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# 1. What is Debate? ディベートとはどのような議論か

**2.a Contention in argument; dispute, controversy; discussion; esp. the discussion of questions of public interest in Parliament or in any assembly.**

**― *Oxford English Dictionary* 2nd Ed.**

## Three important features of “Debates”:

1. Public questions公共の問題について
2. Opposing viewpoints対立する複数の立場がある ―**“Clash”** 「意見の衝突」が大切
3. Third party (judges, juries, audience) 中立の第三者（ジャッジ）がみている

# 2. Academic debates in the world today 教育のためのディベートの世界の流れ

1. 事前準備型（policy debate アメリカ式）  
   Evidence, Preparation
2. 即興型（parliamentary debate　英国式）  
   Rhetorical, Impromptu

### HEnDA Format 形式

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HEnDA**  **Format**  **Features 形式の特徴** | **Comparison to other formats** | | | **Purpose of design** |
| **Policy** | **Public Forum.** | **Parliamentary.** |
| Preparation for the debate topic | Yes | Yes | No | Even beginners can say *something.* Improvement of skills through repetition of the same topic |
| Speech roles fixed | No | Yes | No | Increase clashes by increasing the predictability of speeches |
| Speech order fixed | Yes | No | No/ Yes | Avoid confusion.  Easy to learn |
| No interruption of the opponents | Yes | Yes | No | Understanding of the opponents arguments. |
| Usage of Evidence | Yes | Yes | No | “Information literacy” |
| Limits to the Issues | No | Yes | No/ Yes | Avoid too much competition.  Enhance clashes |
| Team | No | No | No/ Yes | Teamwork  More members can participate |
| Issue-based Judging | Yes | Yes | No | Objective and fair decision  More feedbacks |

# 3. Why Debate? なぜ英語ディベートをすべきか

1. Debate opens up your future!

Law

Science

Management

Administration

## 適切に設計すればディベート形式で鍛えうる6つの能力

## HEnDA Debate foster 6 abilities

## 

1. 理解力（Comprehensive skills）  
   　読解 Reading  
   　リスニング Listening
2. 分析力（Analytical skills)  
   　論理的思考 Logical thinking  
   　情報リテラシー Information literacy
3. 構成力 (Constructive skills)  
   　作文 Writing
4. 伝達力 (Communication skills)  
   　会話 Speaking
5. 意志決定力 (Judging)
6. チームワーク (Team work)

英語ディベート総合力の測定：

　意味のあるClashが，英語でどれだけ出来るようになったか

1. Debate makes Friends (Globally)!

## Why Judge?

1. To make Friends (again)!
2. To train yourself as a rational Decision Maker
3. To know more about Japan and the World

# 4. Caseケース（Constructive Speech立論）の作り方

論題例：High school students should have their school trips in foreign countries.

### Level 0　争点だけ

争点issues (Advantage，Disadvantage)が明確にされている

例，Japanese high school students should go to school trips in foreign countries than in their home country. Because you can learn about foreign cultures.

### Level 1　争点に，最低限の理由・根拠（証拠）がある

例，First Advantage is “you can learn about foreign cultures.”

When you go abroad, you will see things that you don’t see in Japan.

For example, buildings, food, music, and so on. …

### Level 2　各争点に三つの小論点に分けられ証明されている

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Affirmative Constructive Speech Example  Advantage: Learning about Foreign Cultures | Possible Negative Attacks 否定側からの反論の可能性 |
| a) Present Situation  You can’t experience Foreign cultures in Japan. Reading books and searching on Internet can’t tell you what they are really like.  According to… アンケート・証拠・実例などを参照 | 本当に海外に行かないと文化を学べないのか？　必要性（固有性uniqueness）への疑問 |
| b) Effect  A few days in a foreign country will give a lot of experience. According to… アンケート・証拠・実例などを参照 | 数日の滞在で文化を体験できるのか？　効果への疑問 |
| c) Importance  Learning about foreign cultures is very important, because 何が重要かの原則論 | 何故他国の文化を学ぶのが大切なのか（あるいはそもそも文化とは何か？）　重要性への疑問 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Negative Constructive Speech Example  Disadvantage: Expensiveness | Possible Affirmative Attacks  肯定側からの反論の可能性 |
| a) Present Situation  If the school trip is in Japan, the total tour cost is not high. The average is … yen according to… アンケート・証拠・実例などを参照 | そもそも修学旅行はどちらにしろコストはかかる |
| b) Effect  If the school trip is in Foreign countries, the total tour cost is very high. Average is … yen according to…アンケート・証拠・実例などを参照 | 実際には払えないほどの差では無いのでは |
| c) Importance  School trips should not be expensive, because not all students can afford the cost. 何が重要かの原則論 | 差額があったとしても，それだけの価値があるのでは |

### Level 3　争点の三小論点が，全ての反論を考慮しても，説得力が残る

### →　強い議論

# 5. ＊ Debate Speeches ――Basic Speech norms

1. Use impersonal phrases: “Their argument lacks evidence (proof)”  
   “Their DA lacks importance, because most of the Japanese people will not be affected”

Avoid personal attacks, derogatory expressions:  
“The Affirmative is silly”. “The Negative is ridiculous, crazy,”   
相手を馬鹿にするような表現を避け，淡々と事実に即して論評する

1. Use Objective, factual expressions: “The plan causes income inequality.”

Avoid subjective expressions: “I (We) think that …”, “I (We) doubt that” etc.  
自分がどう思うかではなくて，事実はどうなのか，何が重要なのかを客観的に議論

1. Use Specific, concrete expressions:   
   “Their DA lacks importance, because most of the Japanese people will not be affected”

Avoid ambiguous, vague, abstract expressions: “Their DA is weak.”   
どの点がどうなのか，できるだけ具体的にピンポイントして議論すること

## HEnDA Debate Format

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Speech | Time |
| (1) Affirmative Constructive Speech | 4 min |
| Preparation Time | 1 min |
| (2) Questions from the Negative | 2 min |
| (3) Negative Constructive Speech | 4 min |
| Preparation Time | 1 min |
| (4) Questions from the Affirmative | 2 min |
| Preparation Time | 2 min |
| (5) Negative Attack | 3 min |
| (6) Questions from the Affirmative | 2 min |
| (7) Affirmative Attack | 3 min |
| (8) Questions from the Negative | 2 min |
| Preparation Time | 2 min |
| (9) Affirmative Defense | 3 min |
| (10) Negative Defense | 3 min |
| Preparation Time | 2 min |
| (11) Affirmative Summary | 3 min |
| (12) Negative Summary | 3 min |
| Total | 42 min |

## Speech Examples

## ① Aff. Constructive Speech

Hi, everyone. I’m Yoshiro. We on the Affirmative side supports the topic that “Japan should …”

The policy has two Advantages compared to the present policy:

Advantage 1: Beneficial for the economy

Sub-point a) present situation: Japanese economy is not good.

[Evidence] According to the Yomi… Newspaper in 2014, quote “The GDP has dropped …”

One of the reason is lack of business persons that can communicate in English…

[Evidence] According to Prof. Suzuki, an Economist at Univ. of Yamagata, quote “Why …”

Sub-point b) Effect: Plan will increase the number of fluent English speakers

[Evidence] According to …

Actual case in Singapore guarantees that the plan works

[Evidence] According to …

Sub-point c) Importance: The Japanese economy will get a significant boost

The Korean, for example Samsung proves the importance of English speakers  
[Evidence] According to …

## ②，④，⑥，⑧ Questions: Confirmation/Examination

Confirmation 相手に確認する質問

“How many attacks did you present?”

“Is your Advantage 1 about economy?”

“Was your 1st attack on out AD1 effect?

Examination 相手の議論の弱点をといだたす質問  
“You said that the plan will enhance inequality, but did you show any evidence?”

“What is the source of your 3rd evidence? Is it reliable?”

“The evidence shows the example of Singapore, but isn’t Singapore much smaller economy than Japan?”

RULE: The questioner can move on to the next question, if the answerer is taking too much time.

Just interrupt politely and say “Thank you, next question is …”

## ③ Neg. Constructive Speech

The Negative side is against the topic that “Japan should …” and we support the present policy.

The Affirmative policy has two Disadvantages compared to the present policy.

Disadvantage 1: Enormous cost

Sub-point a) present situation: The Japanese state finance is close to bankruptcy.

[Evidence] According to the Yomi-Kai Newspaper in 2014, quote “The National debt …”

Sub-point b) Effect: The Aff. Policy will cost xxx billion yen

[Evidence] According to the estimate of Prof. Y…

Sub-point c) Importance: Collapse of Japanese finance will severely damage people’s lives

Example of Greece proves this…  
[Evidence] According to …

## ⑤，⑦ Attack Speeches

The Affirmative presented two ADs. I would like to attack them one by one.

On their Advantage 1 we have three attacks.

No. 1 on Sub-point a) present situation: they said the Japanese economy because of English but actually it is more complicated. [Evidence] According to the Yomi… Newspaper in 2014, quote “The GDP has dropped …”

No. 2 on Sub-point b) Effect: they showed the Singapore example but this can’t be applied to the Japanese case. Because Singapore is special in terms of ….

No. 3 on Sub-point c) Importance: they showed that boost is significant. But the effect just by the policy is so limited. Because …

## ⑨，⑩ Defense Speeches

We, the Affirmative presented two ADs.

On our Advantage 1, they had two attacks.

1st attack was on Sub-point a) present situation: they said the cause for Japanese economy is more complicated. However, remember our Constructive speech 1st Evidence .. we have proved that …”

Their 2nd attack was on Sub-point b) …. However, …

Please remember that they have granted the c) Importance of this Advantage. Our plan will have huge impact on the Economy.

NB: NEVER FORGET TO REEMPHASIZE YOUR SUBPOINTS THAT WERE NOT ATTACKED

## ⑪，⑫ Summary Speeches

[Opponents’ issues] The Affirmative presented two ADs. However, the AD1 Economy … is not supported by facts. As we have argued in the attack speech the effect is not proven. AD2 has very little importance…

[Own issues] On the other hand, our two DAs are very strong. They attacked the DA1 that the effect is limited. But as we have shown in the Constructive speech, evidence shows that the effect is … So the DA1 is supported by facts and is a very important issue.

[Final Comparison] So in total, the policy has only small AD on AD2, but two DAs. As we argued in the Attack speech it is much more important to save … than just some small cost.   
In conclusion, you should negate the topic and support the present policy. Thank you!

# 6. Basics of Debate Judging ――　ジャッジの基本

ジャッジのモデルは，公平な裁判官，科学者，合理的な政策決定者

Debate Judges ≠Speech contest judges

≒ Courtroom judges, Scientists, Rational decision makers,   
 (Decision are made by issues, not speeches)

鉄則１：必ず勝敗をつけて，理由を説明する（引き分けはなし）

Always pick the winners

鉄則２：争点（内容）で審査する。スピーチ（発音・スタイル）では審査しない

The winner is decided by ADs and DAs: Factual evidence and Importance.

Not by eloquence or fluency.

AD, DA = Probability (factual evidence) × Importance (value)

AFF win: If AD 1 + AD 2 ＞ DA 1 + DA 2

NEG win: If DA 1 + DA 2 ＞ AD 1 + AD 2

### Burden of Proof 証明の責任

AFF has the burden of proof to prove that there is an AD:

AFF has to defend ALL 3 sub-points a), b), and c) in an AD. (Each, at least partially)

NEG has to deny just ONE of these 3 sub-points, and the AD is gone.

NEG has the burden of proof to prove that there is an DA:

NEG has to defend ALL 3 sub-points a), b), and c) in an DA. (Each, at least partially)

AFF has to deny just ONE of these 3 sub-points, and the DA is gone.

まずは上記レベル3の議論かどうかを客観的に見分けられるようになること

試合の最後に生き残ったレベル3の議論を，試合中のディベーターの議論に基づいて，客観的に・公平に比較して，ADとDAのどちらが大きいかを比較

# 7. Typical Bad Judges　悪いジャッジの三つのタイプ

1. Style-Judgeスタイル・ジャッジ　お気に入りの英語発音，スピーチスタイルなどで採点  
   対策　→　争点だけで判定するよう自省
2. Cherry-picker つまみ食いジャッジ：　議論や試合の一部だけで判定  
   対策　→　必ず全ての議論のメモ（フロー）を細かく取る  
   　どの争点も考慮に入れる網羅性を重視
3. Judge-Debater ジャッジ・ディベーター：　生徒が試合にしなかった反論で考慮  
   対策　→　反論しないチームこそが損になるよう常に自分の意見が入らないよう監視

不公平・主観的・非実用的なジャッジにならないトレーニング

　→　じつは教師の成長の糧にもなる

# 8. Judges’ Comments

Judges’ oral comments after the round should have the four following elements.

次の４つの要素が入ることが望ましい（順番はアレンジ可能）

## (1)　褒め言葉　Praise

Always start from praising the debaters! Point out certain general points that were good.

ディベーターをまずは褒め，できるだけよい気持ちにさせるために最初は褒め言葉から，

全体的な印象として，どのような点が特に良かったか

## (2) アドバイス　Advices

Next, make some general advices that debaters should work on (speech style etc.)

勝敗に関わりのない，スタイル上の問題や全体として直すべき点を指摘する。

## (3）各争点の判定 Outcomes of Each Issue

Your decision on the outcome of each (and every) Issue: Advantages, Disadvantages (preferably, in order). Show that you considered all the speeches especially the attacks. You should conclude by commenting on your final assessment of each issue: 1) probability, 2) importance (value) and the 3) strength (probability × importance). Never cherry-pick! Take your time here. Concrete feedback is essential for debate education.

肯定側・否定側の争点Advantage, Disadvantageの一つずつを全部とりあげ，逐一，どのような強さとして判定されたかを述べる。相手の重要な反論（アタック）についても，その反論をどれだけ取り入れたかも述べること

必ずつまみぐいせずに，全ての争点を網羅すること。これは公平性のためにも重要であるとともに，どの争点やアタックは説得力があったのか，そしてどれがなかったのかを具体的にフィードバックすることができる

## (4）試合の勝ち負け Decision and the Reason for Decision

Finally, the total assessment comparing the assessed ADs and DAs. Be concrete hear.

それぞれの争点を総合するとどのような比較になるのか，勝ち負けとともに伝える。

## 例，

(1) Thank you very much for a wonderful debate.

I am really impressed by your wonderful effort. Especially, I think the Affirmative side quoted good evidence and was very persuasive…, And the Negative side had really good attacks on …

(2) But there are some places that you can work on, too. Before going in to the decision, I want to give three advices: One, please slow down and repeat the important Numbers. You both quoted a lot of statistics in the Constructive speeches, but the quotes were too quick… Two, …

(3) Now let’s see what happened to each issue: From Advantage 1: Aff argued that the Basic income will save people that weren’t saved before. They showed very good evidence supporting it. However, the Negative side attacked that actually .. But this was defended by the Aff Defense that …. So AD1’s probability remained strong. However, the importance seemed vague. So AD1 is a little weak. Next AD2:…

Now, move on to the Negative issues. On DA1, there were 3 important attacks, … however, the Defense was really good and all the attacks were answered. So …

On DA2: The impact was very weak from the beginning… So …

(4) Over all, AD1 is weak, AD2 is close to zero, so is DA2, but DA1 remained strong. As the summary speech suggested DA1 is much more important than the AD1, and I agree to the reason. Thus I will vote for the Negative Side.

Finally, good job both teams! Good luck for the Next round!

# 9. HEnDA Tournament Rules Specifics

## Limits on the numbers and the types of issues (Rulebook 2.1.1.3)

Each team can present just up to two ADs/DAs

No cramming! (Each AD/DA should only have one importance/one causality)

## Impact turn(-around)s/Value turns. (2.1.3, 2.1.4)

## Evidence sharing/checking (Rulebook 3.)

相手チーム，ジャッジは証拠の原文と訳文をチェックできる

## NEW Arguments are not allowed in later speeches (esp. summary speech) (4.2.2)

後出し禁止

## Best Debaters 優秀ディベーター（個人賞）

Each Judge Pick One debater that Contributed most to the round outcome. (Not (necessarily) the most fluent English speaker)

Most cases from the Winning team.

Can pick from the Team that Lost (in some cases; when her/his speech made the round a toss-up)

## Communication Points

Each judge is asked to rate each team communication points, ranging from 5 as the maximum and 1 as the minimum. (No fractions, only integers) Judges should scale how well the debate team (not each debater) successfully communicated with the judges, opponents, and the audience during the round.

各ジャッジは，各チームに5点満点・最低点１点のコミュニケーション点をつけることにします。（小数点はなし，整数のみ）。

## Online Debates: Actually, not so different from in-person debates

Ground rules on internet connection

Evidence sharing

# 10.　This Year’s Debate Topic

Topic Resolution

|  |
| --- |
| Resolved: That the Japanese Government should ban production and sales of fossil-fueled cars, including hybrid cars, by 2035.  日本政府は，（ハイブリッド車も含む）化石燃料車の製造と販売を2035までに禁止すべきである。 |

## Definitions:

1. “Fossil-fueled cars” assumes all passenger cars which use fossil fuel. “Fossil fuel” in this sense includes petroleum (or its derivations such as gasoline, diesel fuel, etc.), natural-gas, and coal (and their derivations as well). “Hybrid cars”, should also be the target of the ban as long as it has fossil-fueled engines. (Technically, so called “plug-in hybrids” are more like electric cars, but to make things simple, they should be counted as “hybrids” and should be part of the ban, as long as they also have gas engines.)

2. Alternatives for “fossil-fueled” passenger cars are not defined here. They should not be limited by plans. (Meaning, it is up to predictions using evidence: Electric cars, hydrogen cars, etc. may be the front runners.)

3. “Production and sales” should mean production and sales in Japan. The usage of fossil-fueled cars is not automatically banned at the moment of 2035.

4. Production and sales of fossil-fueled (non-passenger) trucks, special vehicles are not included in the ban (thus out of this debate topic).

NO OTHER PLANS will be allowed, such as:

Banning the usage of gas cars.

Heavily taxing the gas cars. Adding new subsidies to ban usage.

Regulating electric power plants (like banning thermal plants).

Banning the sales of USED cars abroad.

Subsidies to help out the gas car/car-parts industry

However, debaters can argue as a “prediction” in their ADs or DAs that some of these will happen in the future (if they can somehow prove it with evidence).

他のプランの付け足しは，基本的にダメ

×ガソリン車の使用禁止

×ガソリン車の重税化，補助金の付け足し

×火力発電所の廃止・禁止

×中古車の輸入・輸出禁止

×旧ガソリン車産業を救う補助金

ただし，こうしたことを将来の日本が行うようになるという予想（エビデンス付）で論じることはもちろんOK！

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ＊　Debate Judges’ Manual All Japan High School English Debate Tournament  All Japan High School English Debate (HEnDA)  Judging committee 1. What Judges Should Always Keep in Mind Debate judges should always keep in mind that you are not only judging but you are also *teaching* the students through that process. To accomplish this, always keep the following three basic principles in mind.  FAIRNESS: Always try to be fair. Needless to say, never take other personal attributes such as nationality, sex, appearance, school-name, school-location, etc. into account. Winners should be decided by the debaters’ performances *within* the round *you’re judging*. Don’t be bothered by any other previous information.  OBJECTIVITY: Don’t make decisions by hunches or feeling. Try to be rational and objective. Namely, never cast a ballot unless you clearly know the *reason* why you’ve decided team A is better than B  ACCOUNTABILITY: Make the students understand your reason for decision. At the same time always try to cheer them up! Find good points in both teams and make them feel good. 2. How to Decide the Winner Winner of the round should be decided by comparing the outcome of the *ISSUES* of both teams. In short, if you are convinced that supporting the proposition gives more Advantages (ADs) than Disadvantages (DAs), you vote for the Affirmative side (AFF). If you are convinced otherwise that the DAs outweigh the ADs, then you vote for the Negative side (NEG). NO TIES; pick a winner even if you think it’s not possible! (In extreme rare cases, neither AFF/NEG issues were convincing enough to vote for. In such case, it is presumed that the proposition is not true, so vote for the NEG.) Each judge should decide the winner *independently* without consulting the other judges.  Always take notes (“flows”) during the round. Pay attention to the proof and disproof of each issue (AD and DA). After the round, follow the next procedure and fill in the “DECISION MAKING CHART” section of the Judge Sheet to make your decision.   1. List the issues that were extended: How many ADs and DAs were presented, and how many of them were defended and mentioned in the final stage? Write down the titles (tag-lines). The issues should be properly presented following the tournament rules: Maximum number of ADs and DAs should not exceed two. (Ignore the “AD3”s and “DA4”s!) *Don’t count new arguments* after the constructive speech. 2. Judge the *probability (evidential support)* of each issue: First consider how convincing the alleged “ADs” or “DAs” were in terms of factual probability. Especially, you should look back at the strength of the proof (evidence) provided within the round. Weigh them lightly if the causal relation between the plan (proposition) and the ADs or the DAs are not supported by evidence. Also diminish the probability, if the opponent’s attacks were successful, or the defenses were poor. 3. Judge the *value (significance)* of each issue: Next consider the importance of each alleged “AD” and “DA”. What is the value at stake? How much impact will the “DA” bring in terms of quantity and quality? Unless the value mentioned in an issue is explained well by the debaters themselves, don’t weigh such issue as significant (Even if you yourself think it’s important). Note here that values can be sometimes “flipped” by the opponent’s good arguments. (For instance, AFF might argue that “gaps are bad”. However NEG might “flip” the issue by arguing that “gaps are rather welcome”. Compare the reasons supporting both claims. If you think the NEG value assessments were convincing, then the alleged “AD” should rather be treated as a “DA”. ) 4. Judge the *strength* (=multiply probability and value) of each issue: Multiply the above probability (2.) and value (3.) for each remaining ADs and DAs. Note here that “ADs” and “DAs” should not be regarded as “strong” unless *both* their probability *and* their value are effectively proven and defended. 5. Compare the net sum of the issues: Sum up the strength of the ADs and consider if it outweighs the strength of the summed-up DAs. If the ADs outweigh the DAs then AFF wins, else the NEG wins.   Try to avoid your own point of view coming in. Recollect the latter stage speeches (summary) of the debaters. If a team has explained the “value criteria” for deciding whether the ADs outweigh the DAs, such debater’s “criteria” should be used to determine the winner. (For example, AFF insisted that “each child should have enough math ability” but NEG argued that “children’s individuality should have priority”. Which is more important? Such comparison should be done *by the debaters* *themselves*. A good AFF summary may present a “value criterion” insisting that their plan can meet the necessary “civil minimum” concerning “math ability”, and the value of such necessary ability outweighs the vague “individuality” value. If the NEG can not present a counter-criterion, a judge should decide in favor of the AFF). In some debates, neither team is able to present such value criterion effectively. In that case, a judge should compare the ADs and the DAs rationally, using one’s own value judgments.  EXAMPLE: DECISION MAKING CHART  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1. List of issues | | 2. Probability | | ×　3. Value (Impact) | ＝ 4. Strength | | Advantage 1  *Math & Science* | | Hi / Lo  *No proof: why math scores will improve.* | | Large / Small  *well defended:*  *necessary for economy* | Strong / Weak / None  *Very little AD* | | Advantage 2  *Gap Private/Public* | | Hi / Lo  *Well defended.*  *Gap will be narrowed* | | Large / Small  *Need more explanation why gaps are bad* | Strong / Weak / None  *A Little AD* | | Disadvantage 1  *Teacher’s Burden* | | Hi / Lo  *Only little increase:*  *AFF attacks were good* | | Large / Small  *No explanation of the significance* | Strong / Weak / None  *Close to none* | | Disadvantage 2  *Free Time* | | Hi / Lo  *Not defended* | | Large / Small  *Not explained* | Strong / Weak / None  *Forgotten by the NEG* | | 5. Compare the net sum of the issues: | | | | | | | | ○ | AFF won: If AD 1 + AD 2 ＞ DA 1 + DA 2 | | | | | | |  | NEG won: If DA 1 + DA 2 ≧ AD 1 + AD 2 | | | | | | | Your VOTING ISSUE was: | | | *AD2: I am convinced that the Gap will be solved a little. Since other DAs are not well defended, I will vote AFF for this AD2* | | | |  3. Instructions / Interruptions during the Debate Round Basically, judges should leave the debate to the debaters and not intervene in it. However, for educational purposes, do interrupt the speeches in the following exceptional cases: A) *SPEECHES are unintelligible* (not loud enough, etc.) B) *QUESTIONS and ANSWERS are extremely anomalous.* C) *Speeches are interrupted by NOISE* (Chatting, pen-clicking, etc.) 4. Communication Points Each judge should rate the “communication points” of each team using the following scale. The points should reflect the *team’s* communicating ability with the judges, opponents, and the audience. 5 & 1 should be rare. (Only Integers. No 0.5s)   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 5 | Excellent | *Every* speech was easy to follow (adequate speed, elocutions etc.). And every team member was successfully communicating with the audience (good eye-contacts, gestures, good manners, etc.) | | 4 | Good | Most of the speeches had no problem in following. And most of the team members were effectively communicating with the audience. | | 3 | Average | Though with some exceptions, the speeches were basically easy to follow. Majority of the members had no problem in communication. | | 2 | Below Average | Speeches were quite often hard to follow. Lack of audience communication can be found often. | | 1 | Poor | Most of the Speeches were hard to follow. None of the team members were communicative. |   NB: The winner may have lower communication points (The points are mainly for tie-breaking purpose to select the winners of the preliminary rounds). If a team (or its member) does not obey the judge/chairperson’s instructions, being rude, or obstructing the opponent’s speeches, you can subtract some points for PENALTY. 5. Best Debater Each judge should choose the best debater of each round. Pick the single most valuable debater of the round (The debater that most contributed to the output of the debate round should be picked. Not necessarily the most eloquent.) 6. To Avoid Common Misunderstandings  1. *Don’t add your own issues, attacks…* Leave the job to the *debaters*. Don’t add any ADs/DAs or attacks yourself! 2. *Issues that are extended (not forgotten in the latter part of the round) should count:* Constructive speeches are just written down speeches. You shouldn’t weigh the issues too much, unless they are defended and summarized effectively afterwards. 3. *“New arguments” are prohibited:* All the ADs and DAs should be presented in the Constructive Speech. Last minute “surprise attacks” especially in the summary speeches should never be counted. 4. *Don’t judge the winner by comparing the “speeches”:* A *bad* reason for decision typically goes like this: “I’ll vote NEG, as I think the NEG *Q/As* and *Attacks* were wonderful. I thought the other speeches were even.” (Judges should compare the finally defended ADs/DAs. Even if the Q/As were superb, the team can be terribly unconvincing at the end!) 5. *This is not a Parliamentary Debate tournament:* “point of information” is prohibited. Never decide winners using subjective “speech points”. Usage of evidence is to be *encouraged* not discouraged. 6. *This is not a Recitation contest:* Don’t decide the winners by English fluency, accents, intonation, eye-contacts, etc. Rational contentions should count more than just superficial eloquence. 7. *Distinguish “decision making” and “advices”:* When deciding the winners, a judge shouldn’t add/attack the issues themselves, nor should they weigh English fluency too much. However, *advices* on these points are precious. Apart from the decision making, *advices* on the unmentioned “fallacies” or on English skills would be more than welcome.   全国高校生英語ディベート大会　ジャッジ基準  全国高校英語ディベート連盟(HEnDA) ジャッジの基本理念 「全国高校英語ディベート大会」のジャッジは，単に公正な判定者としてだけではなく，生徒の今後の成長をも配慮する教育者としてふるまうことが期待される。とりわけジャッジにとって重要なのは，以下の三つの心構えである。  公平性fairness　両チームの議論をできるだけ公平に配慮した判定を出すよう努めること。当然ながら国籍や性別，容姿，学校名，所在地などに絡む情実は判定には一切持ち込んではならない。その試合でどれだけ活躍したかが重要であり，他の試合でどうだったか，などは一切考慮しないこと  客観性objectivity　カンやフィーリングでなく，理性的で根拠のある判定をするように努めること。勝ち負けの理由をはっきりと言葉にできるまで考え，判定用紙に記入しないこと  説明責任accountability　判定理由を分かりやすく説明できるようにするとともに，できるだけ生徒の向上心を引き出し，アドバイスを与え，元気づけてあげることに努める 2. ジャッジング（勝ち負け判定）の基本 ジャッジは，試合中に論じられた議論の内容を客観的に比較することで，論題が肯定されたか否定されたかを合理的に判断して，試合の勝敗を判定する。簡単に言えば，論題どおりに政策を採用した場合に得られるAdvantage（利益，ADと省略）が，そのDisadvantage（弊害，DAと省略）より大きいとディベーターの議論によって確信させられたのなら，肯定側の勝ちとなる。逆にDAがADを上回ると確信させられたのなら否定側の勝ちとなる。引き分けは，許されない（万が一，どう考えてもADとDAとの強さに有意な差が見いだせない例外的な場合は，論題が真であるとは認められないと推定し，否定側の勝ちとすること）。ジャッジは，それぞれが他人と相談せず独自の判断で投票する。  　試合中は必ずメモ（「フロー」）を取り，それぞれの論点ADやDAの証明や反論がどう行われたかを注意深く聞く。試合後には，ジャッジ・シートにある“DECISION MAKING CHART”を埋める形で，次の５つのステップで判断する。   * 1. 試合の終盤まで忘れられなかった論点のリストアップ――立論で述べられた論点（ADとDA）のうち，ディフェンスや総括まで述べられたものをリストアップし，そのラベル（表題）をまず書き込む。この際，ルールに沿わない論点は無視する。ルールでは，ADとDAは最大で各二つずつまでとなっているが，三つ目や四つ目が述べられているなら，余計なものは無視する。また新しい論点new argumentsを立論以降に「後出し」することは禁止されている。後出しとみなされる論点や反論も無視する   2. それぞれの論点のもっともらしさ（probability蓋然性）を判定する――まずはディベーターの論じたADやDAがどれだけ事実に基づき，蓋然性（もっともらしさ）があるか，一つずつの論点について判断する。ADやDAとプラン（論題のいう政策）との間に因果関係があることが，証拠evidenceに基づいて証明されていないなら，その論点はもっともらしいとは見なさないこと。また相手側のアタックにより反論され，ディフェンスで再構築できなかった場合にも，もっともらしさを減らすこと   3. それぞれの論点の価値（value）を判定する――次にディベーターの論じた論点ADやDAがどれだけ重要性significanceを持つのか，一つずつの論点の価値を判定する。例えば「このDAで議論されている問題は，どのくらいの量・範囲で起きる，どのような質の問題なのか」を判定する。ディベーター自身が，論点の価値について理由もつけず，説明もしていないなら，その論点は重要だとは見なさない。価値の「良し悪し」については，議論次第で試合中に逆転することもありえる（例えば，肯定側が「格差は悪い」と論じたのに対し，否定側がこの評価を「転倒flip」して，「格差はむしろ歓迎すべき」と論じることもできる。その両者の言い分の理由付けの強さを参照し，どちらの言い分をとるかを決める。否定側の評価をとるなら，“AD”はむしろDAとして転倒される）   4. それぞれの論点の強さ（strength＝もっともらしさ×価値）を判定する――試合最後まで残った各ADやDAのもっともらしさ（2.）と価値（3.）とを掛け合わせて，議論の強さをそれぞれ判定する。くれぐれも注意すべきは，各ADやDAは，もっともらしさと価値との両方が上手く証明されていない限り，強いとみなすべきではないこと   5. 論点ADとDAとを全て合計して，比較判断する――肯定側のADの強さ（もっともらしさ×価値）と，否定側のDAの強さ（もっともらしさ×価値）とを足しあわせ，比較する。ADの強さを足しあわせたものが，DAの強さを上回ると判定したのなら，肯定側の勝ちとする。そうでないのなら否定側の勝ちとする。 　その比較の際には，できるだけジャッジ自らの価値観が入らないように努力する。とりわけ試合終盤のディベーターの議論を注意深く思い出し，もしあるチームが，ADやDAの強さを比較するための価値基準value criteriaにあたるものを論じていたのなら，それを極力重視して勝敗の判定をすること（例えば，肯定側が「どの子供も十分な数学能力を持つべきだ」と論じたのに対し，否定側が「子供の個性をそれより重視すべきだ」と反論したとする。どちらが重要かはジャッジが勝手に決めるのでなく，こうした比較こそ，ディベーター自身が議論すべき重要なことがらである。上手な肯定側の総括ならば，例えば「肯定側プランにより，誰もが最低線の数学能力の国民水準を達成できる」と論じて，そうした最低線を達成することの価値は，否定側のいう「個性」に先立つなど，まっとうな価値基準を理由付きで論じることになろう。もし否定側が対抗する価値基準を論証できないなら，肯定側に有利に判定すべきである）。両チームともこうした価値基準を上手く論じることができないという試合はありうる。その場合に限り，ジャッジは自らの評価基準に基づき，合理的にADとDAの強さを比較評価することになる。  EXAMPLE: DECISION MAKING CHART  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1. List of issues　論点名 | | 2. Probabilityもっともらしさ | | ×　3. Value (Impact) 価値 | ＝ 4. Strength　強さ | | Advantage 1  *Math & Science* | | Hi / Lo  *No proof: why math scores will improve.* | | Large / Small  *well defended:*  *necessary for economy* | Strong / Weak / None  *Very little AD* | | Advantage 2  *Gap Private/Public* | | Hi / Lo  *Well defended.*  *Gap will be narrowed* | | Large / Small  *Need more explanation why gaps are bad* | Strong / Weak / None  *A Little AD* | | Disadvantage 1  *Teacher’s Burden* | | Hi / Lo  *Only little increase:*  *AFF attacks were good* | | Large / Small  *No explanation of the significance* | Strong / Weak / None  *Close to none* | | Disadvantage 2  *Free Time* | | Hi / Lo  *Not defended* | | Large / Small  *Not explained* | Strong / Weak / None  *Forgotten by the NEG* | | 5. Compare the net sum of the issues:　各論点を足しあわせて比較する | | | | | | | | ○ | AFF won: If AD 1 + AD 2 ＞ DA 1 + DA 2 | | | | | | |  | NEG won: If DA 1 + DA 2 ≧ AD 1 + AD 2 | | | | | | | Your VOTING ISSUE was:  投票に最も影響した論点 | | | *AD2: I am convinced that the Gap will be solved a little. Since other DAs are not well defended, I will vote AFF for this AD2* | | | |  3.　スピーチ中の試合指揮 ジャッジは試合内容には口を出さず，基本的にはディベーターに任せる。ただし，教育的な観点から以下に該当するケースでは必要最低限の試合指揮を行う。A) スピーチ伝達上の支障（あまりに声が小さいなど） B) 質疑の進行に極端な問題がある場合（質疑が攻撃的になった，あまりに沈黙が長い等）C) 静寂性の問題（騒音・お喋り等） 4. Communication Pointsコミュニケーション点 各ジャッジは以下の基準に従い，各チームにコミュニケーション点をつける。これは，そのチームがどれだけ効果的にジャッジ・相手チーム・聴衆とコミュニケーションできたかで採点する。5や1は例外的にすべき（整数のみ）   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 5 Excellent | 全てのスピーチが分かりやすい（スピードも適切で，間の取り方なども良い）。かつチームの全員が聴衆とコミュニケーションがとれている（アイコンタクトも適切で，マナーも良い） | | 4 Good | ほとんどのスピーチが分かりやすい。ほとんどのメンバーが聴衆とおおむね良くコミュニケーションができている | | 3 Average | 多少の難はあるが，おおむねスピーチもわかりやすく，メンバーの過半が問題ないコミュニケーションができている | | 2 Below Average | スピーチが分かりにくくなることが目立ち，コミュニケーションが取れていないことも目立つ | | 1 Poor | スピーチのほとんどが分かりにくく，チームの誰もコミュニケーションを取れていない |   注意：勝敗とコミュニケーション点の多寡が一致する必要はない（この採点の目的は，主に予選の引き分けを防ぐためである。勝敗判定とは無関係）。あるチームやメンバーが①ジャッジの試合指揮に従わない，マナーが悪い，②証拠資料などの提示に協力的でない場合，その違反に応じてコミュニケーション点を減点しても良い 5. Best Debater ベスト・ディベーター 各ジャッジは，それぞれの試合でベスト・ディベーターを選ぶ。最も試合に貢献した選手を一人選ぶ（試合の勝敗の行方に最も貢献したディベーターが選ばれるべき。最も雄弁なディベーターではない） 6. その他の注意――よくある誤解をふせぐため  1. 勝手に論点や反論を足さない――立論や反論はディベーターが行うべき。ジャッジがするのは不公平・非教育的 2. 忘れられた論点は重視しない――序盤の立論でなく，総括などでどう効果的に論じられたかを重視して判定する 3. 「新しい議論」New Argumentsの禁止――ADやDAなどの論点は，最初の立論時間の間に論じるべき。逆に，総括になっての「後出し」は，どれだけ良い反論がでてもルール違反なら無視すべき 4. 「スピーチ」でなく論点を比較――悪い判定の典型例「否定側のアタックが素晴らしいと思った。他のスピーチは甲乙つけがたい。だから否定側の勝ち」。勝ち負けは具体的な論点AD・DAの強弱で判定（部分的にスピーチがどれだけよくても，最終的な結論に説得力がないなら意味は全くない！） 5. Parliamentary Debate大会とは異なる――相手スピーチ途中の質問“point of information”はこの大会では禁止されている。また勝敗の判定は主観的なスピーチ点で行わない，証拠の使用はここでは奨励されているなどの違いもある 6. 「流暢さ」で判定を行わない――朗読・スピーチ大会とは違い，英語が流暢だろうとアイコンタクトがよかろうと，直接的には勝ち負けに直結させない。英語ディベート大会では，表面的な雄弁より，理性的な答弁を重視し判定する   判定理由とアドバイスとの区別――試合の勝敗判定には，ジャッジ自身が思いついた論点などは持ち込まない。また英語の巧拙だけで勝ち負けは判定しない。しかし，判定とは別にこうした点は是非アドバイスをお願いしたい。「自分ならこの議論にはこう反論した」「こうすれば英語が聞きやすくなる」等のアドバイスは，生徒にとって貴重なフィードバックである。試合後に，勝ち負けとは別個に，様々なアドバイスをしていただければ幸いである。 |

# Judge Sheet (Regular OFFLINE PAPER version)

Room No. 　 Round: 1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th/5th/6th / S-F / Final

Before the round starts, please check and write each team’s name & ID, and every debater’s name & ID.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Affirmative Team (AFF)** | | |  | **Negative Team (NEG)** | | |
| Team ID | Team Name | | Team ID | Team Name | |
|  | | |  | | |
| Speaker A | ID | Name | Speaker A | ID | Name |
| Speaker B | ID | Name | Speaker B | ID | Name |
| Speaker C | ID | Name | Speaker C | ID | Name |
| Speaker D | ID | Name | Speaker D | ID | Name |

Decision Making Chart (After the round, fill in the following chart to make your decision.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. List of issues  Each side should not present more than two issues. Ignore extra ADs and DAs! | 2. Probability  Whether the issue was constructed and defended by facts and evidence | × 3. Value (Impact)  Whether the value (impact, significance) of the issue was effectively explained and defended | ＝ 4. Strength |
| Advantage 1 | High / Low / None | Large / Small / None | Strong / Weak / None |
| Advantage 2 | High / Low / None | Large / Small / None | Strong / Weak / None |
| Disadvantage 1 | High / Low / None | Large / Small / None | Strong / Weak / None |
| Disadvantage 2 | High / Low / None | Large / Small / None | Strong / Weak / None |
|  | | | |
| 5. Compare the net sum of the issues | | | |
| TICK IF YES | AFF won: If AD 1 + AD 2 ＞ DA 1 + DA 2 | | |
| TICK IF YES | NEG won: If DA 1 + DA 2 ≧ AD 1 + AD 2 | | |
|  | | | |
| 6. Check your decision | | | |
| Your VOTING ISSUE was:  “Voting issue” is the most decisive issue (AD/ DA) that affected your vote. If you can’t name it, it is probable that your decision might not be based on arguments but on superficial matters (such as English accents, impressive Attacks etc). If so, reconsider your decision. | | FILL IN THE LABEL OF THE ISSUE (Such as AD1, DA2) | |
| Are you sure that your vote is NOT influenced by NEW ARGUMENTS?  “New arguments” in the latter part of the round are prohibited. Reconsider your decision if you think some of the arguments were new. | | | TICK IF YES |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. The Winner**  Please be extra cautious that the team you are writing here was actually debating on the side you intend to vote for! | Team ID | Team Name |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Communication Points**  1: Poor 2: Below average 3: Average 4: Good 5: Excellent  (Integers only. **No zeroes. No fractions** such as 0.5, 3.5, 5.5) | **AFF** | **NEG** |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. The Best Debater** | ID | Debater’s Name | Team ID |

Do not sign until you have made your decision. A signed sheet will be considered a final decision.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Judge’s Signature** | Judge ID | Judge’s Signature |

1. Yoshiro Yano: Professor, Chuo Univ. PhD (Sociology). Working for the promotion of debate education in Japan since 1992. Director of the Japan Debate Association (Former President). One of the founding members of the All Japan High school English Debate Association (Now, on the board of managing directors, acting as the chief judge). 矢野　善郎：中央大学文学部教授，博士（社会学）。東京大学助手を経て，’03年より現職。日本ディベート協会理事（前会長）。全校高校英語ディベート連盟理事・審査委員長Email: yano@tamacc.chuo-u.ac.jp [↑](#footnote-ref-1)