

## Speaker Order and Roles

**Affirmative Team:** supports the motion that is put forth and builds an argument for the proposition.

**Negative Team:** disagrees with the motion that is put forth and builds an argument in opposition to the proposition.

### Speaking Order:

**Affirmative First Speaker**

**Negative First Speaker**

**Affirmative Second Speaker**

**Negative Second Speaker**

**Affirmative Third Speaker**

**Negative Third Speaker**

**Negative Leaders Reply (delivered by the first speaker)**

**Affirmative Leaders Reply (delivered by the first speaker)**

### Speaker Roles:

First Affirmative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Context/Introduction</li><li>- Set up/define stance or model</li><li>- Outline which arguments each of the first two speakers will make ("Split")</li><li>- First substantive point</li><li>- Second substantive point</li><li>- Third substantive point (optional)</li><li>- Conclusion</li></ul> <p>The role of first affirmative is to set up the debate; provide the context and parameters for the debate; briefly outline the affirmative team's case (by listing the points the team will make); and advance two or three substantive points.</p>
First Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Context/Introduction</li><li>- Define stance or counter-proposal/mode</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outline which arguments each of the first two speakers will make ('Split')</li> <li>- Rebuttal to first affirmative</li> <li>- First substantive point</li> <li>- Second substantive point</li> <li>- Third substantive point (optional)</li> <li>- Conclusion</li> </ul> <p>A first negating speaker should explain what their team stands for (especially if there is a counter-model); respond to the key points raised by first affirmative ('rebuttal'); briefly outline the negative team's case (by listing the points the team will make); and advance two or three substantive points.</p>
Second Affirmative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction</li> <li>- Identify what new substantive points will be made ('their split')</li> <li>- Rebuttal</li> <li>- Fourth substantive point</li> <li>- Fifth substantive point (optional)</li> <li>- Conclusion</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>A second affirmative speaker should respond to the first negating speaker (both what they said in rebuttal and their substantive arguments); build on the first affirming speaker; and advance one or two additional new arguments.</p>
Second Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction</li> <li>- Identify what new substantive points will be made ('their split')</li> <li>- Rebuttal</li> <li>- Fourth substantive point</li> <li>- Fifth substantive point (optional)</li> <li>- Conclusion</li> </ul> <p>A second negative speaker should respond to the first affirming speaker (both what they said in rebuttal and their substantive arguments); build on their first affirming speaker; and advance one</p>

	or two additional new arguments.
Third Affirmative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction</li> <li>- Identify the 'areas of clash' in the debate</li> <li>- Rebuttal for the 'areas of clash' (highlight how your team has the better argument in all the areas that have been disagreed on).</li> <li>- Substantive points (1 or 2)</li> <li>- Conclusion</li> </ul> <p>The third speaker's role is to look at the debate holistically, identify what the most critical issues/areas of disagreement are (the 'areas of clash'), and extend the team's analysis on these issues where possible. Rebuttal should make up around 2 minutes of their speech.</p>
Third Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction</li> <li>- Identify the 'areas of clash' in the debate</li> <li>- Rebuttal for the 'areas of clash' (highlight how your team has the better argument in all the areas that have been disagreed on).</li> <li>- Substantive points (1 or 2)</li> <li>- Conclusion</li> </ul> <p>The third speaker's role is to look at the debate holistically, identify what the most critical issues/areas of disagreement are (the 'areas of clash'), and extend the team's analysis on these issues where possible. Rebuttal should make up around 2 minutes of their speech.</p>

**Leaders replies:** are short (1 minute) summaries of the whole debate. They do not include any new material. The speaker should look to summarize their teams overall

arguments and highlight any key stats or examples that were used. They should also look to clarify WHY their team presented the strongest arguments for the 'areas of clash'.

### **Moot Definition:**

In every debate, the affirmative team must set up the terms of the debate, and be clear about what exactly they are supporting. This should be done at the first speaker, who should make clear what the debate is about.

Setting up the debate does not require a *dictionary definition* of the words in the motion, and this should be avoided. Instead, the affirmative team should aim to describe what they are arguing for so that it is clear to both the negative team and the adjudicator. The affirmative team should look to make clear any words or phrases in the moot that require interpretation.

Common things to include during the set up are: some context or background about the motion (what is currently happening, why this issue is important), a problem that the affirmative wish to solve or something bad they think needs to change, and (if required) a change that the affirmative think will solve the problem(s) or issues.

### **Example**

Motion: This House would ban smoking

The affirming team needs to support a change (i.e. a world where smoking is banned), and so need to define exactly what change they support.

A good affirmative team will be clear and specific from the outset about what they support and what the terms of the debate are, so the negative team know exactly what they are opposing.

### **Good set up:**

"We support a total prohibition on the sale and consumption of tobacco cigarettes in New Zealand. We would implement a ban in a similar way to laws currently outlawing marijuana – this would mean that buying, selling, and consuming cigarettes would become a crime."

This set up by first affirmative is clear, specific, and reasonable.

It does not involve a dictionary definition of what "cigarettes" are, rather it gives general details as to what is being proposed.

It is also not too complicated or vague.

The affirmative team should use the “ordinary reasonable person test” – would an ordinary person think the definition was reasonable based on the wording of the motion?

If an affirmative team does not define the debate fairly, they may be penalised by the adjudicator as it is unfair to the negative team.

The job of the negative team is to accept the moot and add any details they think the affirmative team has overlooked. They cannot reject the moot as this would mean that the debate would not centre around the motion as it was originally provided.

### **Style Advice**

The purpose of a debate speech is to persuade the audience and the adjudicator to side with your team. In order to do this, the following pieces of advice are offered:

1. Have **cue cards** but make sure you know your content well. You want to be able to direct eye contact around the room and this will be difficult if you are reading your speech off the cards. Also, as the other team is speaking, write your rebuttal onto paper so that you can deliver it smoothly.
2. **Confidence:** Being confident is persuasive. This means getting up to deliver the speech with positive body language. Standing tall. Being in control of the room. Maintaining eye contact with the audience, and only occasionally referring to notes. Speakers who are not confident often give this away. They look to their teammates for help, or even tell the adjudicator that they have run out of material, or have just made a silly point, or do not know what they have written down. This always makes things worse, and should be avoided.
3. **Voice:** Actively varying your speaking style can be very compelling. A speaker should aim to vary the tone and pace of their speech. Some speakers are naturally fast speakers and need to be wary of this. Using pauses in a speech can help a speaker control the pace of their speech. Emphasis can also be placed on particular words, or an empathetic tone can be used in

parts of a speech. Other parts of a speech may need to be more matter of fact. The important point to note is variation. A speech that is monotonous will not be easy to listen to and therefore not be as persuasive.

4. **Maintaining interest:** Debating can at times be formulaic, and experienced debaters and judges will often have seen similar arguments made many times by different speakers. It is critical that debaters are able to make their speeches interesting and entertaining – otherwise audience or judge concentration will lapse, and key analytical points may be lost. Memorable speakers are also more likely to be selected into representative teams, awarded prizes, and build a reputation at the tournament – factors that can also influence how their performance is perceived in future debates. Maintaining interest is about managing energy, responding to the audience, and introducing dynamic elements into a speech.
5. **Using techniques to generate empathy** – deliberately trying to establish empathy can help build credibility and trust. The voice can be used to communicate emotional content, and body language (particularly facial expressions) can reinforce the spoken content. Generally, points with more emotional content should be made more slowly, with a deeper pitch and lower voice, and with the tiniest hint of emotional response from the speaker. Your facial expressions should mimic this – sombre – and your body language should not distract from it – try to be subdued.
6. **Being funny** – Humour is a powerful tool in debating, but one that is often overlooked. A well-timed joke can severely damage a team's case, point out a ridiculousness hiding just under the surface, break up the tension in a tight round, or bring interest to an otherwise dull debate. People often overestimate how hard it is to be funny. The building blocks of humour are fairly basic – exaggeration, reversal, pantomime, and irony are all fairly reliable sources of humour in a debate. Political or topical jokes are also often successful, as are amusing pop-culture references, quotes or analogies.
7. **Stance / Gestures:** A speaker should try to take as natural a stance as possible. Avoid pacing around the front of the room while delivering a speech, or standing so rigidly still that you begin to rock back and forward or sway side to side. Gestures can also be an important part of a speech. Using finger signals as you list numbers, or small hand gestures to emphasise a particular point are effective gestures.

### **The Three Persuasive Routes**

Let's say hello to our good friend, Aristotle, again and thank him for providing such great material for our course this year. Yes, there is another Aristotelian

manuscript on persuasion. This one is called *Rhetoric*.

Aristotle coined the following terms in regards to what he believes are the three ways to appeal to an audience when you are attempting to persuade them: ethos, logos and pathos.



### Ethos — Appealing to Ethics, Morals and Character

In Greek, ethos means “character.” But in the context of persuasion, what it really means is: show you are trustworthy. To persuade someone, we need to prove we are worth listening to.

Some ways to do this:

- Tell stories about yourself. Good stories require empathy, and empathy leads the reader to trust the storyteller (you).
- Present your credentials. Show you are qualified but do not brag.
- Show your connections with others. Mention your relations with someone who is trustworthy, and you suddenly appear trustworthy too.

Ethos also encompasses the fundamental values of a specific person, people, corporation, culture, or movement. When appealing to a group of people, you need to have an understanding of what their ‘ethos’ is and ensure that your argument will not be in contradiction to this. If you were listening to a speaker who held vastly different morals to you or the group you represent, it’s unlikely that you are going to engage with them as you might with someone who does portray a similar stance.

### Logos — Appealing to Logic

In the case of logos (where our term 'logic' is derived from), a persuader uses facts, statistics, quotations from reputable sources/experts, as well as existing knowledge. This is the side of the argument that can prove how solid it is based on facts alone.

It is important to note that the conclusions drawn from the facts, stats and supporting material must be reasonable in order to develop logos. People can manipulate, with language, how they present the conclusions they have reached because of the data. You need to be mindful of this.

### Pathos — Appealing to Emotions

Authors use pathos to invoke sympathy from an audience; to make the audience feel what the author wants them to feel. A common use of pathos would be to draw pity from an audience. Another use of pathos would be to inspire anger from an audience, perhaps in order to prompt action. Pathos is the Greek word for both "suffering" and "experience." The words empathy and pathetic are derived from pathos.

Emotional appeal can be accomplished in many ways, such as the following:

- by a metaphor or analogy, comparing the topic with something that the audience can understand easily and feel emotion towards.
- by passion in the delivery of the speech or writing. This includes not only the use of oral language features like voice, facial expression and body language but also the written devices such as emotive or connotative language.
- by personal anecdote or emotive storytelling.