incorporated various instructional techniques were better able to motivate their students and generate interest in the lessons. This implied the implementation of SWPBS could have affected TSE because students at SWPBS schools were less prone to distraction and more inclined to actively engage with the lessons (Kelm & McIntosh, 2012), but teachers with high TSE believed they could influence students' intellectual development regardless of the opposing influences on the students (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012). The juxtaposition of student behavior at SWPBS schools versus

traditional schools and high TSE instructors' willingness to help students achieve regardless of the students' situation pointed to the cyclical nature of student motivation and TSE (Kelm & McIntosh, 2012) and suggested the need to understand the role school climate played in TSE.

**School Climate's Effect on TSE.** Garvis (2012) warned once the support structure of a college or university was removed from a beginning teacher, TSE may decline. Swan et al. (2011) suggested new teachers experienced their lowest level of TSE after their first year of teaching. At that point, the teacher's school climate, more specifically the school's principal, largely influenced TSE. According to Aldridge and Fraser (2016), an encouraging school climate, one that supported communication among staff members and schoolwide goal consensus, significantly influenced positive TSE. Veiskarami et al. (2017) showed group efficacy and individual efficacy were linked. The researchers found a positive correlation between school climate and TSE and between collective self-efficacy and TSE (Veiskarami et al., 2017). Aldridge and Fraser (2016) proposed those significantly positive relationships suggested teachers who taught at schools that had greater collective efficacy would also have higher individual TSE. The researchers asserted the higher levels of TSE directly related to the teachers' ability to receive help and guidance from their coworkers while feeling accepted and encouraged (Aldridge & Fraser, 2016).

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2016) furthered this notion of positive school climate and positive collective efficacy being a predictor of positive TSE with the idea of value consonance, which was described as "the feeling that the prevailing goals and values at the school are in accordance with the teachers' personal

values” (p. 1796). When the teacher’s and the school’s values aligned, there was a feeling of belonging and job satisfaction that directly related positively to the TSE. Stipek (2012) claimed teachers had higher TSE when they worked in a climate where co-teachers who shared values and held all students to the values of the institution supported each other. This idea was paralleled by Aldridge and Fraser (2016), who suggested staff members who identified themselves as having goal consensus with the other staff reported having higher TSE. According to Kelm and McIntosh (2012), classroom management became less of an issue for the individual teacher when a school had aligned expectations and disciplinary standards, which led teachers to feel they were better able to affect student outcomes. Those positive student outcomes fed back to the overall school climate, and as the school climate improved, TSE increased, creating an overall climate that was conducive for teacher and student success (Çalik et al., 2012; Veiskarami et al., 2017).

**Administrators’ Effect on TSE.** The school principal was an important factors that altered TSE within the school climate. According to Çalik et al. (2012), school principals’ instructional leadership style had a positive, significant effect on TSE. The researchers found the strongest significant relationship between TSE and instructional leadership techniques were at the evaluating teachers dimension of instructional leadership, which implied administrators who fostered relationships and aided personal growth in teachers during evaluation had teachers with higher self-efficacy. This higher TSE increased collective efficacy by a process that Bandura (1997) called *reciprocal causality*. Reciprocal causality stated as one variable positively impacted a second variable, the rise in the second

variable increased the first variable. The positive increase in the first variable inevitably positively affected the second variable, and the process continued. *Reciprocal causality* was a common theme in TSE, seen in the relationship between TSE and student success (Kelm & McIntosh, 2012) and in the relationship between TSE and teacher content knowledge (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Menon & Sadler, 2016; Swackhamer et al., 2009). Çalik et al. (2012) cited Bandura's (1977) principle of *reciprocal causality* as justification for the results of the study. Perceived affective instructional leadership techniques positively affected TSE, which increased collective efficacy, which in turn affected perceptions of instructional leadership techniques.

Stipek (2012) investigated the effect perceived administration support and student demographics had on TSE. Administrator support was significantly correlated with TSE, while the student demographics were not significantly correlated with TSE. This suggested, with effective administrative support, teachers felt they could teach students regardless of the students' ethnicity, economic status, or recorded intelligence, which supported the claim high TSE teachers were more capable to affect student achievement (Kelm & McIntosh, 2012; Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012; Wiesman, 2012). In fact, Stipek (2012) reported only perceptions of barriers to parents' involvement in student's education negatively impacted TSE. Self-efficacy decreased when teachers felt there was limited or negative support from parents. The researcher stated the negative impact of TSE from perceived parent support could be offset by administrators. Stipek (2012) suggested administrators should provide opportunities for parental involvement in schools and districts that report having low or negative parental

involvement. This would directly impact TSE by addressing a primary source of low TSE and indirectly impact TSE by improving the climate of the school through community involvement, which has been linked to have positive effects on TSE (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016).

An administrator's role in TSE was a balancing act. The administrator should support and protect their teachers from negative elements coming from outside of the school (Stipek, 2012) and help the teacher strive to intrinsically improve classroom instruction that would ultimately result in higher student achievement outcomes (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011), all without creating an educational environment of heteronomy. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2014) studied the relationship between TSE and educator perceptions of autonomy. The researchers identified three significant outcomes of perceived autonomy. The primary finding was autonomy and TSE were positively correlated, suggesting teachers felt highly capable if they believed the administration trusted the teachers to operate the classroom and instruct the students. The two other outcomes were "teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy positively predicted engagement and job satisfaction and negatively predicted emotional exhaustion" (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014, p. 74). This suggested teachers who felt capable to teach and felt trusted by their administration were content to work harder in their profession. As seen in Bandura's (1997) theory of *reciprocal causality*, this sense of engagement, satisfaction, and lack of emotional exhaustion resulted in higher student achievement.

Mojavezi and Tamiz (2012) stressed the importance of the school administrator in creating opportunities for the teachers to improve their

self-efficacy. Those opportunities came by way of a perceived leadership style that focused on teacher needs, development, support, and autonomy, which indirectly improved student achievement by way of higher TSE. Principals directly contributed to positive TSE by being approachable, supportive, concentrating on team building and goal consensus, and empowering teachers to work autonomously (Edwards et al., 2002).

According to Aldridge and Fraser (2016), the administrators could heighten job satisfaction by decreasing the amount of work pressure felt by the teachers. A teacher's perceived work pressures and stresses were inversely related to TSE. According to Srivastava et al. (2016), teachers with low confidence in their ability to manage negative situations in their classroom lost interest in their jobs, which led to decreased job involvement. Teachers altered their teaching activities and modified their definition of success and failure as job involvement decreased (Yu et al., 2015). The lowering of TSE also affected teachers' mood regulation, which could have a negative impact on the institution, as teacher morale and job performance was related to teacher interaction (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016).

**Professional Development and Collaboration's Effect on TSE.** The research has shown a teacher's university experience, job climate, and principal played a large role in TSE, and once TSE was established it was resistant to change (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011), but that did not mean TSE was impervious to change. Stressors, often many outside of the administrator's control, were present over the course of a teacher's career, and one of the best ways to fight stressors and increase TSE was through regular professional development and

collaboration. Professional development and collaboration could increase teacher knowledge and, in turn, support teacher mastery in a multitude of contexts, which could increase teacher confidence and ultimately TSE (Drape et al., 2016). The advantage to professional development and collaboration was the teacher's ability to gain knowledge, resources, and support over a myriad of topics relevant to the individual educator. That paralleled with Skaalvik and Skaalvik's (2016) theory that each source of teacher stress should be addressed separately. That permitted teachers to self-advocate by allowing teachers to feel as though their individual needs mattered and were worthy of attention, thereby increasing TSE.

Gaikhorst et al. (2015) conducted a study in which the researcher gathered views of beginning primary school teachers following the professional development program *Mastery*. At the conclusion of the year, the group that attended the Mastery professional development program showed a significant increase of TSE as compared to the control group, who did not attend the training. Gaikhorst et al. (2015) reported the teachers who attended the Mastery program felt more comfortable in their roles, and that comfort led to the higher sense of TSE. Swan et al. (2011) suggested new teachers often experienced a decline in TSE following their first year of teaching, and professional development programs could help struggling teachers regain confidence (Drape et al., 2016).

Professional learning communities (PLCs) were professional development tools also found to positively affect TSE (Battersby & Verdi, 2015). Owen (2016) suggested the nature of PLC teams and activities, the shared vision and pleasure, the trusting relationships and meanings, and the collaborative inquiry and learning engagement directly related to the teachers' views of their school climate.

Teachers involved in PLCs had a positive view of their work environment and fellow teachers, which led to greater job satisfaction and higher TSE (Battersby & Verdi, 2015; Milner, 2002; Owen, 2016). Specifically, within the PLCs, the administration played a large role in teacher opinions (Çalik et al., 2012; Stipek, 2012). Principals placed emphasis on PLCs as a way to build pedagogical skills, student feedback techniques, and peer evaluation, which created a sense of independence and autonomy in the teachers in their classrooms that led to the increase of student achievement (Owen, 2016). The findings reflected previous studies exploring the interaction of school climate, administration support, students' success, and TSE (Çalik et al., 2012; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014; Stipek, 2012).

TSE was an important component to study in the educational landscape and could potentially parallel to the understanding of forensics-drama CE. Through careful analysis of current literature and research, four factors (i.e., student motivation, school climate, administrators, and professional development and collaboration) all had affected TSE. According to Bandura (1997), the improvement of one of those factors could positively impact TSE, which then could positively affect another aspect; however, the inverse can also be true. If one factor deteriorates, there could be a negative impact on TSE, which could then negatively impact the other factors, making it imperative to analyze each factor individually to fully know how to improve TSE to best serve the students (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). The understanding of the four factors that affected TSE along with an understanding of how TSE was formed, was an important step to understanding forensics-drama CE.

## **Coaching Efficacy**

The literature outlined the importance of understanding the sources and effects of TSE on student learning. According to researchers, like teachers, coaches played an important role in the lives of students (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999; Myers et al., 2008). Although often associated with sports, Moen and Allgood (2009) defined a coach as someone who helped people achieve specific goals, and the objective of coaching was the development and growth of the pupil. The literature pertaining to coaching was primarily focused on athletic coaches, but the sources of CE were necessary to understand the potential sources of forensics-drama CE.

Players saw coaches with high CE to be effective coaches because of their instructional styles (Feltz et al., 1999). High CE coaches praised, encouraged, and corrected players more effectively than low CE coaches, but researchers had not studied the sources and effects of CE as widely as TSE (Feltz et al., 1999). Feltz et al. (1999) were the first researchers to look into CE as a separate construct from TSE (Chase et al., 2005; Myers et al., 2008), using Bandura's (1977) framework for understanding TSE to guide the study, and defined CE "as the extent to which coaches believe they have the capacity to affect the learning and performance of their athletes" (Feltz et al., 1999, p. 765).

Feltz et al. (1999) began with the idea that since TSE was perceived as a predictor for teacher effectiveness, then CE should predict coaching effectiveness. A study identifying qualities and skills of effective team coaches reiterated the importance of CE and showed the most important quality of an effective team coach was for the coaches to be aware of themselves and aware of their impact on

others (Jacox, 2016). Feltz et al. (1999) pulled from available coaching literature to create a preliminary model of CE, which included four factors: extent of coaching experience/preparation, prior success (win-loss record), perceived skill of athletes, and school/community support. The researchers admitted the list was rudimentary but necessary to create a starting point to better understand CE. Chase et al. (2005) later refined the sources of CE to reflect opinions of active high school coaches. The researchers selected high school coaches to begin the research of CE because high school coaches were at the intersection of coaching and teaching, and there was an assumption that coaches at higher levels had higher degrees of confidence in their coaching abilities because coaches would require a higher skillset to coach at higher levels (Chase et al. 2005; Feltz et al., 1999).

Feltz et al. (1999) conducted a seminar with 11 high school basketball head coaches and had open discussions about the four factors of CE. From those discussions, Feltz et al. (1999) created four CE dimensions:

- Game strategy efficacy: the belief the coaches had in their ability to lead their team during a game/match;
- Motivation efficacy: the belief the coaches had in their ability to motivate their players psychologically;
- Technique efficacy: the belief the coaches had in their ability to train their athletes in a specific sport related skill; and
- Character building efficacy: the belief the coaches had in their ability to influence their athlete's attitude and personal growth.

The researchers identified these four dimensions to allow future researchers to look into specific facets of CE as well as to create a CE scale similar to the Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) TSE scale. Feltz et al. (1999) used teams of researchers to observe coaches with the highest CE and lowest CE in attempt to connect the findings of the literature and subsequent efficacy dimensions to create a reliable Coaching Efficacy Scale (CES). The researchers concluded the assumed sources of CE (i.e., coaches' years of experience, coaches' winning percentage, coaches' perceived athlete ability, and social support) positively correlated with the observations of the high efficacy coaches and negatively correlated with low efficacy coaches. Feltz et al. (1999) deemed the CES a valid and reliable tool with the caveat that more research was required to narrow specific sources and factors of CE.

Researchers used the CES tool to measure CE at all skill levels, but there were appreciable differences between coaches' motivations at the youth/recreation leagues, secondary level, and the collegiate/professional levels that could potentially alter CE findings (Francis, 2012). Youth/recreation league coaches were primarily volunteers, and collegiate/professional level coaches were employed solely to be the coach of a team (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; McLean & Mallett, 2012). According to Lee (2013), secondary level coaches were either coaches who also taught at the school they coached or freelance coaches hired by the district to coach a team. Myers et al. (2008) created a CES tool specific to high school team head coaches by adjusting certain elements of the Feltz et al. (1999) survey to make the tool more specific to high school coaches. Although the Coaching Efficacy Scale II – High School Teams (CES II – HST) survey was

a reliable and valid tool to use to gauge CE, it yielded similar results to the original CES (Myers et al., 2008).

Lee (2013) utilized the CES II – HST to study the efficacy of 230 high school head coaches in New Mexico across several sports. The researcher studied the effects of coach gender, coach ethnicity, school size, and school assignment (i.e., teacher and coach or school contracted coach) on CE. Lee (2013) noted school assignment did not affect CE but found coach gender and coach ethnicity played a role in establishing CE. White, male coaches, on average, had the most years of coaching experience, and Lee (2013) suggested the differences in levels of CE between male and female coaches, and white and non-white coaches, was a result of the discrepancy of years of experience. The largest factor that affected CE, according to the researcher, was school size. Lee (2013) claimed coaches at larger high schools had more students to choose from and that increased the coaches' perceived student ability, which aligned with the source of CE outlined by Feltz et al. (1999).

Chase et al. (2005) expanded on the work of Feltz et al. (1999) to gain a deeper understanding of the sources of CE. The researchers began with the framework of the Feltz et al. (1999) study and dove deeper into the preliminary assumptions of the sources of CE based on literature. The researchers intended to identify sources of CE from primary source interviews to strengthen the reliability and validity of the CES tool. Chase et al. (2005) conducted interviews of 12 of the high school boys' basketball coaches studied by Feltz et al. (1999). After coding the interviews, the researchers isolated six additional sources of CE: player development, coaches' development, knowledge/preparation, leadership skills,

player support, and past experience. Chase et al. (2005) expanded the original model of sources of CE from Feltz et al. (1999) to include the factors gleaned from the interviews (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Sources of Coaching Efficacy*

Feltz et al. (1999)	Chase et al. (2005)
Extent of Coaching Experience/ Preparation	Extent of Coaching Experience/ Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge to prepare team</li> <li>• Past experience in coaching</li> <li>• Leadership skills</li> <li>• Coaches' development</li> </ul>
Prior Success (win/loss record)	Prior Success (win/loss record)
Perceived Skill of Athletes	Perceived Skill of Athletes
School/Community Support	Support from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Students/Teachers</li> <li>• Community</li> <li>• Parents</li> </ul>
	Player Improvement

The researcher highlighted four of the six sources of efficacy dealt with intrinsically motivated themes for the coaches and suggested further research was necessary to understand what motivated coaches to deeply understand CE.

Although research pertaining to the formation of CE was limited, similar to TSE, the coaches' motivations to train altered their level of CE (Feltz et al., 1999; Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016). Researchers who studied coach motivation suggested, like CE, motivators were different for all coaches, but coaching motivations fell into one of three categories: intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivational (McLean & Mallett, 2012). Deci and Ryan (1980) introduced the

Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which defined the three motivational categories of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivational. The SDT suggested the two avenues that motivated behavior were the conscious decisions rooted in intrinsic or extrinsic stimuli and the automated decisions rooted in the subconscious (Deci & Ryan, 1980). The researchers grouped intrinsic and extrinsic motivation into one category because both motivations required a reward structure, where the intrinsic reward was the participation in the activity and the extrinsic reward was a reward separate from the action (e.g. money) (Deci & Ryan, 1980). The amotivational subsystem of the SDT categorized the remainder of stimuli that did not fit in the behavior and outcomes relationship, such as stressors, coping skills, psychological well-being, burnout, and identity (Norris et al., 2017).

Researchers predicted coaches who coached for primarily intrinsic reasons had higher levels of CE (Chase et al., 2005). Mallett and Lara-Bercial (2016) conducted an examination of serial winning coaches. The researchers interviewed 14 purposefully selected coaches based on the coaches' level and frequency of success. Mallett and Lara-Bercial (2016) coded the interviews and reported the serial winning coaches primarily focused on learning and personal growth, both for the players and for themselves. The coaches reported setting and accomplishing personal goals, such as serving their athletes and support staff, promoting teamwork, and positively influencing others, were more important than winning. A common explanation for the coaches' intrinsically motivated goal setting was often times when they were younger, coaches played the sport they coached (Brailsford, 2015; McLean & Mallett, 2012). While playing, the coaches developed an early passion and enjoyment for the game they took with them into

coaching. The coaches remained involved with the sport longer because their love of the sport lowered levels of burnout and increased their psychological well-being (Alcaraz et al., 2015).

McLean and Mallett (2012) interviewed 13 head coaches from team and individual sports and suggested coaches who worked at lower levels of competition, such as youth/recreation leagues and at the secondary level, were more intrinsically motivated to coach. The researchers proposed at the higher levels of coaching, such as at the collegiate and professional levels, the extrinsic motivator *winning* was the predominate factor in coaching motivation because the primary performance outcome evaluator was winning. Coaches were not effective or successful if their teams did not win. McLean and Mallett (2012) claimed the pressure to win from the team's fan base and financial support structure related positively with the coaches' extrinsic drive to win.

The researchers also claimed player enjoyment and player growth were strong extrinsic motivators for coaches at the participation and development levels but less important for high performance coaches. Francis (2012) suggested the coaches' desire for player enjoyment and player growth connected to the coaches' view of their coaching responsibility. Coaches at the participation level, youth/recreation leagues, were often volunteers who desired to instill love of the sport while teaching the athletes the basic skills required to play. Coaches at the secondary level still viewed their role as instruction based, but at varsity levels, coaches could pick the teams which suggested athletes had some level of prior knowledge and skills of the game. (Francis, 2012; McLean & Mallett, 2012). Coaches at the collegiate and professional levels expected the athletes to already

have the passion and skills necessary to be successful and did not view their responsibility as coach to instruct but rather to challenge the athletes and facilitate growth and development of the team (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016). McLean and Mallett (2012) pointed out, regardless of perceptions of compensation, none of the coaches interviewed cited money as a motivator. The researchers suggested coaches' intrinsic motivations were stronger than the extrinsic motivations to coach.

Researchers traditionally overlooked the amotivational coaching category as a topic of study, and researchers began studying the subgroups of amotivation later than intrinsic and extrinsic motivations (Alcaraz et al., 2015; Chase et al., 2005; Norris et al., 2017). Researchers had limited observations of amotivation but focused on the basic psychological needs (BPN) of the coaches (Alcaraz et al., 2015; Bentzen et al., 2016; Norris et al., 2017; Pope & Hall, 2015). According to Pope and Hall (2015), BPN for coaches involved coaches having ownership over their actions, viewing themselves as effective and capable, and feeling connected to their athletes. Bentzen et al. (2016) surveyed 343 head coaches of various sports three weeks prior to the start of their seasons and three weeks before the end of their seasons. Coaches who met their BPN reported to have higher psychological and emotional well-being and reported lower levels of burnout than coaches who did not meet their BPN (Alcaraz et al., 2015; Bentzen et al., 2016). Mallett and Lara-Bercial (2016) claimed players perceived their coaches as less emotionally stable than their coaches perceived themselves, which insinuated a disconnect between coaches and perceived BPN. Bentzen et al. (2016) noted, despite the sport or length of season, there was an overall negative trend in

well-being reported, and all coaches conveyed some level of burnout. The researchers suggested there were extraneous reasons for the trend and recommended more research on the subject.

Researchers expressed the need for more studies regarding CE (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999); however, the findings about CE could help guide the understanding of forensics-drama CE. Coaching motivation played a role in creating CE (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; McLean & Mallett, 2012), and players saw coaches with higher levels of CE as more effective than coaches with lower levels of CE (Feltz et al., 1999). Researchers suggested five factors (i.e., experience and preparation of the coach, prior success, skill of the athletes, player improvement, and program support) affected CE (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999). This study used the five factors affecting CE along with the four factors shown to affect TSE to guide the investigation into sources of forensics-drama CE.

### **Forensics-Drama Coaching**

The roots of forensics dated to the ancient Greek and Roman ages with the formation of rhetoric and debate (Hogan & Kurr, 2017; Ivey, 2017), and the history of forensics-drama in America was almost as old as America itself (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015). Debate began in the American colonies in colleges as a way to teach argumentation and became prominent in 19th century education when the resolutions evolved from philosophical quandaries to practical political issues of the day (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015). During the American Progressive Era (late 19th century–early 20th century), Americans took a more active role in politics, and the principles of oratory were valued in education along with

argumentation and debate rhetoric (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015; Hogan & Kurr, 2017). Forensics-drama participation, as understood in the 21st century as “competition for the sake of competition” (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015, p. 159), did not appear until after World War II. According to Bartanen and Littlefield (2015), America experienced an increase of citizens with higher education who sought mentally stimulating leisure activities, and forensics-drama provided stimulation.

There was no agreed upon catalytic moment that brought forensics-drama from the university level to the secondary level, but as competition entered high schools, state level governing bodies took over, regulated, and adapted forensics-drama events (NSDA, 2020; Tennessee High School Speech and Drama League [THSSDL], 2020). The National Speech and Debate Association (NSDA) served as a governing body for forensics-drama competition and oversaw event rules and regulations and presided over a national tournament at the culmination of each competition year. I focused on forensics-drama coaches in the state of Tennessee who adhered to NSDA and THSSDL regulations. THSSDL was the governing body for Tennessee forensics-drama competition and oversaw event rules and regulations and presided over a state tournament at the culmination of each competition year. Although THSSDL chose to align similar events with NSDA, success in THSSDL did not translate to entry in the NSDA national tournament. The NSDA had a separate state-level qualifying tournament for entry to their national tournament.

THSSDL recognized three elements of forensics-drama competition: debate, speech, and acting. The speech category contained both traditional and

interpretive (i.e., taking a form between speaking and acting) speech events, and the acting category contained acting and theatrically derived events (NSDA, 2020; THSSDL, 2020) (see Table 2).

Table 2

*Forensics-Drama Events*

Debate Events	Speech Events	Acting Events
Big Question	After Dinner Speaking*	Duet*
Congressional*	Commentary	One Act Play*
Cross-Examination*	Expository	Pantomime*
Extemporaneous	Extemporaneous*	Solo*
Lincoln-Douglas	Impromptu*	
Policy	Informative*	<i>Theatre-Based</i>
Public Forum*	Original Oratory*	Theatre Design - Costume*
World Schools		Theatre Design - Set*
	<i>Interpretations</i>	
	Dramatic*	
	Duo*	
	Humorous*	
	Interpreter's Theatre*	
	Poetry*	
	Program Oral*	
	Prose*	
	Storytelling*	
	Television Broadcast*	

*Note:* \*THSSDL state and district level event. All events acknowledged by THSSDL and a description of the event have been provided (see Appendix A).

Forensics-DRAMA coaches worked in a world between teacher and coach (Rutledge, 2006), but unlike teaching and coaching studies, researchers minimally explored forensics-drama coaching (Baker, 2016; Rosenthal, 1997) and did not examine forensics-drama CE. The literature pertaining to forensics-drama coaches revealed the coaches' role in the team, an expectation and emphasis on team and individual success, and the benefits of the forensics-drama activities for the students (Burnett et al., 2003; Derryberry, 1991; Kleinjan, 2014; Rutledge, 2006).

### ***Forensics-Drama Coach Responsibilities***

Forensics-drama coaches' responsibilities included recruiting students to the team, acclimating students to the traditions of the team, educating the students to the rules of the events, helping students succeed in their events, and ultimately convincing students to come back the next year (Brennan, 2011). According to Friedley and Manchester (2005), the coach was the primary source of communication for the team. Coaches communicated basic tournament information, rules for the events, and feedback for students' performances, but coaches communicated more than just verbal information.

Holm (2015) found students modeled their actions after their coach. Strong coaches modeled the events for their students, but also modeled appropriate interaction and encouragement (Stolen, 1995). Coaches who emphasized the value of relationships within their team had a more cohesive team worked together to achieve performance goals (Derryberry, 2005). Cohesive teams generated their own ideas and standards for defining and achieving success (Friedley & Manchester, 2005).

Logsdon (2013) claimed peer coaching was a major aspect of team cohesion. The coach must be present and involved in all of the team activities but needed to find a way to teach leadership skills to the students so the coach could comfortably divide leadership responsibilities to create a sense of team autonomy (Logsdon, 2013). Littlefield and Venette (2004) suggested once the team achieved a level of autonomy, coaches must remain the center of power to keep the team aligned with a unified set of values and performance goals.

### ***Forensics-Drama Program Success***

According to researchers, students would rather join a forensics-drama program with a history of victory than a floundering program, so the coach should not overlook the role success played in the team despite the fact that there was no unified definition of team success (Burnett et al., 2003). Holm (2015) suggested the concept of success differed from year to year, coach to coach, and student to student, so it was the coach's responsibility to identify the definition of success each year. According to Logsdon (2013), winning was only a fraction of what was considered successful. Successful teams set and achieved individual and team goals, created a culture of pride, and embraced traditions that celebrated the past while the team looked to the future. Stolen (1995) interviewed top-rated Minnesota forensics-drama coaches who reported students should set their own expectations and goals for success, which allowed coaches to define success at the individual level. Derryberry (1995) suggested forensics-drama teams could not achieve success without first identifying and adhering to team values. Successful students carried their team's values with them even when not participating in competition and applied forensics-drama skills to academic work and to life (Derryberry, 1991).

According to the literature, the coach and the support of the program affected the success of forensics-drama programs. Successful coaches were thoroughly trained and were able to connect with their students to properly motivate and educate the team (Rutledge, 2006). Thriving programs were monetarily and emotionally supported by the school, administration, community, and parents (Baker, 2016; Jackson, 2004).

Rosenthal (1997) conducted a meta-analysis of academic studies published about the forensics-drama coach and found coaching success was a result of the coach holding an advanced degree, having extensive formal forensics-drama training, and participating in forensics-drama in both high school and college. Rosenthal (1997) warned the findings were potentially no longer applicable to modern forensics-drama competition because the studies analyzed were published between the 1950s and 1970s. The researcher claimed the coach was an important part of forensics-drama team success, but not enough modern research was available to claim the three factors were still applicable. Rosenthal (1997) recommended researchers should conduct studies to better understand the role the coach played in forensics-drama team success. Rutledge (2006) conducted in-depth interviews with six top forensics-drama coaches (having won more than one national tournament at the team-wide level) and claimed coach knowledge was an important factor to success but stressed awareness of the written and unwritten rules of each event, as well as the foresight to stay ahead of event trends, were more important than formal forensics-drama education. Gray et al. (2018) reported coaches' personal experience and forensics-drama training affected the coaches primarily at the beginning of their careers because the experience and training shaped coaches' understanding of forensics-drama. Coaches with experience and a desire to grow adapted with their students over the course of their career as the events and team expectations changed (Stolen, 1995). Rutledge (2006) suggested coaches' relationships with the individual team members and the team as a whole was as important to success as coaches' content knowledge. The researcher claimed the coaches' pedagogy, knowledge, and

motivational strategies only mattered to the students if the students and coaches had a good relationship. Holm (2012) further proposed coaches must strive to learn and understand new generations to continue a strong relationship with students over the course of the coach's career.

Kleinjan (2014) suggested the coach was the primary factor in forensics-drama team success but not the only factor of success. Researchers identified several components of support that could affect forensics-drama team success (Derryberry, 1997; Holm, 2012; Jackson, 2004; Stolen, 1995). Derryberry (1997) suggested the nature of forensics-drama competition, often spread out across a school building without a central observation location, made forensics-drama seem less influential than sports, choirs, and orchestras, and therefore made it harder for the team to receive support. Stolen (1995) suggested the best way to create support for a forensics-drama program was to involve the parents of the competitors. Holm (2012) championed parental involvement by claiming administrators would support forensics-drama to appease parents even if the administrators had no interest in the activity. Administrators could help support a forensics-drama program by promoting the program to the student body (Jackson, 2004). Administrators who promoted the forensics-drama program both assisted in increasing the number of students who joined the team and increased the school and community awareness of the program.

Baker (2016) suggested school and community awareness would create support for the team, which could heighten the confidence of the forensics-drama competitors. The largest support component that affected forensics-drama team success was money (Baker, 2016). Forensics-drama competition required

transportation to and from competitions, often including hotel accommodations, meals, proper tournament attire, and entry fees (Derryberry, 1997). Jackson (2004) reported programs that were properly funded were able to grow, but Baker (2016) noted, because of all of the monetary obligations of the competition, educational systems viewed forensics-drama as too expensive. This placed the burden of fundraising on the coach among the myriad of other obligations required to sustain a successful forensics-drama program (Jackson, 2004).

### ***Benefits of Forensics-Drama***

Forensics-drama participation balanced students between the worlds of competition and education, both as an individual and as part of a team (Kuyper, 2016). Students reported the main reason they participated in forensics-drama was the perceived attainability of victory (Burnett et al., 2003). According to Kleinjan (2014), students participated in forensics-drama because attending tournaments provided students an opportunity to win awards while spending time with their friends engaging in an activity they loved. Brennan (2011) claimed the educational benefits of forensic-drama preparation and competition outweighed the perceived rewards of actually winning the events. Academic lessons continued to benefit the participants' lives far after the thrill of winning trophies passed (Lowery-Hart & Simmons, 2008), and researchers suggested the study skills and confidence learned from participation transferred to students of all academic ability (Littlefield, 2001; Minch, 2006). Students succeeded in forensics-drama competition through hard work and time spent in preparation, and the discipline learned in event preparation transferred to academic discipline (McCrary, 2001), and helped students mold a broader approach to their study habits (Moyo, 2015).

The most commonly reported perceived benefit of forensics-drama competition was enhanced social skills (Beall, 2002; Littlefield, 2001; Minch, 2006; Moe, 2003).

Kuyumcu (2018) reported forensics-drama even helped students with anger management issues because the students reported a desire to communicate problems and potential solutions after engaging in the activity. Researchers found students who participated in forensics-drama were more open minded and willing to learn about other cultures (Silva et al., 2017), which resulted in students creating a deeper sense of empathy and enabled them to communicate effectively with individuals of different race, gender, and age (Bauschard & Rao, 2015). Students learned empathy at a deeper level because forensics-drama provided a network of individuals on the team who provided emotional resources (Ward, 2018), a home base for students to share memories and inspiration (Carmack & Holm, 2005; Derryberry, 2005), a connection to older students who shared their love of the events (Brand, 1996), and the ability to grow as a team through service learning opportunities (Hinck & Hinck, 1998).

Luong (2002) reported students who were captains of their forensics-drama team had a 60% higher acceptance rate to elite universities than students who did not compete. Students were able to attain greater positions of leadership at their university (Bartanen & Littlefield, 2015) and had stronger leadership and conflict management skills throughout their careers (Cranston & Kusanovich, 2014). Littlefield (2001) concluded of all of the perceptions of forensics-drama participation, “Notably absent in the top ten benefits listed by

high school students were items related to winning contests, acquiring trophies or awards, and travel” (p. 87).

### **Conclusion of Review of the Literature**

The review of the literature revealed a lack of research regarding forensics-drama coaches, in particular forensics-drama CE. The literature suggested the importance of understanding TSE because teachers with higher TSE were more confident, took on classroom challenges, created effective classroom practices, and had greater student academic success than teachers with low TSE (Bandura, 1997; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Haider & Mushtaq, 2017; Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014). The literature outlined student motivation and success, school climate, administrator support, and professional development and collaboration as primary factors that affected TSE (Aldridge & Fraser, 2016; Çalik et al., 2012; Garvis et al., 2011; Kelm & McIntosh, 2012). Like TSE, understanding CE was important to helping athletic coaches succeed because high CE coaches corrected, encouraged, and praised players more effectively than low CE coaches (Feltz et al., 1999). Researchers of CE suggested the extent of coaching experience, prior success, perceived skill of athletes, player improvement, and perceived support were the primary factors that affected CE (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999; Myers et al., 2008).

The literature review concluded with a brief history of competitive forensics-drama, the responsibilities of the forensics-drama coach, research outlining forensics-drama team success, and the benefits of forensics-drama to the student competitor. Since the forensics-drama coach performed in a world between an academic teacher and an athletic coach (Rutledge, 2006), sources of

efficacy for both teachers and coaches were reviewed. I took the next step to understanding sources of forensics-drama CE to assist forensics-drama coaches in cultivating their programs to ultimately help as many high school students as possible.

I employed the work of Bandura (1977, 1986, 1997) and the Chase et al. (2005) study, *Sources of Coaching Efficacy: The Coaches' Perspective*, to drive the framework of the study. Chase et al. (2005) looked to Bandura's (1977, 1986) work to parallel CE with TSE. The theoretical framework for this study was rooted in understanding the importance of both TSE and CE to fully understand all dimensions of forensics-drama CE. In Chapter III, the researcher used this theoretical framework to choose the research methodology, govern sampling procedures, and describe the analyzation of data in a qualitative study to answer the problem identified.

### **Chapter III: Methodology**

Researchers suggested teachers with high levels of TSE and coaches with high levels of CE improved student achievement by increasing students' and athletes' intrinsic motivation to succeed (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). The forensics-drama coach's role in students' education fused the responsibilities of teachers and coaches (Rutledge, 2006), yet little was known about the forensics-drama coaches' formation of CE. In this study, I interviewed purposefully selected forensics-drama coaches in the state of Tennessee to identify factors that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE from the perspective of forensics-drama and to create a framework for the understanding of the forensics-drama coaches' perceptions of success.

#### **Research Design**

Anthropologists and sociologists have conducted qualitative research to understand how humans interpret and define their life experiences (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Educational researchers have similarly utilized qualitative inquiry and research to understand the perceptions of teachers, administrators, students, and stakeholders and to capture an accurate meaning of the subjects' reality (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), one of the earliest and most commonly used qualitative research design was the qualitative interpretative study because of the purity and simplicity of the design's purpose to "understand how people make sense of their lives and their experiences" (p. 24).

I used the qualitative interpretative study as the methodology in this study because I was interested in how forensics-drama coaches interpreted and attributed their perceptions of their efficacy. This methodology guided my

collection of data related to the participants' perceptions of factors that led to forensics-drama CE. This methodology led me to conduct semi-structured interviews of purposely selected forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee. I then coded the responses to the interview questions to answer the research questions presented in this study.

### **Role of the Researcher**

Prior to beginning this research study, I was an active member of THSSDL and coached secondary students to THSSDL state championships at two different high schools in East Tennessee. During that time, I observed the benefits of forensics-drama participation for secondary students firsthand but noticed a lack of support and understanding of forensics-drama competition from teachers, administrators, and stakeholders who were unaware of the activity.

While compiling the literature review, I uncovered studies that focused on the benefits of the forensics-drama activities to the participants and studies that highlighted coaches at the collegiate level, but I also noticed a lack of research on the secondary forensics-drama coach. I selected Bandura's (1986) theory of self-efficacy to guide the framework of the study because of the findings of researchers regarding the improvement of student success through improved intrinsic motivation from high TSE teachers (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). I also discovered the burgeoning studies on the effect of athletic coaches' levels of CE on their players' success (Chase et al., 2005; Feltz et al., 1999; Myers et al., 2008). At the time of this study, I was unable to locate any research regarding forensics-drama CE. I decided to begin by investigating the perceptions of forensics-drama coaches about the factors that led to forensics-drama CE. It was

my hope that this study would be a foundational study other researchers could use to further investigate effects of forensics-drama CE.

There was a potential bias in this study because I was an active member of the same organization as the participants, THSSDL. To mitigate this potential bias, I adapted an interview protocol developed by Chase et al. (2005) to establish sources of athletic CE. Second, according to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), the researcher's role in a qualitative study was to build understandings of concepts. I sought to understand how forensics-drama coaches perceived the factors that led to forensics-drama CE and the only potential alteration to the coaches' perceptions came from having to formally express their opinions out loud (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). My actions to mitigate interview bias adequately alleviated the potential bias of THSSDL membership.

### **Participants of the Study**

For the purposes of this study, the population was forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee. According to Creswell (2009), purposefully selected participants were the best sample choice for qualitative interpretive studies because the researcher could gain specific insight to concepts rather than a general understanding of concepts. I followed Creswell's (2009) suggestion and chose to purposefully select the participants for this study. This study was interested in identifying perceptions of the factors that led to forensics-drama CE. The Chase et al. (2005) study investigated successful coaches' perceptions of the factors that led to CE. At the time of this study, there was not a unified definition of success in forensics-drama for all THSSDL coaches. I selected the executive board of THSSDL and any former THSSDL board chairs who were still active

forensics-drama coaches for the sample of this study because the board was voted in to their positions by their fellow THSSDL forensics-drama coaches. This suggested, but did not prove definitively, the coaches in the sample had reached a certain level of forensics-drama success.

The THSSDL executive board was comprised of the state chair who led one district chair and one district representative for each of the five forensics-drama competitive districts in Tennessee. District one comprised school systems located in West Tennessee, and the district identifiers moved numerically along the eastward geographic boundaries of Tennessee, where district five was the furthest school systems of East Tennessee. I believed the inclusion of all five competitive districts would provide rich data that represented the entire state of Tennessee and not just one region. Among the 11 board members, four were male and seven were female. All 11 board members coached forensics-drama at the secondary level and were selected by their peers to serve on the THSSDL executive board. Of the still active former THSSDL chairs, four were female and one was male.

### **Data Collection**

Prior to conducting this study, I received permission (see Appendix B) to adapt and use the interview protocol (see Appendix C) created and executed by Chase et al. (2005) in that team's study seeking to identify sources of CE. Chase et al. (2005) attempted to identify sources of CE to gain a greater understanding of how coaches acquired CE to help guide new coaches establish practices that would result in higher CE and ultimately greater success for their students. The researchers believed interviewing coaches would provide a greater cache of data

because “an opportunity to elaborate on the bases of their confidence in their coaching effectiveness” (Chase et al., 2005, p. 30) would yield superior results than if the coaches responded to a questionnaire or open-ended survey. I added a question regarding perceptions of success to the Chase et al. (2005) interview protocol. Questions three through seven were used to answer the first research question and question eight was used to answer the second research question. The first two questions of the interview protocol were used to establish the participants’ understanding of the topic and provided an opportunity for me to establish positive rapport with the participants.

I conducted semi-structured interviews using the approved interview protocol in September and October of 2020 via Zoom until I reached saturation. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) defined saturation as when further data collection resulted in no new information. I selected the semi-structured approach as suggested by Creswell (2009) to minimize bias and maximize validity while still allowing me to ask probing follow up questions based on the participants’ responses. I contacted each board member via email using the THSSDL membership contact information provided on the THSSDL website. In the body of the email, I introduced myself and the nature of the study. I included a consent form (see Appendix D) that outlined specific information about the study and provided a location for the participant to sign they consented to be interviewed. The consent form also informed the participants, because of the nature of interviews, their responses would not be anonymous, but I detailed how I would ensure confidentiality in reporting. The participants emailed me their signed consent forms before their interview was conducted.

I recorded each session with the permission of the participants over the Zoom application's recording encryption software to guarantee the security and privacy of the interviews. I followed Merriam and Tisdell's (2016) suggestion and took detailed notes of the participants' actions, reactions, tone, and other subtle qualities along with the interview timecode to create a richer data set and to triangulate the findings.

### **Methods of Analysis**

For the purposes of this study, I utilized Creswell's (2009) six-step method of analysis. Step one involved organizing all of the raw data. After completing all of the interviews, I downloaded the files onto a password-protected external hard drive. I then transcribed verbatim each interview into a digital written format, along with my handwritten notes for analysis. I assigned the participants a pseudonym (i.e., Coach X) to protect their identities. I used the process of transcription and checked for accuracy to begin step two of Creswell's (2009) method of analysis, which required familiarization of the responses. I read the transcripts two more times after assuring fidelity. Before I began the coding process of Creswell's (2009) method of analysis, I shared the transcripts of the interviews with the corresponding participant to member check the data and increase trustworthiness (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Creswell (2009) recommended searching for expected codes, codes based on past literature and common sense, unexpected or unusual codes, codes of interest to the readers, and codes that addressed the conceptual framework of the study. Steps three through five of Creswell's (2009) method of analysis pertained to coding the information. After I assured transcription fidelity, I printed out the

transcripts and placed them in a three-ring binder. As I reviewed the transcribed interviews, I followed the third step of Creswell's (2009) method of analysis and highlighted key sentences and phrases in the raw interview data. I grouped the highlighted sentences and phrases into open codes (Creswell, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Following the fourth step of Creswell's (2009) method of analysis, I grouped similarly focused descriptions of the categories into axial codes. Finally, I selectively coded the focused descriptions of the categories into themes based on the framework of the study to show how the themes would be used in the qualitative narrative (Creswell, 2009). I used the selectively coded themes to guide the discussion of the collected data.

### **Trustworthiness**

I received permission to use the Chase et al. (2005) interview protocol and inserted the questions into the interview protocol for this study exactly as the questions appeared in the Chase et al. (2005) interview protocol except for one question where clarifying terms were added to the question. The original interview questions sought to understand the perspectives of athletic coaches, but the language of the questions referred only to the *coach*, resulting in questions worded appropriately for use with any derivative of coach, and not simply athletic coaches. Chase et al. (2005) exchanged the term efficacy for the term confidence to create reliability in the interview protocol. According to Chase et al. (2005), self-confidence was synonymous with self-efficacy and was used in data collection because "self-confidence was a term with which the coaches would be more familiar and likely to have a clearer understanding than self-efficacy"

(p. 30-31). I also referred to self-efficacy as self-confidence with the forensics-drama coaches to secure the reliability of this study.

According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), the researcher was the biggest threat to the validity of any qualitative study, so I protected the validity of this study in four ways. Primarily, I utilized the same interview protocol for every participant and only carefully deviated by asking probing questions to help elicit a richer, deeper response. Second, I reached a point of data saturation of rich, thick description of the perceptions of forensics-drama coaches of the factors that led to forensics-drama CE. The tertiary protection of validity was the detailed researcher's notes of the physical and verbal characteristics of the participants while they answered the interview questions. After I coded the interview questions and field notes, I emailed the transcript of each interview to the associated participant to member check the data. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) encouraged member checking to triangulate data as a method to assure validity. Finally, I disclosed the relationship of the researcher and participants of this study in the limitations portion of this study. According to Creswell (2009), a researcher may have a connection to the participants as long as the connection was ethically disclosed.

### **Limitations and Delimitations**

Limitations were features of a research study that the researcher knew could affect the results of the study but were ultimately out of the researcher's control (Roberts & Hyatt, 2019). According to Roberts and Hyatt (2019), limitations did not necessarily negatively impact research as long as the

researcher disclosed the limitations of the study. Like all qualitative studies, I identified limitations to this study.

The primary limitation of this study was the use of Zoom to conduct the interviews due to the COVID-19 pandemic. According to Creswell (2009), interviewers should take detailed notes to support the value of the data source. I was still be able to see the participant in the Zoom interview, but virtual conferencing could reduce my situational awareness to pick up on the non-verbal cues of the participant. Despite this limitation, Zoom was the best way to establish communications with forensics-drama coaches across the state of Tennessee.

Another limitation of this study was I was an active member of THSSDL and previously knew the participants before conducting this study. According to Creswell (2009), the nature of qualitative research suggested the researcher was involved in an experience with the participants simply through the journey of inquiry. Wiersma and Jurs (2009) suggested researchers could manipulate the participants' responses simply with their presence, so precautions should be taken to diminish the researcher's effect on the participants. I adhered to carefully established procedures to protect the dependability and credibility of this study, as described in the Trustworthiness section.

According to Roberts and Hyatt (2019), delimitations were the boundaries of a research study that were set by the researcher. I selected high school level forensics-drama coaches in the state of Tennessee who were active members of THSSDL for the population of this study because I worked at high schools in East Tennessee as a forensics-drama coach for over 10 years, so I was familiar with the roles of THSSDL board members. For the purposes of this study, only THSSDL

executive board members were included in the study's sample. I selected perceptions of forensics-drama CE to study because I believed the findings of this study could help guide future research designed to discover information that could support the growth of forensics-drama coaches in improving the wellbeing of their students.

### **Assumptions of the Study**

In research, assumptions were elements of the study that the researcher took for granted as true because limited proof existed to the contrary (Roberts & Hyatt, 2019). For the purposes of this study, I interviewed active forensics-drama coaches who were members of the THSSDL executive board because, at the time of this study, there was not a unified definition of forensics-drama coaching success. I assumed the board members were a representative group of successful forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee because board membership was an elected position and a forensics-drama coach would have had to attain a certain level of perceived success to be considered for the position. Additionally, the assumption was all participants responded honestly and provided complete answers to all of the questions so the research questions could be answered as accurately as possible.

### **Summary of Methodology**

In Chapter III, I introduced the qualitative interpretive study design used for this study. The role of the researcher, sample of participants, data collection methods, and data analysis methods were provided to justify their effectiveness in a qualitative interpretive study. I then detailed the trustworthiness, limitations and delimitations, and assumptions of the study to provide transparency to the reader.

The results of the data analysis discussed in Chapter III were presented in Chapter IV.

## **Chapter IV: Analyses and Results**

I conducted this research study to examine the factors leading to forensics-drama CE from the perception of forensics-drama coaches in the state of Tennessee. Due to the lack of research on the forensics-drama coach in the existing body of literature pertaining to both CE and the coach's role within the forensics-drama activity itself, I hoped to increase the literature base and fill the gaps in the literature regarding forensics-drama CE. I relied on contemporary Tennessee forensics-drama coaches who were members of the THSSDL executive board and previous THSSDL board chairs who were actively coaching a forensics-drama team to create a purposeful sample of participants. I anticipated reaching saturation after completing 10-15 interviews and met the point of saturation after 10 interviews. At that point, I found the responses to the interview protocol were similar and no new information was provided by the participants; therefore, I stopped conducting interviews after the 10th interview.

### **Data Analysis**

I utilized Bandura's (1986) theory of self-efficacy to identify perceptions of factors that led to forensics-drama CE. I received permission to use the Chase et al. (2005) interview protocol and inserted those questions into the interview protocol for this study exactly as the questions appeared in the Chase et al. (2005) interview protocol except for one question, where I added clarifying terms to the question. Participants responded to eight questions in the interview with additional probing questions to clarify information. The first two questions were used to create a baseline for the participants' definition of self-confidence, which was used as a proxy for self-efficacy, to gauge the level of self-confidence that

each coach possessed and to create a sense of rapport with the participant.

Questions three through seven were the questions used in the Chase et al. (2005) study, and question eight was used to create a better understanding of how forensics-drama coaches perceived success.

The participants had similar definitions of coaching self-confidence, which also aligned to the definition generated for the Chase et al. (2005) study. Of the 10 coaches interviewed, all but one coach reported having high to very high levels of self-confidence. I included the one participant's responses who reported low to medium levels of self-confidence because that participant also reported the *disadvantage* of being the least experienced board member.

For each of the research questions in this study, I utilized Creswell's (2009) six step method of analysis. I initially open coded the raw interview data into themed categories (Creswell, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I then axial coded the initial categories into focused descriptions of the categories. Finally, I selectively coded the focused descriptions of the categories to show how the themes would be used in the qualitative narrative (Creswell, 2009).

## **Research Questions**

### ***Research Question 1***

According to secondary school forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee, what perceived factors led to higher levels of forensics-drama coaching efficacy?

To directly address Research Question 1, I utilized the five questions employed in the Chase et al. (2005) interview protocol: *How did you develop your confidence in coaching? What makes you more confident in your coaching? What are some qualities of a confident coach? What influenced your perception of*

*qualities of a confident coach? What advice would you give a new coach who wanted to improve his confidence?* I analyzed the data provided in the answers to these questions by applying open codes and axial codes to render four themes related to Research Question 1: Success, Experience, Knowledge, and Recognition. Three of the four themes—*Experience*, *Knowledge*, and *Recognition*—were explored in detail for Research Question 1 (see Table 3). The fourth theme, *Success*, was explored in greater detail in Research Question 2.

Table 3

*Data Sorted in Levels of Coding for Research Question 1*

Open Codes	Axial Codes	Themes
<i>Coaches based their technique on their own coach.</i>		
<i>Coaches wanted to share their high school experience with their students.</i>	<i>Forensics-Drama Participation History</i>	<b>Experience</b>
<i>Coaches who did not compete felt they started behind coaches who did.</i>		
Coaches felt thrown in to the job.		
Coaches had a ‘learn as you go’ mentality.	Years of Coaching	
<i>Events were continually added to the competition selections.</i>		
<i>Established event rules evolved over time.</i>	<i>Event and Tournament Comprehension</i>	<b>Knowledge</b>
<i>Tournaments differ from district to district/state to state/agency to agency.</i>		
Coaches were responsible for hosting tournaments.		
Unwritten rules were as powerful as written rules.	Ambiguous Factors Awareness	
<i>Coaches needed a thick skin, resilience, and some arrogance.</i>	<i>Internal Appreciation</i>	<b>Recognition</b>
<i>Coaches felt under appreciated by school.</i>		
Some programs were classes, others were extracurricular.		
Community celebration of coaching accomplishments	External Appreciation	
Team publicized in the community		

**Experience.** I inferred this theme based on two axial codes. The first of the axial codes was the *forensics-drama coaches' personal participation history*. Of the coaches interviewed, all but one coach participated in forensics-drama to some degree in high school, college, or both. Coach N stated the following:

I was a forensics person, so I came through that and learned what I'm trying to teach to other children or other students right now so my confidence level is, is pretty high in the situations that I can control, and that I, that I'm familiar with.

Coach C was also a participant and stated the following:

I did this in high school, and I, and I think I really just tried to grasp, or remember what I had gone through, you know, what my experiences have been. And I think, you know, I think what really propelled me was how much I loved it in high school and how much it meant to me in high school. So, it just, I knew that it could be that for so many students that I was working with. And I wanted them to, I wanted them to have what I had.

Coach A shared, "I participated in, in high school Speech and Debate myself and, and maintaining the relationship with my former coach. Being around my peers . . . So, I think that helps [my confidence]." When I followed up with Coach A about the importance of participating as a new coach, Coach A stated the following:

Did that coach participate in high school? How much do they know about it to begin with, or are they starting from scratch? You know, I think we

have so many, so many coaches now get discouraged because they're an English teacher. They're a new teacher and they need somebody to sponsor the speech team and they don't know anything about forensics and I get, I get those emails as the NSDA state director all the time. It's like, *I'm new at this. I'm just having to do this. I'm learning on the fly.*

Coach L echoed the importance of coaches' personal participation history:

I guess, I kind of look around and see other programs and see other coaches and think, *Well, you've had experience. You had, you came up in a program. You competed at high school. And so, you've had that competitor background that I don't have.* And I feel like that puts me at a disadvantage. And then I'm, I'm playing catch up trying to figure out things that I could have figured out in high school.

The second axial code for the theme of experience was *years of coaching*.

Coach B shared, "I get a little confident, a little more confident each year, mainly because I have more experience under my belt." I asked Coach B how confidence was built with experience, and Coach B replied, "I think from just doing it . . . learning things the hard way . . . so, trial and error, you know?" Coach C had a similar response to how experience built confidence, "Trial and error and walking blindly with a flashlight . . . I'm still trying to figure it out." Coach D continued with the following:

I really, truthfully don't know that I'm the most experienced person out there. I never debated. Everything that I've learned through debate has been being thrown to the wolves. Again, getting your feet wet, getting the

experience and learning from, from that experience and growing as a result . . . I think some of it is being able to look around at coaches with longevity and seeing that they too sort of preach the, the idea of getting tossed in . . . If you've always been taught that you've got to immerse yourself and just jump in, then you're going to jump into the deep end and you might come out gasping for breath, and struggling to keep afloat.

Coach E continued the importance of experience and stated the following:

Well, number one is the experience. Experience is a wonderful teacher, and as a young coach, I judged lots of different events, judged lots of rounds. Now when I first started judging I was not confident in my judging, especially judging debate. I was terrified when I first started judging debate. And so those first debate rounds I judged mostly on speaking more than content because I didn't feel confident to do that.

Similarly, Coach N acknowledged, "New coaches, it's hard for them to find their way, but you got to find your own way. You can't really emulate anybody else.

You got to find your space and that's how you feel confident." Coach C concluded the following:

The only thing I can say is, *Take one day at a time. Keep going. Don't stop.* Every day that I wanted to just not do it anymore, I can't hardly remember those days. But there will, there have been days where I thought, *Man, I'm just not good at this.* And I just kept going. You know, and you have fluxes of big teams, small teams. Great talented team . . . You just have all of these fluctuation, fluctuations in your team.

And you just keep going. That's, that's all I can say. Just take it one day at a time. And you'll be 29 years in, and you can retire next year.

**Knowledge.** I deduced this theme based on two axial codes. The first axial code was *event and tournament comprehension*. To some degree, all coaches mentioned the understanding of events and tournaments as a factor that led to confidence. Coach I stated, "I think you have to know your material. You have to know your stuff." Coach A elaborated on Coach I's sentiment and stated the following:

I'm going to teach you what I think the event is, but I think that's directly tied to confidence levels as well, so the more you know about an event, about speech and debate, about forensics, that's going to help you build confidence . . . So, the knowledge, I think, is a big thing and knowing the events and knowing how tournament works and knowing how to prepare kids for the tournament.

When asked what made a confident coach, Coach C made this remark:

I think being prepared for tournaments, being prepared for their shows, and being prepared for meetings. And I don't mean like dressing to the tee necessarily, as in, having their kids ready to perform. Thinking through what could happen, you know, in the meeting or in the production, having you know, things like a rehearsal schedule ready, contracts, things like that. And I'm not a paperwork heavy type coach, but, but having the things ready that need to be ready, I guess.

When asked how new coaches could improve their confidence, Coach D replied to the question:

Mitigate the small things that obscure the big picture. I think for a lot of people, or at least my experience in terms of head coaching. A lot of times it's getting bogged down with the minutiae of paperwork and travel forms and all the things that really get you to a local tournament on a Friday or a Saturday . . . the more that you can do to figure out all the behind the scenes stuff, the better you become as a coach.

Even with a base knowledge, Coach K expressed the importance of experience:

I knew how to direct. And so, I took everything I had at my disposal and tried to use it in this forum. But the truth was that the kids knew more than I did. And as I went, I just made it a point to continue learning. And as you learn, you, you kind of gain that ability to, you know, feel comfortable stepping out and doing more and more and more.

The second axial code of the theme of knowledge was *awareness of ambiguous factors*. Coach I referred to the ambiguous factors as the “ins and outs and the finesse of an activity.” Coach N discussed an example and included the aggravation of an ambiguous factor:

There were unspoken rules. And if you're a brand-new coach, you're, you're swimming upstream, because they go, *Oh no, they're supposed to do the speaker's triangle*. Where's that in the rules? It's not in the rules. It's an unspoken rule. So, you, the first few years, don't let that frustrate you. It

is a learning process. It's a huge learning curve that you just got to go through.

Coach E affirmed Coach N's assessment:

I went to a forensic coaches' conference in Alabama. And I went to a session, conducted, the two ladies who started public forum debate, who wrote and created that event, and conducted that section. And when they said that they never agreed in their decision and I thought, *Well, if they can't agree, the decision, then I guess I'm okay.*

Coach C suggested the following about the ambiguous nature of forensics-drama:

I mean I feel pretty confident about coaching forensics. It's not, there's not like, just one way to coach it. It's every, I feel pretty confident about coaching. I just feel like there's not one answer for how to coach it.

Coach J added, "I believe that even though I may not have the answers, I know where to find them." Coach K stressed the following:

There's no shame in not knowing something or not having, you know, all, all of the answers or anything. But when we pretend we do, we have to, kind of, start chasing that falsehood that false image. When we acknowledge we don't know, that's liberating.

**Recognition.** I derived this theme based on two axial codes. The first axial code was *internal appreciation*. Coach B suggested a coach must first look inward and recognize his or herself. Coach B stated the following:

I think to be patient with yourself, and to realize no matter what, no matter at what level you're, you're, you are at, that you're doing good, that you're

helping the kids, and, and not to worry about someone else doing a better job or being in your place, because you were the one meant to be there for that particular time, and your job is to do the best with now. And to realize that every year you're going to get better and better.

Coach C also advocated for personal affirmation while discussing forensics-drama competition:

You walk in that room with your head held up, and you say this is what it is today. This is what I've got. This is all it is, and I'm going to own it and take it or leave it. Thank you very much.

Similarly, Coach D stated the following:

I do not see anything where there, there's any sort of obstacle or anything along those lines, that really impede me. I feel fairly confident with everything that I do and that my decision is made, if not necessarily most accurately, at least with the most, the best of intentions.

Coach A claimed, "I think at some point you got to be a little arrogant." I asked Coach A for clarification of arrogance and Coach A replied, "So the arrogance, and I guess arrogance is one way, but a tough skin maybe? A thick skin? You have to have that." Coach A continued with the following:

It's, you got to have tough skin, so it takes a little bit of that arrogance to say you're better than this and you've got to get better and you want to compete. These are the things you've got to do.

Coach E disclosed the importance of taking risks:

Young coaches mistakenly think, and young teachers often mistakenly think too, that safe is better. But I disagree with that. I think learning to fail, learning to get out there and take that risk, and risking failure is how you learn.

Coach J was in agreement:

I believe that I exhibit strong self-confidence because I'm willing to do things. I'm willing to stand up for what is right and to speak up when something is not right. Even though other people would disagree.

The second axial code of the theme of recognition was *external appreciation*. Coaches' perceptions of recognition were multifaceted. External recognition came as appreciation of their students' performances. Coach I stated the following:

Sometimes it's a really great performance, you know when, when that, that pause that affects an audience, the way you want it to, or, had a 40-year-old woman come up and say, *That child changed my philosophy on immigration, and I'm 40-years-old*. So, those are really important moments.

Support from the community was another form of recognition. Coach A added the following:

I think that's a big thing when it comes to confidence too, when parents of former students. Of course, parents of current students, they feel obligated to do stuff . . . but even after the kid graduates and the parents of the kids,

after they graduate still want to come back and help out. I think that boosts the confidence level as well.

Coaches discussed personal recognition of their coaching performance. Coach J noted the following:

But then recognition came . . . I've earned awards that make me feel that with that recognition, that I'm at least doing a good job . . . But I did not, like, search it, which I think was helpful to me. Like, I didn't search it. I didn't politic for it. I didn't want it. It was just kind recognition, like, *Hey, you're doing a great job and, and we want to thank you*, and those things meant a lot . . . And so, I continue doing the best job that I can.

Coaches were often required to create their own recognition. Coach L stated the following:

And so, one thing I started doing was really advertising, was, we would go on the announcements and just like they announced sports, you know, the basketball team had a win over so and so and these people score these many points and I started doing the same thing with forensics. I started putting out there who placed what at competition and displaying the trophies in the front office and, and really making it more visible. So that it was a little more legitimate.

Not all recognition was positive. Coaches also discussed the lack of recognition that affected their confidence. Coach I explained the following:

New coaches get chewed up and spit out and we don't see them. And this is, I think, one of the hardest things to keep folks plugged in as, as adults because the hours are grueling and the pay is minimal if any.

Coach C discussed the lack of recognition from administration:

We had a transition in principalship, and I had wanted to start a forensics class, but the assistant that I had who did the scheduling, he wouldn't do it. He wouldn't, he wouldn't let me have a class . . . So, I forced the school to let me have a forensics class without them realizing. So that's what I did.

### ***Research Question 2***

According to secondary school forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee, what were the perceived factors of a successful forensics-drama coach?

I designed one question in the interview protocol to directly address Research Question 2: *How do you describe forensics-drama coaching success?* In several cases, the participants in this study provided information pertaining to Research Question 2 while responding to other questions in the interview protocol; similarly, the themes in Research Question 2 defined in greater detail the fourth theme in Research Question 1, *Success*. I analyzed the data provided in the answers to these questions by applying open codes and axial codes to render three themes related to Research Question 2 (see Table 4).

Table 4

*Data Sorted in Levels of Coding for Research Question 2*

Open Codes	Axial Codes	Themes
<i>Coaches value personal relationships with students.</i>		
<i>Coaches work on individual pieces with students as well as strive to grow the team.</i>	<i>Coach and Student Connection</i>	
<i>Coaches strive for students to cheer and coach each other.</i>		<b>Relationships</b>
Coaches recognize strengths of other teams.		
Coaches learn from each other.	Coach-to-Coach Connection	
<i>Because of the nature of forensics-drama, there is always information to learn.</i>		
<i>Coaches want to help students achieve forensics-drama goals.</i>	<i>Coach Improvement</i>	
Coaches want to help students be prepared for life.		<b>Growth</b>
Coaches want students to unite as a team to meet team goals.	Team and Individual Student Improvement	
<i>Trophies are tangible representations of achievement.</i>	<i>Local Tournament Awards</i>	
<i>Trophies aren't everything.</i>		<b>Winning</b>
Team goals should be victory centric.	State/National Champions	
THSSDL & NSDA Victories		

**Relationships.** I developed this theme based on two axial codes. The first axial code was *coach and student connection*. Coach D stated, “I think the big picture things are genuine relationships that you form.” Coach K added the following:

I think there are a couple of, like, verifying moments that everyone gets. One, is when, like, you completely jive with a kid. I don't know if that's the right, but like you, you're working with a kid and you almost go like mind-meld with them, like, they're excited about something and they get you excited about it and you start contributing ideas to help them, and they start taking those ideas and making them bigger and bigger and bigger and then you finally see it fully developed.

Coach I mentioned, “I went into the classroom, and never struggled with kids for some reason, and I don't know why that is. I do love them and enjoy them. And maybe I am one at heart.” Coach N continued, “The coaches that I've loved to watch, are the ones where you can tell their kids love ‘em. And that's pretty, that's pretty cool.”

Coaches also reported success when their relationships with their students strengthened the team. Coach C stated, “I think I feel successful when I feel the kids have and take pride in, in the team.” Coach C continued with the following:

I think if you can build a team that supports itself. Like, they support themselves. They are cheerleaders for themselves. They are happy that each of the team members are thriving, are not just succeeding but, like, coming together and supporting each other, then I think that's success.

Coach D also mentioned the importance of a strong team:

I always love to hear when students, especially at our orientation in the fall, or at our showcase, our senior showcase in the spring, when they want, they ask, they say, *Can we have so and so do their impromptu, or their [Humorous Interpretation]?* or whatever the event might happen to be because they have a legitimate desire to see what everybody else does. And that sense of camaraderie is something that I think you talk about cross application. We see it with sports, athletes supporting each other. And so being able to see varying types of students all under one umbrella is also a big picture thing that I've always really appreciated.

Coach L explained how a strong team could improve itself:

And what's kind of weird about it is that it is in some ways it's, it's almost a little hands off, where you kind of pass off to the kids themselves as you critique each other and you help each other but then the kids, you have to give the kids those skills, and you have to tell them what to look for, so that they can help each other.

Coach N claimed, "So, I think that's the big thing to me. That's, whenever I've at the end of the year felt like we've been the most successful, it's because we were a team."

The relationships between coaches and students did not end when the student graduated. Coach A stated: "I think that helps self-confidence as well, when you're able to maintain relationships after the kid leaves school." Coach C stated, "You know, I missed the kid, and the relationships. And I know that that's what they miss too, it's because that's what brought us close as a team were the

relationships.” Correspondingly, Coach B continued, “I’m just really proud of my college freshmen or my graduated seniors. They were pretty special to me . . . and I feel like forensics was their home.” When asked to define success, Coach K stated the following:

I think it's a really, really good retirement party where you're surrounded by people who you have helped them in their lives and you deeply care about them. And you get to see how healthy, and how happy they are. I think that if we're going to define what success looks like, that is success.

The second axial code was *coach-to-coach connection*. Coach-to-coach connections were reported between the coach and their personal coach and the coach to the other active coaches. Of the 10 coaches interviewed, all of the coaches mentioned coaches who played a part in their coaching styles, with half of the coaches specifically recalling their former coaches by name. Coach E stated, “I didn't think I could coach, and if it weren't for my former coaches who said, ‘Well, of course you can, and we’ll help you,’ then this would never have happened.”

After the coaches discussed their relationship to their former coaches, all 10 mentioned in some way their connection to current coaches. Coach K claimed, “You have to view yourself as a part of a fraternity of coaches.” Coach I added, “Find a kind, old coach who is very willing to just help you in any way possible.”

**Growth.** I established this theme based on two axial codes. The first axial code was the *improvement of the coach*. Coach C stated the following:

Forensic drama coaching success, success. I'm still trying to have a, be a successful coach. Every year it's, every year, it's like starting over. And

you got to figure out how to make this successful . . . This is my 29th year.

I mean, I always feel like it's a learning process for me. I try to grow within the process myself.

Coach K added, "First of all, ask for help. Just a great rule for life is asking for help." Coach D stated, "I think a confident coach is also going to be one that is willing to learn." Coach B noted, "Realize that every year you are going to get better and better." Coach E expressed the following:

I started looking at and reading, really reading, all of the ballots from my students from known coaches. So, I saw what they focused on, and I learned from them through my students' ballots . . . I'm also a huge sports fan. And I'll be honest with you, I've done a lot of studying of sports psychology and a lot of studying of successful athletic coaches. They have a lot to teach us as well about confidence, and just do it and get out there and, and take a risk because if you don't take a risk, you'll never know if you can be successful with it or not.

Coach I stated, "So, my students taught me those first few years, and they still teach me. Sometimes they teach me grace. Sometimes they teach me how to do a performance better." Coach L continued, "And so, you know that as a coach you are growing because your competitors are growing."

The second axial code was *improvement of the team and individual students*. Coach D stated, "I think that success then is, do you get skills that you didn't have before?" Coach N affirmed the following:

You get, you get your little victories by watching people evolve and, and so, to me that's what builds my confidence is, I got the kid to be where I

wanted them to be . . . So, to me, success is measured that way. And that the kids start taking responsibility, responsibility for their actions. At the beginning of, when I have newbies, I'm helping them write their introduction sometimes. I'm writing them for them. And then by the end of the year, they're writing their own. That's growth, you know, and that's success.

Coach L reiterated Coach N's belief:

The other metric of success is, are you growing as a, as an individual? Are your critical thinking skills improving? Are your public speaking skills improving? Your, your ability to work with other people, your constructive criticisms, the soft skills that I think are really a big way that forensics benefits people. It's, am I watching those skills develop, as well? So, I'm seeing you as a competitor. But I'm also seeing you as a, as an individual.

Not all proof of growth was instantaneous. Coach E proclaimed the following:

In my view, I feel that my success comes when I hear from students after they graduate. And I don't always hear back from the national qualifiers, the national winners, the trophy winners. I hear back from those kids who really learned something. And when they email me or come back to see me, which they do, after they leave me and they say, *I use what I learned in forensics in college more than anything else that I learned or I've got this job because of what I learned in forensics* and that's the success.

Coach B discussed the importance of growth for the forensics-drama student outside of the forensics-drama realm:

I think in the long run, you just want them to be, I hope that, would that people would want them to be just better people. And I think college readiness is extremely important. So, helping them go to the college that they need to go to, encourage them in whatever programs they need to be in.

Coach I concluded success was simple and attainable, “But for me personally, when [a student] can speak in front of a crowd and go to college and thrive, that makes me a successful coach.”

**Winning.** I inferred this theme based on two axial codes. The first axial code was *local tournament awards*. Coach K stated, “I mean, everyone likes winning. No one’s saying you shouldn’t. I don’t hide trophies by any means. I used them to recruit and to get the administration.” Coach D continued that idea:

I tried to emphasize, as much as possible, that the success in forensics can be measured individually but shouldn’t necessarily be done in that way. Because our philosophy has always been one of a team philosophy . . . So, success against another team, I think, because forensics is competitive speech, drama, and debate, and I think that aspect of competition is oftentimes seen as a negative. But, I look at it as a positive because in any arena . . . whatever you open up to having any sort of competitive value, there is going to be a winner. And there are going to be those that do not win.

Coach E offered a succinct answer to define coaching confidence and success. I asked Coach E if there was anything else to add, and Coach E disclosed the following:

Winning. It really does. I know that may sound awful. And I know that what, you know, that's not supposed to be the number one thing but I never knew I was a competitive person until I started coaching. And then when I started coaching and my students started being successful, then that motivated me to learn to be a better coach and they would be more successful and continue being success.

Coach J continued the importance of winning:

That is awards. Awards are how administration value or, like, see success. And so, to be a successful coach at some point in time, my team needs to bring home awards. They don't have to be a lot but they just need to be something. And it definitely helps if they don't get an award if I get one.

Coach L suggested winning was a measurement tool for the team:

Again, you do have the, the rankings. You've got the trophies. You have, you have clear data. After every competition to say, *this is what we've done*; however, and I tell my kids it's not about the winning. But I follow the caveat that, but if you're not going to win, why are you wasting your time?

The coaches did not agree on the importance of winning. When a coach reported to not put value on winning, I asked the coaches to clarify their position on winning. Coach A stated the following:

I think there are several lessons that I try to teach my kids. I have never asked a kid to go out and win, never. I've asked them to want to win because the desire to win and that, that's not just in a speech tournament, the desire to be successful is going to drive you and motivate you.

Coach C also provided clarification on winning:

I've always told them you have to find other reasons for being here besides the first place or the final for the trophy. Now, don't get me wrong, can we shoot for that, please? I don't have a problem with that.

The second axial code was *state and nation championships*. Coach D commented, "You want your students, as a coach, you want your students to be the ones to be in first place, or go to nationals." Coach B added, "You want kids to be first in the state. That, that's, you know, an ultimate goal or to qualify for nationals. You know, and maybe even place at nationals. That would be so awesome." Coach L stated the following:

When you kind of compare your team to others, you see that they've matched that. Oh, yes. Well, my team, I have produced national finalist. I have produced state champions, and you look at that and you say, *Well, I know that I'm good because of, of these accomplishments.*

Coach A expressed the value of a national championship with an anecdote:

One kid started out in poetry and solo acting and those kinds of things. Had moderate success as a freshman, but as a sophomore, she changed

gears and started doing extemp [extemporaneous speaking] and oratory, and qualified for nationals three years in extemp, and her senior year was the last year you could double qualify. She qualified in oratory and extemp.

### **Summary of Results**

In Chapter IV, I outlined the qualitative research process I used to analyze the interview questions that sought to answer the two research questions that were the foundation of this study. The analysis utilized open codes, axial codes, and themes which were derived from the answers given by the forensics-drama coaches. I discovered, according to the perspective of forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee, four primary factors led to forensics-drama CE: *Success, Experience, Knowledge, and Recognition*. Furthermore, according to the perceptions of forensics-drama coaches in Tennessee, three primary factors encompassed success: *Relationships, Growth, and Winning*. Not all of the coaches agreed on the importance of winning in the definition of success. Those differences, along with the conclusions of the research questions and recommendations for further research, have been discussed in Chapter V.

## Chapter V: Discussion of the Study

Forensics-drama coaches were a primary source of student growth, success, and retention in the forensics-drama discipline (Derryberry, 2005; Holm, 2015; Stolen 1995). There was a lack of research regarding the forensics-drama coach, and I hoped to fill the gap in the limited body of literature regarding forensics-drama to increase academic awareness of the activity and facilitate forensics-drama student and coach growth and success. Generalizations in this discussion were limited to the perceptions of high school forensics-drama coaches in the state of Tennessee because no other grade grouping or state was included in the interview process; therefore, the evidence from this study must support the conclusions until future research either refutes or corroborates the findings.

One factor not considered for this study was the competitive nature of forensics-drama in the state of Tennessee. It was possible that forensics-drama coaches who coached in a state where more emphasis was placed on the forensics-drama program could report different factors that led to higher forensics-drama CE. Similarly, I did not differentiate between the three subgroups of forensics-drama competition: speech, acting, and debate. It was possible coaches could report different factors that led to higher forensics-drama CE if they differentiated between the three subgroups.

The findings from this study outlined perceptions of four factors that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE: *Success, Experience, Knowledge, and Recognition*. Additionally, the three factors that forensics-drama coaches used to define forensics-drama coaching success were independently perceived to

increase levels of forensics-drama CE: *Relationships, Growth, and Winning*, as success was a perceived factor that increased forensics-drama CE.

### **Implications for Practice**

This study served as a foundational study exploring forensics-drama CE. This study was important to the field of education because it could guide administrators, stakeholders, and policymakers to support the elements that are truly important to the forensics-drama coach. That support could result in potentially higher levels of forensics-drama CE, which would ultimately increase student levels of intrinsic motivation, resulting in greater student learning and competitive success; furthermore, researchers could use this foundational study as a framework to guide future studies regarding forensics-drama CE.

### ***Absence of The Teacher Self-Efficacy Factors ‘School Climate’ and ‘Administration’***

According to Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2016), two factors often studied were the effect the school climate had on TSE and the effect the administration had on TSE. Both factors positively affected TSE (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016), yet this study did not reveal either element as a potential factor that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE. This suggested, unlike classroom teachers, either forensics-drama coaches’ levels of CE were not affected by their school climate and administration, or more likely, forensics-drama coaches did not feel supported by their school and administration so did not consider those factors when discussing their efficacy.

Forensics-drama coaches did report recognition was a factor that led to higher forensics-drama CE but only discussed recognition that came from within

the forensics-drama community. They also reported having the responsibility of announcing the team's victories and displaying trophies where they could be seen. This pointed to the absence of school support because the coaches felt if they did not advertise the team, the team would go unnoticed. Only one coach mentioned the impact of administration when that coach suggested an administrator prevented the team from moving from a club to a forensics-drama class. None of the other coaches suggested their administration played any role in their factors affecting higher levels of CE.

This finding suggested, although school climate and administration were not found to negatively impact forensics-drama CE, school climate and administration were not found to improve levels of forensics-drama CE either. Administrators could increase their students' forensics-drama success through small adjustments in their leadership style toward the forensics-drama coach, resulting in higher levels of forensics-drama CE, which would ultimately improve the forensics-drama coaches' ability to help their students (Aldridge and Fraser, 2016; Edwards et al., 2002; Mojavezi and Tamiz, 2012). Similarly, if administrators took an active role in promoting the forensics-drama activity, forensics-drama coaches would view administrative promotion as recognition, which would increase forensics-drama CE and the additional support from the school could positively affect forensics-drama CE.

### ***Coaches Did Not Agree on the Importance of Winning***

According to Chase et al. (2005), one factor that affected CE was the coaches' previous win/loss record. Coaches who had higher winning percentages recorded higher levels of CE, which suggested forensics-drama coaches' winning

history would also affect forensics-drama CE; however, winning was only a portion of what coaches perceived to be coaching success, with a number of coaches claiming winning could not be considered in the matrix for defining success or efficacy. Although further research was required to corroborate this claim, coaches were able to not focus on winning for two reasons.

First, unlike athletic coaches who viewed the perceived skill of their athletes as a factor affecting CE (Chase et al., 2005), forensics-drama coaches were happy to take students with all skill levels on to the team. This aligned with the forensics-drama coaches' claim that student growth was a factor in both higher levels of forensics-drama CE and forensics-drama coaching success. Additionally, this aligned with the emphasis forensics-drama coaches put on the effect relationships with their students had on levels of forensics-drama CE. Coaches wanted their students to win, but they were more concerned with their students growing as individuals and as a team than winning.

Second, forensics-drama coaches reported relative seclusion in their work with their forensics-drama students. This differed from the athletic coaches who were more visible to the administration, school body, and community (Chase et al., 2005). Athletic coaches reported support from the stakeholders as a factor that affected CE and felt winning was required to keep their supporters happy and involved. Because of the isolated nature of forensics-drama competition and the lack of support from administration, forensics-drama coaches may have felt liberated to place less emphasis on winning and place more emphasis on the intangible goals of growth and relationships. This would suggest the individual coaches' desire to win would be predominantly intrinsically motivated rather than

extrinsically motivated. This aligned with Mallett and Lara-Bercial's (2016) suggestion that intrinsically motivated coaches reported higher levels of CE.

### ***Suggestion for Administration***

Because this was a foundational study, more research was required to create a deeper understanding of forensics-drama CE; however, the primary implication of this study was the need for school administrators to increase their knowledge and support of the forensics-drama discipline. The administrators' need for greater knowledge was important to prevent the administrators from focusing solely on winning. It could be easy for administrators to inquire about forensics-drama success the same way they might inquire about their football team's success. The administrator cannot simply ask the forensics-drama coach if the forensics-drama team *won* and think they were supporting the forensics-drama program. The forensics-drama coach could perceive administrative action as a mandate to have to win, which would increase extrinsic pressure to win and could negatively affect the levels of the forensics-drama coaches' efficacy (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016).

### **Recommendations for Further Research**

In this study, my primary objective was to identify perceived factors that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE. The forensics-drama coaches had aligned perceptions of factors that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE except for the role that winning played in their perceptions of success and ultimately their level of efficacy. That suggested more research was necessary to fully understand the forensics-drama coaches' perception of winning. Because forensics-drama was competitive speech, acting, and debate, winning and losing

were inherent aspects of the activity. Understanding coaches' perceptions of the importance of winning could help administrators and stakeholders support the forensics-drama coach, which would result in positive student achievement outcomes (Bandura, 1997; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014).

Along with the competitive nature of forensics-drama, the discipline was three distinctly different activities. Because of the foundational nature of this study, I did not differentiate between the subgroups of forensics-drama. Future studies should explore the forensics-drama coaches' level of CE in each of the three subgroups of forensics-drama to create a richer dataset of factors that affect forensics-drama CE. Coaches reported knowledge as a factor that affected forensics-drama CE, which aligned with factors that affected TSE (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011) and CE (Chase et al., 2005). A deeper understanding of the coaches' knowledge of the subgroups of forensics-drama could guide creation of specific professional development that would increase coaches' knowledgebase and increase forensics-drama CE (Garvis et al., 2011).

Similarly, the competitive nature of forensics-drama might vary from state to state. Because this study took place in Tennessee, the competitive emphasis placed on forensics-drama programs in other states might alter the perceived factors that led to forensics-drama CE. This study should be replicated in states where both more emphasis and less emphasis were placed on the value of forensics-drama competition. This would help to create a richer understanding of the forensics-drama coaches' perceptions of factors that led to forensics-drama CE.

My final recommendation for further research was the need to explore the effect of administration on forensics-drama CE. Administration was one of the strongest factors affecting TSE (Çalik et al., 2012; Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014; Stipek, 2012), but very little was mentioned about administration in the search for perceived factors that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE. This suggested current forensics-drama coaches could view administration as not affecting or possibly decreasing levels of forensics-drama CE. More research was necessary to identify the impact administration had on forensics-drama CE.

### **Conclusions of the Study**

Forensics-drama coaches perceived experience as a factor that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE. This suggested forensics-drama coaches improved their CE through continual coaching. That was an important detail for newer coaches who had lower levels of CE. Knowing high CE coaches gained efficacy from continual years of coaching implied the newer coaches would increase CE if they continued to work and did not give up in their first few years of coaching.

Forensics-drama coaches also perceived knowledge as a factor that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE. Forensics-drama coaches who knew more about the events felt they were better able to help students edit and improve their forensics-drama pieces, which would ultimately result in higher rates of student success. Similarly, forensics-drama coaches who had knowledge of the competition process felt they could spend more time instructing their students instead of spending time focusing on the small details of competition.

Forensics-drama coaches perceived recognition as a factor that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE. Forensics-drama coaches did not feel supported by their schools and administration. Forensics-drama competition was not viewed by spectators, which prevented students and teachers from being able to attend competition and support the forensics-drama team like a sports team. This put additional stress on the forensics-drama coach to promote the program and generate awareness.

Success was the largest perceived factor that led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE because the three elements that defined forensics-drama coaching success also increased forensics-drama CE. The first element that defined forensics-drama coaching success, *winning*, was not viewed by all forensics-drama coaches to affect forensics-drama CE. All coaches included winning as a portion of success because, like in any competition, coaches should try to help their students win. The discrepancy was not that coaches did not want their students to win, but rather they wanted their students to understand there was more to learn from forensics-drama than how to win, and the unpredictable nature of forensics-drama judging prevented students from being able to prepare for all potential eventualities. Forensics-drama coaches believed students should want to win but not have to win. The balance between pushing a student to win and blaming faulty judging for students' lack of preparation vexed the perception of the importance of winning and should be studied independently.

The second element that defined forensics-drama coaching success and led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE was growth. Forensics-drama coaches felt successful and had higher levels of forensics-drama CE when they felt they grew

as coaches. This finding overlapped with the perceived factors of knowledge, relationships, and winning. Coaches felt they grew in their forensics-drama coaching ability when they learned new information and were able to answer their students' questions when they created and maintained positive relationships with their students and when their students were able to win. Forensics-drama coaches also felt successful and had higher levels of forensics-drama CE when they believed their students were growing. Forensics-drama programs were all inclusive, and students joined forensics-drama with different skill levels. The students' skill level at the start of the students' forensics-drama experience could provide rationale for the discrepancy in forensics-drama coaches' perceptions of winning. Forensics-drama coaches knew not all students on their team had the skillset to be a state or national champion. The coaches measured their level of coaching success based on the improvement of their students, not on their students' ability to win a trophy.

The final element that defined forensics-drama coaching success and led to higher levels of forensics-drama CE was relationships. This suggested forensics-drama coaches felt more successful and had higher levels of CE if they had strong relationships. Forensics-drama coaches relied on their relationship with other coaches to gain knowledge and grow, but their relationship with their students connected through the other two elements that defined success. Forensics-drama coaches desired strong, positive relationships with their students to help their students grow as competitors and as individuals. Coaches had higher levels of forensics-drama CE and felt they were successful when their students had the skills to be successful in life as a direct result of their coach-student

relationship. Despite the fact that coaches did not agree on the importance of winning, it was clear that forensics-drama coaches believed helping their students grow and maintaining positive relationships with their students played a large role in defining forensics-drama coaching success.

## References

- Alcaraz, S., Torregrosa, M., & Viladrich, C. (2015). How coaches' motivations mediate between basic psychological needs and well-being/ill-being. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 86*(3), 292–302.
- Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2016). Teachers' views of their school climate and its relationship with teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Learning Environments Research, 19*(2), 291-307.
- Baker, J. S. (2016). *Three elements of forensic competition: The coach, content, and student* [Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bartanen, M. D., & Littlefield, R. S. (2015). Competitive speech and debate: How play influenced American educational practice. *American Journal of Play, 7*(2), 155-173.
- Battersby, S. L., & Verdi, B. (2015). The culture of professional learning communities and connections to improve teacher efficacy and support student learning. *Arts Education Policy Review, 116*(1), 22-29.

- Bauschard, S., & Rao, P. A. (2015). *The value of speech and debate in the middle school years*. <http://rhetoric.wp.tulane.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2014/08/Value-of-Speech.pdf>
- Beall, M. L. (2002). Speech and theatre education. *Encyclopedia of Education*, 2297-2302.
- Bentzen, M., Lemyre, P.-N., & Kenttä, G. (2016). Changes in motivation and burnout indices in high-performance coaches over the course of a competitive season. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 28(1), 28–48.
- Brailsford, K. (2015). *An investigation into coaching efficacy and effectiveness in gymnastics* (Master's thesis, University of Birmingham). University of Birmingham Research Archive.
- Brand, J. D. (1996). Collegiate forensics outreach to high schools: Supporting the forensics community. *National Forensic Journal*, 30(1), 37-44.
- Brennan, D. J. (2011). *Defining success: Examining what it means to be good in forensics* [Doctoral dissertation, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Burnett, A., Brand, J., & Meister, M. (2003). Winning is everything: Education as myth in forensics. *The National Forensic Journal*, 21(1), 12-23.
- Çalik, T., Sezgin, F., Kavgaci, H., & Kiliç, A. Ç. (2012). Examination of relationships between instructional leadership of school principals and self-efficacy of teachers and collective teacher efficacy. *Kuram Ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, 12(4), 2498-2504.

- Carmack, H. J., & Holm, T. T. (2005). Home sweet home: The role of the forensics squadroom in team socialization and identification. *National Forensic Journal*, 23(2), 32-53.
- Chase, M. A., Feltz, D. L., Hayashi, S. W., & Hepler, T. J. (2005). Sources of coaching efficacy: The coaches' perspective. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 3(1), 27-40.
- Cranston, J., & Kusanovich, K. (2014). More drama in school leadership: Developing creative and ethical capacities in the next generation of school leaders. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 151, 1-33.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1980). Self-determination theory: When mind mediates behavior. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 1(1), 33-43.
- Derryberry, B. R. (1991). *Toward a philosophy of coaching forensics*.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED340083.pdf>
- Derryberry, B. R. (1995). *Forensic evolution: Influences upon local program development*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED392108.pdf>
- Derryberry, B. R. (1997). *Forensics as a cooperative agent: Building a tradition within an academic community*.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED415528.pdf>
- Derryberry, B. R. (2005). Traditions and memories as elements of forensics team building. *The Forensics of Pi Kappa Delta*, 90, 17-26.

- Drape, T. A., Lopez, M., & Radford, D. (2016). Teacher efficacy and professional development needs of mid-career agriculture educators integrating the next generation science standards and other content areas. *Career and Technical Education Research, 41*(1), 33-48.
- Edwards, J. L., Green, K. E., & Lyons, C. A. (2002). Personal empowerment, efficacy, and environmental characteristics. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(1), 67-86.
- Feltz, D. L., Chase, M. A., Moritz, S. E., & Sullivan, P. J. (1999). A conceptual model of coaching efficacy: Preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(4), 765.
- Forensics*. (2020). In Merriam-Webster.com. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/forensics>
- Francis, J. (2012). *You are what you do: An investigative look at coach identity* [Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Friedley, S. A., & Manchester, B. B. (2005). Building team cohesion: Becoming "we" instead of "me." *National Forensic Journal, 23*(1), 95-100.
- Gaikhorst, L., Beishuizen, J. J., Zijlstra, B. J. H., & Volman, M. L. L. (2015). Contribution of a professional development programme to the quality and retention of teachers in an urban environment. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(1), 41–57.
- Garvis, S. (2012). Beginning generalist teacher self-efficacy for music compared with maths and English. *British Journal of Music Education, 30*(1), 85-101.

- Garvis, S., & Pendergast, D. (2011). An investigation of early childhood teacher self-efficacy beliefs in the teaching of arts education. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(9), 1-15.
- Garvis, S., Twigg, D., & Pendergast, D. (2011). Breaking the negative cycle: The formation of self-efficacy beliefs in the arts. A focus on professional experience in pre-service teacher education. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 36(2), 36-41.
- Ginsberg, M. B. (2015). *Excited to learn: Motivation and culturally responsive teaching*. Corwin.
- Goodwin, B. (2011). *Simply better: Doing what matters most to change the odds for student success*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gray, C., Pascoe, R., & Wright, P. (2018). "I felt that I could be whatever I wanted": Pre-service drama teachers' prior experiences and beliefs about teacher training. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 19(10), 1-25.
- Haider, A., & Mushtaq, H. (2017). Self-efficacy as a mediator in the relationship between servant leadership and teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 11, 167–182.
- Hinck, E. A., & Hinck, S. S. (1998). Service-learning and forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 16(1), 1-26.
- Hogan, J. M., & Kurr, J. A. (2017). Civic education in competitive speech and debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 53(2), 83-89.

- Holm, T. T. (2012). Managing millennials: Coaching the next generation. *The Forensics of Pi Kappa Delta*, 97, 25-38.
- Holm, T. T. (2015). (Re)building a team culture. *Speaker & Gavel*, 52(1), 3-27.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93(4), 355-372.
- Ivey, C. (2017). Putting the 'forum' back in forensics. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, 41(2), 11-12.
- Jackson, V. L. (2004). *Variables that promote and/or inhibit theater program development in public high schools in Georgia* [Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Jacox, W. (2016). *What are the key qualities and skills of effective team coaches?* [Doctoral dissertation, Antioch University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Kelm, J. L., & McIntosh, K. (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavior support on teacher self-efficacy. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(2), 137-147.
- Kleinjan, B. (2014). So, you're a new forensics coach? Establishing an oral interpretation program and culture of success. *The Journal of the Speech Communication Association of South Dakota*, 1(1), 9-14.
- Kuyper, C. (2016). Inroads to outrounds: A Hofstedian approach to newcomer integration into the culture of forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 32(1), 34-47.

- Kuyumcu, F. N. (2018). Opinions of high school students and PCG teachers participating in the study about the forum theatre training process. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(7), 1613-1618.
- Lee, J. (2013). *Analysis of factors associated with coaching efficacy among new Mexico high school coaches* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Littlefield, R. S. (2001). High school student perceptions of the efficacy of debate participation. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 38(2), 83-97.
- Littlefield, R. S., & Venette, S. J. (2004). Perceptions of high school opinion leaders about the role of college debaters in the high school debate community. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 40(4), 259-266.
- Logsdon, C. S. (2013). *The experience of "team": Interpreting the texts of "lived coaching experiences" in intercollegiate forensics* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska at Omaha]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Lowery-Hart, R., & Simmons, J. (2008). *To award trophies or not to award trophies: That is the question*. Nationalforensicsjournal.org
- Lumpkin, A., & Stokowski, S. (2011). Interscholastic sports: A character-building privilege. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 47(3), 124-128.
- Luong, M. (2002). *Forensics and college admission*. Accidental Hero. <http://www.pbs.org/accidentalhero/parents/college.html>

- Mallett, C. J., & Lara-Bercial, S. (2016). Serial winning coaches: People, vision, and environment. In *Sport and Exercise Psychology Research* (pp. 289-322). Research Gate
- McCrary, R. (2001, April 27). Drama vs forensics: Aye, there's the rub. *Rostrum*.  
<https://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/McCraryApr%2701.pdf>
- McLean, K. N., & Mallett, C. J. (2012). What motivates the motivators? An examination of sports coaches. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 17(1), 21–35.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Milner, H. R. (2002). A case study of an experienced English teacher's self-efficacy and persistence through "crisis" situations: Theoretical and practical considerations. *The High School Journal*, 86(1), 28-35.
- Minch, K. (2006). *The value of speech, debate and theatre activities: Making the case for forensics*. National Federation of State High School Associations. Indianapolis, IN.
- Menon, D., & Sadler, T. D. (2016). Preservice elementary teachers' science self-efficacy beliefs and science content knowledge. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 27(6), 649-673.
- Moe, B. (2003). Building a successful speech and debate team.  
[https://debate.uvm.edu/dcpdf/Moe\\_NFL\\_buildingsuccessfulteam.pdf](https://debate.uvm.edu/dcpdf/Moe_NFL_buildingsuccessfulteam.pdf)
- Moen, F., & Allgood, E. (2009). Coaching and the effect on self-efficacy. *Organization Development Journal*, 27(4), 69-82.

- Mojavezi, A., & Tamiz, M. P. (2012). The impact of teacher self-efficacy on the students' motivation and achievement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3), 483-491.
- Moyo, C. (2015). Applied drama and the higher education learning spaces: A reflective analysis. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(6), 9-14.
- Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L., Chase, M. A., Reckase, M. D., & Hancock, G. R. (2008). The coaching efficacy scale II—High school teams. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68(6), 1059-1076.
- National Speech and Debate Association. (2020, April 11). *History*.  
<https://www.speechanddebate.org/>
- Norris, L. A., Didymus, F. F., & Kaiseler, M. (2017). Stressors, coping, and well-being among sports coaches: A systematic review. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 33, 93-112.
- Owen, S. (2016). Professional learning communities: Building skills, reinvigorating the passion, and nurturing teacher wellbeing and “flourishing” within significantly innovative schooling contexts. *Educational Review*, 68(4), 403–419.
- Pope, J. P., & Hall, C. (2015). Understanding the relationship between coaches’ basic psychological needs and identity prominence and their commitment, positive affect, and intentions to persist. *The Sport Psychologist*, 29(2), 134-142.
- Roberts, C., & Hyatt, L. (2019). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation* (3rd ed.). Corwin.

- Rosenthal, S. (1997). Forensics coaching as self-reward. *The Rostrum*.  
<https://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/coachrosenthal1297.pdf>
- Roux, C., Crispino, F., & Ribaux, O. (2012). From forensics to forensic science. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 24(1), 7–24.
- Rutledge, L. E. (2006). *Highly successful coaches in intercollegiate forensics: Seeking methods to the madness* [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
- Silva, J. E., Ferreira, P., Coimbra, J. L., & Menezes, I. (2017). Theatre and psychological development: Assessing socio-cognitive complexity in the domain of theatre. *Creativity Research Journal*, 29(2), 157-166.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports*, 114(1), 68–77.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy as predictors of engagement, emotional exhaustion, and motivation to leave the teaching profession. *Creative Education*, 7(13), 1785-1799.
- Srivastava, S., Tiwari, G., & Srivastava, A. P. (2016). Examining correlates between school teacher's self-efficacy and their job involvement. *Scholedge International Journal of Management & Development*, 3(12), 194–203.
- Stipek, D. (2012). Context matters: Effects of student characteristics and perceived administrative and parental support on teacher self-efficacy. *The Elementary School Journal*, 112(4), 590-606.

- Stolen, S. (1995). Secrets of successful coaching. *The Rostrum*.  
<https://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/coachsecstolen1295.pdf>
- Swackhamer, L. E., Koellner, K., Basile, C., & Kimbrough, D. (2009). Increasing the self-efficacy of inservice teachers through content knowledge. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 36(2), 63-78.
- Swan, B. G., Wolf, K. J., & Cano, J. (2011). Changes in teacher self-efficacy from the student teaching experience through the third year of teaching. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 52(2), 128.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2020, April 11). *Endorsement code listing*.  
<https://preprod.tn.gov/education/licensing/licensure-resources/endorsement-code-listings.html>
- Tennessee High School Speech and Drama League. (2020, April 11). *THSSDL manual*. <http://www.thssdl.com/THSSDL%20Tournament%20Manual.pdf>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 944–956.
- Veiskarami, H. A., Ghadampour, E., & Mottaghinia, M. R. (2017). Interactions among school climate, collective self-efficacy, and personal self-efficiency: Evidence from education institutions. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(1), 481–488.
- Ward, T. R. (2018). *The students' perspective: In-depth interviews examining perceptions of burnout in college forensics* [Doctoral dissertation, Eastern Michigan University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.

- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G., (2009). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Wiesman, J. (2012). Student motivation and the alignment of teacher beliefs. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 85(3), 102–108.
- Yu, X., Wang, P., Zhai, X., Dai, H., & Yang, Q. (2015). The effect of work stress on job burnout among teachers: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*, 122(3), 701–708.

## **Appendix A**

### **Overview of Forensics-Drama Events**

## **Debate Events**

### **Big Questions Debate**

Big Questions Debate is designed to enhance students' current debate experiences, opening their minds and encouraging them to engage in life discussion that may not align with their previously held beliefs. Whether or not students change their opinions, the rich experience of this debate event will advance their knowledge, comfort, and interest in learning more about the subject matter.

### **Congressional Debate (House and Senate)**

A simulation of the U.S. legislative process, students generate a series of bills and resolutions for debate in Congressional Debate. Debaters alternate delivering speeches for and against the topic in a group setting. An elected student serves as a presiding officer to ensure debate flows smoothly. Students are assessed on their research, argumentation, and delivery skills, as well as their knowledge and use of parliamentary procedure.

### **Cross Examination Debate**

Cross Examination Debate is designed to promote the application of reason and persuasion following a structured format. A Novice Debater is any student who is in his first year of debate.

### **Extemporaneous Debate**

A one-on-one format, Extemporaneous Debate consists of two students who argue a specified topic with limited preparation time. Students are given a minimum of 30 minutes to prepare for each debate and are notified if they will

debate the affirmative or the negation of the provided resolution. This quick-moving debate takes roughly 20 minutes to complete.

### **Lincoln-Douglas Debate**

In this one-on-one format, students debate a topic provided by the National Speech & Debate Association. Topics range from individual freedom versus the collective good to economic development versus environmental protection. Students may consult evidence gathered prior to the debate but may not use the internet in round. An entire debate is 45 minutes and consists of constructive speeches, rebuttals, and cross-examination.

### **Policy Debate**

A two-on-two debate that focuses on a policy question for the duration of the academic year, this format tests a student's research, analytical, and delivery skills. Policy debate involves the proposal of a plan by the affirmative team to enact a policy, while the negative team offers reasons to reject that proposal. Throughout the debate, students have the opportunity to cross-examine one another. A judge or panel of judges determines the winner based on the arguments presented.

### **Public Forum Debate**

Public Forum involves opposing teams of two, debating a topic concerning a current event. Proceeding a coin toss, the winners choose which side to debate (*pro* or *con*) or which speaker position they prefer (1st or 2nd), and the other team receives the remaining option. Students present cases, engage in rebuttal and refutation, and also participate in a *crossfire* (similar to a cross

examination) with the opportunity to question the opposing team. Often, community members are recruited to judge this event.

### **World Schools Debate**

World Schools Debate features a dynamic format combining the concepts of *prepared* topics with *impromptu* topics, encouraging debaters to focus on specified issues rather than debate theory or procedural arguments. This highly interactive style of debate allows debaters to engage each other, even during speeches. This challenging format requires good teamwork and in-depth quality argumentation.

## **Speech Events**

### **After Dinner Speaking**

The After-Dinner speech generally is designed to entertain or to satirize. It should be structured as any speech would be and not as a monologue or stand-up comic routine. While it is basically humorous, the After-Dinner speech can offer some serious thought or comment on its subject.

### **Commentary**

Students are presented with prompts related to societal, political, historic, or popular culture and, in 20 minutes, prepare a five-minute speech responding to the prompt. Students may consult articles and evidence they gather prior to the contest but may not use the internet during preparation. The speech is delivered from memory and no notes are allowed.

### **Expository**

Crafting an original speech, Expository students should describe, clarify, illustrate, or define an object, idea, concept, or process. The speech includes

research and is aimed at informing the audience; the goal is to educate, not to advocate. No visual aids are permitted. The time limit is five minutes. The speech is delivered from memory.

### **Extemporaneous Speaking**

Students are presented with a choice of three questions related to international current events or American current events and, in 30 minutes, prepare a seven-minute speech answering the selected question. Students may consult articles and evidence they gather prior to the contest but may not use the internet during preparation. Topics range from country-specific issues to regional concerns to foreign policy. The speech is delivered from memory.

### **Impromptu**

Impromptu is a public speaking event where students have seven minutes to select a topic, brainstorm their ideas, outline, and deliver a speech. The speech is given without notes and uses an introduction, body, and conclusion. The speech can be light-hearted or serious. It can be based upon prompts that include nursery rhymes, current events, celebrities, organizations, and more.

### **Informative Speaking**

Students author and deliver a 10-minute speech on a topic of their choosing. Competitors create the speech to educate the audience on a particular topic. All topics must be informative in nature; the goal is to educate, not to advocate. Visual aids are permitted but not required. The speech is delivered from memory.

## **Original Oratory**

Students deliver a self-written, 10-minute speech on a topic of their choosing. Limited in their ability to quote words directly, competitors craft an argument using evidence, logic, and emotional appeals. Topics range widely and can be informative or persuasive in nature. The speech is delivered from memory.

## **Interpretations**

### **Dramatic Interpretation**

Using a play, short story, or other published work, students perform a selection of one or more portions of a piece up to 10 minutes in length. With a spotlight on character development and depth, this event focuses on the student's ability to convey emotion through the use of a dramatic text. Competitors may portray one or multiple characters. No props or costumes may be used. Performances can also include an introduction written by the student to contextualize the performance and inform the audience of the title and the author of the piece.

### **Duo Interpretation**

Two competitors team up to deliver a 10-minute performance of a published play or story. Using off-stage focus, competitors convey emotion and environment through a variety of performance techniques focusing on the relationships and interactions between the characters. No props or costumes are used. Performances can also include an introduction written by the students to contextualize the performance and state the title and the author.

## **Humorous Interpretation**

Using a play, short story, or other published work, students perform a selection of one or more portions of a piece up to 10 minutes in length. Humorous Interpretation is designed to test a student's comedic skills through script analysis, delivery, timing, and character development. Competitors may portray one or multiple characters. No props or costumes may be used. Performances can also include an introduction written by the student to contextualize the performance and state the title and the author.

## **Interpreter's Theatre**

Interpreter's Theatre is an activity in-group interpretation. The style of the performance is based on the traditions of oral interpretation with emphasis placed on the literature. Movement and the creation of stage pictures by the interpreters are permitted. Interpreter's Theatre is presented in a different form from conventional theatre and should not serve as a substitute. In conventional theatre, a *representational* type of performance is used: the actors *become* the characters they portray; and realistic settings are used. In Interpreter's Theatre, a *presentational* style of performance is used: the artists *suggest* characters, scenes, and situations. The dramatization is in the audience's mind.

## **Poetry**

Using a selection or selections of literature, students provide an oral interpretation of poetry. Poetry is characterized by writing that conveys ideas, experiences, and emotions through language and expression. Students may choose traditional poetry, often characterized by rhyme or rhythm, or nontraditional poetry, which often has a rhythmic flow but is not necessarily structured by

formal meter (e.g., a beat, pattern, or structure, such as iambic pentameter).

Students may not use prose or drama (plays) in this category. This event is seven minutes, including an introduction.

### **Program Oral Interpretation**

Using selections from Prose, Poetry, and Drama, students create a 10--minute performance around a central theme. Program Oral Interpretation is designed to test a student's ability to intersplice multiple types of literature into a single, cohesive performance. A manuscript is required and may be used as a prop in the performance if the performer maintains control of the manuscript at all times. Performances can also include an introduction written by the student to contextualize the performance and state the title and the author of each selection.

### **Prose**

Using a short story, parts of a novel, or other published work of prose, students provide an oral interpretation of a selection of materials. Typically a single piece of literature, prose can be drawn from works of fiction or non-fiction. Prose corresponds to common speech patterns and may combine elements of narration and dialogue. Students may not use poetry or drama (i.e., plays) in this category. This event is seven minutes, including an introduction.

### **Storytelling**

Students select a published story that meets a designated theme. Themes range widely and may include mysteries, heroism, or fairy tales. Students select a story that would be appropriate for young children and tell the story as if presenting to that audience. This event is five minutes. Students may use a chair. Manuscripts are not permitted.

## **Television Broadcasting**

Television Broadcasting is designed to give the student an opportunity to present a five-minute newscast as it might be seen on television.

## **Acting Events**

### **Duet Acting**

Two actors will present a selection or cutting from a published, printed play of recognized literary merit.

### **One-Act Play**

One-Act Play is a contest of the production skills of the traditional play and involves all the elements present in any good theatrical experience: good acting, staging, and interpretation of the author's words. Set and costumes shall be considered secondary to the production.

### **Pantomime**

Pantomime is a silent, solo category; the performer may play as many roles as desired within the time limit.

### **Solo Acting**

The actor will present a selection, or cutting, from a published, printed play. The cutting may consist of a number of scenes but is restricted to one character.

## **Theatre Based Events**

### **Theatre Design – Costume**

This speaking event is also for those who are interested in technical theatre. A participant must develop a costume design concept for a predetermined play, communicate that concept to a panel of three judges using a visual display,

and defend that design in a limited amount of time using good communication skills, both physical and vocal. A prepared speech is required. Extemporaneous responses are also required. A physical product must be presented.

### **Theatre Design – Set**

This speaking event is for those who are interested in technical theatre. A participant must develop a set design concept for a predetermined play, communicate that concept to a panel of three judges using a visual display, and defend that design in a limited amount of time using good communication skills, both physical and vocal. A prepared speech is required. Extemporaneous responses are also required. A physical product must be presented.

## **Appendix B**

### **Permission to Use Established Interview Protocol**

Sunday, June 28, 2020 at 1:18:30 PM Eastern Daylight Time

**Subject:** Re: Sources of Coaching Efficacy Questions  
**Date:** Monday, May 18, 2020 at 7:24:22 PM Eastern Daylight Time  
**From:** Chase, Melissa  
**To:** Wooley, Anthony

Hello Anthony,

You have permission to use any qualitative questions from the research we did. The questions we used can be gained from the article. Good luck with your research.

Dr. Chase

Melissa A. Chase, Ph.D.  
Professor | Sport Leadership & Management  
Miami University  
Office: 204C Phillips Hall | Email: [Chasema@miamioh.edu](mailto:Chasema@miamioh.edu)

Office hours are changed to email conversations. Please include a copy of your DARS for all advising questions.

On Sun, May 17, 2020 at 4:38 PM Wooley, Anthony <[anthony.wooley@lmunet.edu](mailto:anthony.wooley@lmunet.edu)> wrote:

Dr. Chase,

My name is Anthony Wooley, and I am a doctoral candidate at Lincoln Memorial University in Tennessee. I am hoping to study sources of coaching efficacy pertaining to forensics (speech & debate) coaches. While compiling my literature in my dissertation process, I studied the article "Sources of Coaching Efficacy: The Coaches' Perspective." The objective of that study, as well as the first of the two studies from the article "A Conceptual Model of Coaching Efficacy: Preliminary Investigation and Instrument Development" dealt with discovering the sources of coaching efficacy. As I continued my research, I found that several additional studies were able to look into specific factors affecting coaching efficacy. The idea of uncovering sources of forensics coaching efficacy in order to be able to dig deeper into the factors that affect forensics coaching efficacy was exactly what I hoped to uncover in my study. I am writing today to inquire about the qualitative interview tool that you and your team used to uncover sources of coaching efficacy. I would appreciate permission to use a slightly adapted version of the interview questions used to identify athletic coaching efficacy to construct my preliminary investigation into the sources of forensics coaching efficacy. As my study goes on, I may opt to use this adapted version with questionnaires or with in-person interviews. Please let me know how I could obtain permission, and thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Anthony Wooley

*The information in this email, including any attachments, is confidential and if you are not the intended recipient be advised that you have received this email in error and any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of it is strictly prohibited, and may be subject to civil or criminal penalties. If you have received this email in error you should notify the sender by return email and delete the entire communication, including any attachments, from your computer system(s) or storage medium(s). It is the responsibility of the addressee to scan this mail and any attachments for computer viruses or other defects. The sender does not accept liability for any loss or damage of any nature, however caused, which may result directly or indirectly from this email or any file attached. Email sent through the Internet is not secure. Do not use email to send us sensitive*

Page 1 of 2

## **Appendix C**

### **Interview Protocol for this Study**

Candidate Name: Anthony Wooley  
Date of Interview:  
Time Interview Began:  
Time Interview Concluded:  
Participant Pseudonym:  
Participant Information:

Interviewer (I):  
This interview should take about 30 minutes.

Do you mind if I record our conversation?

Speech, debate, and acting at the competitive level (also known as forensics) has been shown to be beneficial to high school students, but very little has been studied about the coach. I am hoping to find out more about the coach's views in order to help forensics-drama programs grow.

Your responses will remain confidential.

If you would like a printed copy of the transcript of this interview one will be provide to you with the opportunity to check for accuracy and correct any information.

You may end the interview at any time. Just tell me you want to stop.

Do you understand everything so far?

Do you have any questions?

May we begin?

Participant (P): Participant Affirmation(s)

1. Explain the meaning of self-confidence.
2. Describe your level of self-confidence.
3. How did you develop your confidence in coaching?
4. What makes you more confident in your coaching?
5. What are some qualities of a confident coach?
6. What influenced your perception of qualities of a confident coach?

7. What advice would you give a new coach who wanted to improve his confidence?

8. How do you describe forensics-drama coaching success?

Thank you for your time. This concludes our interview. I will now stop recording and data collection.

**Appendix D**  
**Informed Consent for Participants**

**INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT**

Perceptions of Factors Leading to Forensics-Drama Coaching Efficacy

You are being asked to participate in a research study about how forensics-drama coaches create coaching efficacy. You are selected as a possible participant because of your involvement with forensics-drama. Please read this form and ask any question before agreeing to be in the research.

This study is being conducted by researchers at Lincoln Memorial University.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The purpose of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of forensics-drama coaching efficacy in order to help forensics-drama programs grow and better serve students.

**DURATION**

The duration of the interviews will be between 20 and 30 minutes.

**ELIGIBILITY**

You must have served as a board member on the Tennessee High School Speech and Drama League executive board.

**PROCEDURES**

If you agree to be a participant in this research, I would ask you to do the following things.

- *Print out and sign the bottom of this consent form.*
- *Scan and email the completed form to Anthony Wooley. (anthony.wooley@lmu.net.edu)*
- *Please select best days and times for a Zoom interview with Anthony Wooley.*

Monday     Tuesday     Wednesday     Thursday     Friday     Saturday  
 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM     5:30 PM – 7:30 PM     7:30 PM – 9:30 PM     Other

(If you selected OTHER, please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**RISKS AND BENEFITS**

There are no known risks associated with this research.

The benefit of participation is knowing that you will be a part of furthering the academic literature pertaining to forensics-drama.

**PRIVACY/CONFIDENTIALITY**

- *Because of the nature of interviews, I will not be able to provide total anonymity, but you will be assigned a pseudonym to protect your identity, and I will assure confidentiality so that your identity will not be available to anyone other me.*
- *Only I will have access to the video and transcription of the interview.*
- *The data may be published or presented at a conference. Only your pseudonym will be used to protect your identity.*
- *Video recordings will be made via Zoom recording software, stored on an external, password protected hard drive, along with the transcriptions of the interview. Only I will have access to the password for the hard drive.*
- *Consent forms will be kept in a sealed envelope.*
- *All data collected will be kept for three years then destroyed.*

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION**

Your participation is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to participate and you are free to withdraw at any time.

- *You may skip any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering.*
- *You may request the recording to be turned off at any time.*

**CONTACTS and QUESTIONS**

The researcher conducting this study is Anthony Wooley. If you have questions you may contact him at [anthony.wooley@lmunet.edu](mailto:anthony.wooley@lmunet.edu).

If you have questions about the rights and welfare of research participants please contact the Chair of the Lincoln Memorial University Institutional Review Board, Dr. Kay Paris at (423) 869-6323 or [kay.paris@lmunet.edu](mailto:kay.paris@lmunet.edu).

**RETURN INSTRUCTIONS**

- *Please email a copy of your signed consent to [anthony.wooley@lmunet.edu](mailto:anthony.wooley@lmunet.edu).*

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION STATEMENT\***

You should not sign this form unless you have read it and have been given a copy of it to keep. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or discontinue your involvement at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with LMU or your quality of education provided to you by LMU. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information in this consent form and have had a chance to ask questions that you have about the study.

**IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS\***

If you have any comments, concerns, or questions regarding the conduct of this research please contact the research team listed at the top of this form.

If you are unable to reach a member of the research team listed at the top of this form and have general questions, or you have concerns or complaints about the research study, research

team, or questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the Chair of the LMU IRB, Dr. Kay Paris at (423) 869-6323, or by email [kay.paris@lmunet.edu](mailto:kay.paris@lmunet.edu).

I have read and understand the information above and I willingly give my consent to participate in this research study. I am 18 years of age or older.

---

Subject Signature

Date

---

Printed Name of Subject

---

Researcher Signature

Date

---

Printed Name of Researcher

**A COPY OF THIS CONSENT CAN BE PROVIDED FOR YOUR RECORDS**