

# **Toronto French School**

## **World's Style Judging Guide**

The World's Style focuses on only three criteria.

**Matter (Content)– 40**

Median Mark: 30

Range: 27 – 33

This criterion assesses 3 main aspects for each speaker:

### Quality of Argument (the WHY)

Don't just focus on the number of arguments presented. Assess the quality of the reasoning. It is not just the idea that should persuade but how convincingly the idea is applied to the issue of the debate.

### Quality Counter-argument or rebuttal (the WHY NOT)

Consider both the reasoning presented to counter the other teams arguments but also, whether the team left opposing arguments unanswered.

### Examples (the HOW)

Examples do not prove anything but they do serve as good illustration of the reasoning presented. In other words, they indicate that the debater understands that their argument can apply to the real world.

**Manner (Style)– 40**

Median Mark: 30

Range: 27 – 33

This criterion assesses the presentation. There are a number of aspects of presentation that should be considered but you should assess the overall impact of the presentation. Aspects to consider:

Eye Contact, Voice Projection, Voice modulation, Diction, Vocabulary, the use of Drama, Pausing for effect.

At this level you should expect the debaters to use changes in manner to signal different phases of their speech, such as the change to summary made from content presentation.

**Method (Strategy) – 20**

Median Mark: 15

Range 13 – 17

While this is the least weighted criterion, it is also the most complex to assess. In broad terms you should consider 4 main aspects:

### Does the speaker fulfill their role in the team?

You need to understand the 3-speaker structure for World's Style to assess this.

### Timing?

This can be considered a subset of the aspect role because the timing for different phases does change from speaker to speaker. However ALL speakers should present a clear summary at the end of their speech of about 1 min. ALL speakers should have completed their presentation in the allocated time and not have time to spare.

### Does the speaker map out their speech clearly?

This is also known as **signposting**. Order of presentation is dependent on convention. Here you should expect: Reconstruction, Rebuttal, Construction, Summary.

### Consistency and Teamwork?

Each speaker in a team must be internally consistent but also consistent with what their teammates have said.

## Finding a Number to assign each debater

In general you should start with the Median marks as shown on the previous page. This mark is for a debater who presents a reasonable argument, with clarity and fulfills their role appropriately.

If you find a debater shows a particularly good aspect of any of the criteria, you should add one or two to the median mark for those criteria. e.g.; they have particularly good voice modulation, an argument is particularly well explained and/or illustrated, their signposting is quite clear,

If you find a debater is deficient in any aspect of the criteria, you should deduct one or two marks from the median mark. e.g.; They speak too quietly or with poor diction, one of their arguments is really no more than an assertion, they speak under or overtime.

The sum or the additions or deductions should give you a mark for each criteria.

In your speaker and team totals you should find the following:

- Each criteria for each speaker reflects their relative performance.
- The totals for each speaker should reflect their relative performance in the debate.
- The totals for each criteria for the team should indicate the main weakness of that team, overall. This should be consistent with the main **reason** for your decision.

Don't be afraid to modify marks as the debate proceeds to ensure that the relative performance is being reflected by your marks.

**Be careful not to allow mark creep** as you start to hear spirited rebuttal, i.e.; 3<sup>rd</sup> speakers should not automatically get higher scores. Remember, the first speakers should not be presenting rebuttal. The effectiveness of their presentation is found in other areas.

Aim for a margin between teams that reflects the outcome of the debate (yes, you should fiddle the marks to ensure that you achieve these margins).

1-2 difference (out of a likely 249) – a very close debate.

3-4 difference – an average debate with one clear reason for the decision

6-10 difference – a clear win for one side (there is no need to rub it in!)

# Assessing Role Fulfillment

## *First Affirmative Speaker*

This speaker has perhaps the most regulated speech in the debate, with very specific expectations to fulfill. The questions that must be answered along with all the general style, content and strategy questions are:

- Did the speaker **define** the motion as an issue to be?
- Is the definition **reasonable**, and does it leave room for the opposition to debate?
- Is it clear from this speech where the debate should lie? In other words, are the parameters for the debate clear?
- Did the speaker outline an appropriate **case split** for the team?
- Did the speaker go on to develop the key **arguments** for the proposition case?

## *First Negative Speaker*

Like the Proposition First Speaker, this speaker also has several things expected of them.

- Did the speaker set up a clear clash? In other words, is it clear where the Opposition **differs** from the Proposition?
- Was an Opposition **case split** set up, and was it appropriate?
- Did the speaker offer about a minute of **rebuttal** and spend the rest of his time developing his part of the opposition case?
- In short, has the speaker told us on what grounds the opposition is against the motion as defined by the proposition, and given clear arguments to support this position?

## *Proposition and Opposition Second Speakers*

The Second Speakers have very similar roles to one another, as do the Third Speakers:

- Was the clash as laid out by the Opposition First Speaker carried through? If the proposition had a different interpretation of the clash, was this made clear?
- Was the correct balance of rebuttal and new matter maintained? (2-3 min rebuttal, 3-4 min new matter, 1 min summary)
- Did the speaker address their part of the proposition/opposition case?
- Did the speakers interact with one another and with the debate as a whole?
- In short, did the speakers systematically weaken the other side's case while completing their own?

## *Proposition and Opposition Third Speakers*

Was the clash still clear at this late stage in the debate?

- Did the speakers focus mainly on rebuttal, with at most one minute spent on clarifying their teams' arguments?
- Did the Proposition Third Speaker bring in new positive matter? If so, was it relevant and brought in at an appropriate stage? (Note: Positive matter comprises arguments that are not used in rebuttal, but rather to add to your case.)
- Did the Opposition Third Speaker bring in new matter for their argument? Remember that this is **not allowed**, and should be penalised.
- Was the speaker **structured** in his rebuttal? This is very important, and deserves a separate mention: a thematically structured rebuttal speech is very difficult, but very effective, and it clarifies the debate to a large degree. Structure should thus be *heavily* weighted in the calculation of a third speaker's style mark.

- In short, did the speaker identify the key arguments of the opposing side, and then rebut them in a logical, clear and substantial manner?

### ***Proposition and Opposition Reply Speech***

The Reply Speeches are different from the other speeches in the debate, and have different criteria for content and strategy.

#### **Strategy in the reply speech:**

- Did the speaker present an overview of the debate as it actually happened, or of the debate that he was expecting to happen?
- Was the speech a logically structured **clarification of the major issues** that arose during the course of the debate, or rather a set of arbitrary and unrelated points?
- Did the speaker focus overly on examples and cheap rebuttals, or did he manage to capture the **essence of the debate** in three minutes?
- In short, did the speaker hammer home the points that could win them the debate?

#### **Content in the reply speech:**

- Was there any new material or rebuttal in the reply speech? Neither is allowed.
- Was there a level of detachment from the debate, enabling the speech to fulfil its role of **clarification**? This detachment consists of providing thumbnail sketches of arguments and examples from the debate to show how the debate went, instead of merely summing up the speaker's own side.
- Did the speech look at both sides of the debate, as it should?
- In short, did the speaker cover all of the key points made by both sides in the debate, and do so in a way favorable to his side?