



Welcome to the DAV!

On behalf of the Debaters Association of Victoria (the DAV), I would like to welcome you to debating! The DAV is here to help you learn how to debate, develop better communication skills and have some fun along the way! This resource guide is designed to be used in conjunction with the training offered in the Junior Secondary Program (JSP). Fill in the worksheets with notes from the training and any feedback you may receive from your adjudicators. Remember to bring this workbook to all of the JSP rounds and complete the activities as instructed by your trainers. More information can be obtained from the resources section of our website at www.dav.com.au. So please enjoy the program and I look forward to seeing you all participating in our Schools Competition in the years to come!

Andrew Costa
Training & Development Administrator

What is debating?

Debating is all about advancing arguments against an opposition and developing public speaking skills in front of an audience. As a debater you will be asked to speak for (affirmative team) or against (negative team) on a particular topic. Topics will often be drawn from current events, however they may also encompass broader issues where there are two very firm stances, such as "That school uniforms should be compulsory." It should also be noted that sometimes you will be asked to argue in favour of things that you do not necessarily believe in personally. A good debater will not be influenced by their own opinions and needs to realise that there is always two sides to an issue.

There are certain rules that need to be followed in debating, and this guide should give you a general idea about the kinds of issues and concepts that you will need to follow. Debating is as much about working well in a team as it is about performing individually, and it is important to share ideas and tips with each other if you want to be successful.

Page 2 - Program overview
Page 3 - Speaker roles
Page 4 - Matter, manner & method
Page 5 - Preparing your speech
Page 6 - Worksheet 1
Page 8 - Worksheet 2

Page 10 - Exhibition debate
Page 11 - Worksheet 3
Page 13 - Resource guides
Page 15 - Notes
Page 16 - Code of conduct

CONTENTS

Overview of Nights: 2011 Junior Secondary Program

Night 1 – Basic Training Session

The aim of this session is to bring all students to a similar level in terms of understandings about (the art of) debating.

	<i>Group A</i>	<i>Group B</i>
<i>Start</i>	6:00 pm	7:00 pm
<i>Finish</i>	7:30 pm	8:30 pm

Worksheet assigned for next session – “Structuring a speech”

Night 2 – Exhibition Debate

The aim of this session is to showcase a high quality debate.

	<i>Group A</i>	<i>Group B</i>
<i>Debate Round 1</i>	6:00 pm – 6:55 pm	7:45 pm – 8:30 pm
<i>Exhibition Debate</i>	7:00 pm – 7:45 pm	

Worksheet covered in discussion of exhibition debate – “Structuring a speech”

Worksheet assigned for next session – “Rebuttal”

Night 3 – Extension Session

The aim of this session is to extend some key concepts in debating.

	<i>Group A</i>	<i>Group B</i>
<i>Debate Round 2</i>	6:00 pm – 6:45 pm	7:00 pm – 7:45 pm
<i>Session</i>	6:45 pm – 7:30 pm	7:45 pm – 8:30 pm

Worksheet covered in extension session – “Rebuttal”

Worksheet assigned for next session – “Research”

Night 4 – Extended Adjudication

The aim of this session is to consolidate skills through a training and feedback orientated adjudication which has specific reference to Night 3’s worksheet.

	<i>Group A</i>	<i>Group B</i>
<i>Debate Round 3</i>	6:00 pm – 6:30 pm	7:00 pm – 7:30 pm
<i>Adjudication</i>	6:30 pm – 7:00 pm	7:30 pm – 8:00 pm

Worksheet covered in extended adjudication – “Research”

Speaker Roles – What to do where!

Each of the three speakers in the team has certain roles to play in the debate. It is important that each speaker fulfils these roles for the debate to function properly.



First Affirmative	First Negative
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____

Second Affirmative	Second Negative
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____

Third Affirmative	Third Negative
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• _____

Matter, Method & Manner - The Three 'M's of Debating

MATTER

Simply, Matter refers to the raw material which you use to construct your arguments - the facts or evidence upon which your case is based. Matter includes such things as quotes, statistics, facts and evidence that you may be able to put forward to prove or further your own team case. The two cornerstones of matter are logic and relevance.

Logic:

Relevance:

METHOD

Method is the structure or organisation of your speech, and how it fits into your team's case as a whole.

In each speech:

Across all speeches:

Be flexible!

MANNER

Manner is the way in which you deliver your speech, and includes how you use your voice, gestures, and interact with the audience. It is the most subjective aspect of debating, the only rule of which is that you must be *persuasive*.

Voice:

Body:

Notes

Preparing your speech

Topic

Does our team agree (affirmative team) or disagree (negative team)?

What is the key message of my team?

What is the key message of my speech?

Main ideas to prove my point (no more than 3)

Examples or evidence to prove each of my ideas

What my speech will look like as a whole (structure)

Describing words I will use

Questions I will answer

Mood of my speech

WORKSHEET 1: Structuring a Speech

Topic: That Sports people are not good role models.

“Ladies and Gentlemen, let’s think about what a qualities a good role model has. We believe that it is important for role models to firstly, treat other people well, secondly, show exemplary behaviour and thirdly perform well in their career. I will go through each of these qualities and show why sports people do not make good role models.

Firstly, a good role model should treat other people with respect. On many occasions, sports people do not do this. There are many stories of male sports people having poor relationships with women, which other people should not be aspiring to. For example, Wayne Carey was cheating on his wife with his best friend’s wife, while Shane Warne is also reputed to consistently harass women other than his wife. One of the worst examples of this poor behaviour was a group of Rugby players who raped some female fans. This behaviour is absolutely unacceptable, and we should not be calling these people “role models”.

There are some sports people who do treat others well, however those that are disrespectful receive the most media coverage, meaning that this is what most people will see of them. Therefore, the sportspeople given the most media coverage, and therefore most likely to be idolised, are those whose bad behaviour has put them in the limelight. These people are not good role models.”

Is this speech persuasive? Why?

What are the strengths of the speech?

What are the weaknesses of the speech?

What would you change about it to make it more persuasive?

How would you summarise the arguments made in the speech if you were the third speaker in this debate?

WORKSHEET 1: Structuring a Speech (cont.)

Topic: That the Playstation has destroyed the playground.

“Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a Playstation epidemic. There are too many of them. Even though more and more kids are spending time in front of computers – but computers have not destroyed the playground. Playstations are destroying the playground because they are only made to play games. This is bad because children should spend their time either studying or watching TV, even if it happens in a playground.

The playground is full of bullies, and these bullies are normally people who play Playstations. These consoles encourage violent behaviour, and children then apply this to the playground. Whilst some people may like violence, as a general rule it is a bad thing. Hence, Playstations should only have educational games.”

Is this speech persuasive? Why?

How would you rewrite this speech to make it more persuasive?

Here are some arguments that your team brainstormed. Decide which ones are the strongest, which ones you would combine into one point and which ones you would not use in the debate. Compile a team split between your first and second speakers.

Topic: That we should lower the voting age to 16 (affirmative team)

- A: “At 16 a person can get married and have children. If we allow them this responsibility, we should also recognise that they are mature enough to vote.”
- B: “If you give kids the vote, it’ll get them interested in politics and keep them off the streets.”
- C: “In today’s society 16-year-olds are more mature than ever before. There’s really not much difference between an 18 year old and a 16 year old which means why one should and the other shouldn’t.”
- D: “The bigger the pool of voters we have, the better it is for democracy since it increases representation.”
- E: “Lots of 16 year olds have their L-Plates, which is why they should be able to vote.”
- F: “Many 18-year-olds do not make informed decisions. In fact many 40-year-olds do not make informed decisions and this does not mean we deny them the vote.”
- G: “One of the important ideas behind democracy is that there was “no taxation without representation”. At 16 you can get a job and pay taxes and it is undemocratic that you have no say in who sets taxes.”
- H “Issues which young people care about are not being adequately represented. Things like the environment, and social issues like drugs use and anorexia. We need 16 year olds to be able to vote to have these issues put on the agenda.”
- I: “16 year olds already vote in Big Brother and Australian Idol, so they know how to make an informed/reasoned choice, so they should be allowed to vote”

WORKSHEET 2: Rebuttal

Whilst debating is the art of persuasion, it is also a fight between two teams. You can't generally win an argument solely through putting your own case forward: you'll also have to knock down the other person's case. Each speaker should attack the main theme or position of the opposition, as well as the specific arguments raised by the speaker before them.

These are some short excerpts from a speech. Pretend you are the speaker that comes after them and write down how you would go about rebutting them.

"We should bring back compulsory military service because too many young people are not willing to contribute to society. Young people these days need to learn more than what they do behind a desk in a class. They can do this by giving back to the community through military service."

Your rebuttal:

"The government should stop spending so much money on elite sporting organisations like the Australian Institute of Sport and the Victorian Institute of Sport because it means there is less money available for community sport. Community sport helps a bigger number of people get fit and healthy which is more important than a few overpaid and privileged sportspeople."

Your rebuttal:

"Our team believes that contact sports should be banned in schools because we ban all sorts of things which hurt people. For example, we don't allow people to use drugs because it harms them. Contact sports also injure people."

Your rebuttal:

WORKSHEET 2: Rebuttal (cont.)

Topic: That we should ban beauty contests

An excerpt from the first Negative speaker

What ideas is the speaker trying to advance?

What are the reasons the speaker gives for their arguments?

What examples do they use?

Which argument do you think is weaker?

What would be your rebuttal to these two points?

“The Affirmative team has said that people don’t enjoy beauty contests, but they do! Many women enjoy entering them. Many people enjoy watching them. Nobody is forced to do either. Beauty is something we can all take pleasure, and beauty contests, along with other forms of art, allow us to do so. That’s why we shouldn’t ban them.

The Affirmative team also say that people are only judged on their physical appearance. We say that there’s nothing wrong with judging people primarily on their physical prowess—we do this all the time in competitive sport, where fitness and strength are major determinants of success. Every single competition in the world values certain qualities over others and beauty contests are one type of competition. Beauty contests, like sport, can be an important focus of national or regional pride.”

Topic: That burning the Australian flag should be illegal

An excerpt from the second Affirmative speaker

What idea is the speaker trying to advance?

What are the reasons the speaker gives for their arguments?

What examples do they use?

What would be your rebuttal to this point?

“We admit that we are not a perfect society and that sometimes people do need to protest. However, protests should not involve the destruction of property nor should they offend people. Burning our flag is not appropriate. The flag is our national symbol and represents every Australian and it honours those who have fought for their nation.

Destroying or violating this flag in any way is unacceptable. It should be illegal. Burning the flag is not a suitable form of protest because it involves the damage of property, which is an act of destruction. The intentional burning of a building is a crime, so is burning a school or a bench in the park. Why should defacing the Australian national flag be any different? Why should our national symbol have its own set of rules allowing its destruction, when nothing else of its significance does?”

Activity: Exhibition Debate

Topic:

What was the model proposed by the affirmative team?

What was the team split of the negative team?

What did you think of the manner of the second affirmative speaker? Did you find their use of gestures persuasive? What about the pace and tone of their delivery?

What were the main arguments discussed by the second negative speaker? Did you find them persuasive? Why?

How did the third affirmative speaker structure their rebuttal?

How long did the third negative spend summarising? Was this effective?

WORKSHEET 3: Research

When debating, it is important to support what your team is arguing with evidence and facts. This will help you appear more credible to the audience and will lead to a more convincing speech. It is important to realise that evidence can only be used as proof or support for an idea—that is to say it is not an argument by itself. For example, in the debate *that we should ban smoking*, a speaker for the affirmative team may say that “smoking-related diseases kill 40 Australians every day”. Although this evidence is true, it is not an argument by itself. The speaker should first outline her idea/argument, for example, “Firstly I will explain that Smoking should be banned because it is bad for your health and causes preventable deaths”.

Your first point of reference when researching for your debate should be the DAV Resource Guide. This guide will brief you on the context of the topic, discuss the major issues it addresses and provide links for further reading.

When researching for your debate, it is a good idea to think of the different people who are affected by the topic. For example, in the debate *that we should ban violent video games*, the people affected could include teenagers, the gaming industry and retailers. You can then find information from these people to understand their views.

Suggest some possible information to research for the following topics:

That we should close all zoos

e.g. Zoo conservation efforts

That we should ban alcohol

e.g. Health effects of alcohol

That Australia should embrace nuclear power

e.g. Which countries already use nuclear power

WORKSHEET 3: Research (cont.)

These are some short excerpts from a debate on the topic 'That we should ban all cars from the Central Business District of Melbourne.'

"When I go in to the city with my mum, we always drive in because she doesn't like public transport and we like being comfortable in our car. Once, she sprained her ankle so we had to drive everywhere so a ban would have been really bad."

Is this a good example of a use of evidence? Is the source credible? Why/why not?

"Banning cars would reduce congestion. It is estimated that congestion costs businesses in Melbourne a total of \$4 billion each year. If this congestion was reduced or eliminated, then this money could be spent more effectively elsewhere."

Is this a good example of a use of evidence? Are the statistics relevant? Why/why not?

"On February 10, the Herald Sun ran a survey that asked 'should cars be banned from the CBD?' 63.5% of Herald Sun readers said yes."

Is this a good example of a use of evidence? Why/why not? What does it suggest?

"John So said 'Ride a bike!'. John So is our Lord Mayor, so he knows. So that's what we should do."

What authority does the source have? Is this being used as evidence or an argument?

Resource Guide 1

That we should have harsher punishment for school bullies

Introduction

Recent incidents of schoolyard bullying have brought into scrutiny schools' policies for dealing with such actions. Studies have proven that bullying has detrimental long term effects on the mental health of victims, finding that those who have been bullied are likely to suffer low self-esteem, anxiety and depression. It is estimated that one in four Australian students experience bullying and as such, there is a call to implement harsher punishment for school bullies.

Many parents of bullying victims are pushing for schools to deal with bullies more severely, but education experts insist that more emphasis must be placed on prevention and identification. This debate delves into the effectiveness of punishment as opposed to better anti-bullying education and early detection strategies.

Questions

- How are schools currently dealing with bullying?
- Is punishment an effective prevention strategy?
- How would harsher punishment solve the problem?
- Who is ultimately responsible for bullying within schools?

Links

<http://www.ncab.org.au>
National Centre Against Bullying

<http://education.theage.com.au/cmspage.php?intid=135&intversion=331>
The Age: Bullying

<http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2007/s1922433.htm>
ABC The World Today: No Quick Fix for School Bullying

Resource Guide 2

That everyone should become vegetarian

Introduction

In the last ten years, Vegetarianism has steadily gained both popularity and exposure, with most restaurants (even steakhouses) now offering some kind of vegetarian option. 5% of Australians identify as vegetarians, with many young people being attracted to the healthy and sensible image it portrays.

There are a variety of reasons for which people chose to be vegetarian, and there are also lots of people who have been brought up without eating meat as a result of parental beliefs or economic reasons—in many parts of the world meat is simply too expensive for people to eat. In countries like Australia where meat is not as expensive, people chose to be vegetarians for other reasons than cost: religious beliefs, health issues, and concerns for animal rights or the environment. People argue that Vegetarianism has proven health benefits and can even help with detoxification and weight loss, but others see eating meat to be part of a natural and healthy diet, so is being vegetarian a good thing for everyone?

Questions

- Why are there so many types of vegetarian?
- Why is Vegetarianism becoming more popular?
- What are the benefits of everyone becoming vegetarian?
 - Are there other means to achieve this?
- Who should decide what we eat?

Links

<http://www.vegetarianvictoria.org.au> - *Vegetarian Victoria*

[http://kidshealth.org/teen/food_fitness/nutrition/vegetarian.html#Teens Health: Becoming a vegetarian](http://kidshealth.org/teen/food_fitness/nutrition/vegetarian.html#Teens%20Health%3A%20Becoming%20a%20vegetarian)

<http://www.time.com/time/covers/1101020715/story.html>
Time: Should we all be vegetarians?

<http://vegetarian.procon.org/> - *ProCon: Should people become vegetarian?*

Resource Guide 3

That parks are more important than car parks

Introduction

In the past 20 years more than half of the grasslands in the Melbourne region have been destroyed as a growing population struggles to find space in our capital cities. In the world's most livable cities index (EIU 2011), four Australian capital cities were amongst the top 10[^]. This is partially thanks to their vast parklands and low levels of congestion.

These parklands, as well as inner-city parks, are increasingly coming under threat by developers responding to the increasing population. It is important to realise that this topic uses car parks to represent the idea of urban development, and not car parks specifically. As such, the debate focuses on the importance of park conservation and urban development.

Questions

- What purpose do parks have?
 - Are they a necessity or luxury?
- In a growing society, are parks a practical use of space?
 - If not, how could this space be better used?
- How many resources are needed to maintain parks?
- What is the reasoning behind conservation?

Links

<http://newsroom.melbourne.edu/news/n-219>

<http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/politics/we-need-more-green-areas-not-people-20100111-m285.html>

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/parks-and-squares-who-cares.pdf>

Notes

Things I liked that I will try in a debate:

Things my adjudicator told me I can improve:

Debating Word Find

L	Q	C	O	B	X	U	I	P	H	A	B	R	I
A	D	J	U	D	I	C	A	T	O	R	H	Q	T
B	E	D	W	M	E	T	H	O	D	G	D	B	H
R	E	B	U	T	T	A	L	V	P	B	A	S	D
J	R	F	I	Q	P	N	E	G	A	T	I	V	E
Q	S	U	H	P	S	M	F	L	Y	N	O	K	B
P	H	R	A	N	K	Z	A	Z	N	Z	Q	L	U
A	F	F	I	R	M	A	T	I	V	E	M	T	D
Z	E	C	O	C	A	L	G	P	R	T	A	O	B
P	O	Y	W	U	T	Y	E	L	H	O	N	P	B
O	H	V	M	S	T	P	Q	I	H	P	N	I	Q
P	X	S	P	E	E	C	H	E	S	U	E	C	O
O	W	T	O	S	R	L	K	X	D	B	R	F	F
D	E	F	I	N	I	T	I	O	N	G	Y	E	P

Words

Adjudicator
Affirmative
Definition
Manner
Matter
Method
Negative
Rebuttal
Speeches
Topic

Code of Conduct

The Code of Conduct makes sure that everyone in the debate is respectful and plays by the rules. Treat the debate like any other competition, and be a good sport.

Debaters will -

- treat the occasion, each other, and the adjudicators with respect;
- respect the rules of the competition, particularly relating to secret subject and advised subject preparation; and
- accept the adjudicator's decision.

Debaters will not -

- disrupt or distract from another debater's speech or the adjudicator's comments;
- use offensive language or behaviour;
- make denigrating comments on the basis of age, race, sex or religion; or
- harass their opponents or the adjudicator.

Adjudicators will -

- treat the outing in a formal and professional manner;
- limit their adjudications to 10 minutes, and make constructive comments to assist the debaters; and
- be sensitive when commenting upon physical or physiological disabilities.

Adjudicators will not -

- allow bias or personal knowledge to influence their decisions.

Teachers and the audience will -

- hear the speakers in reasonable silence; and
- encourage and foster a spirit of fair play and good sport.

Teachers and the audience will not -

- harass debaters and adjudicators during or after the debate.

This guide is produced by the Debaters Association of Victoria Inc.



PO Box 2125, Royal Melbourne Hospital, 3050
debater@dav.net.au
Ph : (03) 9348 9477 Fax : (03) 9348 9466
www.dav.com.au