

While preparing the project, we did not want to be blinded by our intuitions and first impressions of the contemporary debating formats. For this reason, we started working on a paper on different formats and different positions they take on certain issues. Below we will share a table regarding our preliminary findings.

Model	BP	Policy	Asian-Australian	Linc oln-D ougl as	Ethic s Cup	WSDC
Cooper ation Type						
Advers ality Type						
Geogra phy	Mainly Europe + Africa but practiced everywhere	US	South-east Asia, Australia, New Zealand	US	Scotland	National teams based for highschoolers all around the world
Individu al / Team	Team	Individual	Team	Team	Team	Team
Number of Teams	4	2	2	2	2	2
N Team Members	2	1	3	2	3-5	3 (Kindly check, the number of team members in WSDC are more than 3, I think 5. But in any given round only 3 persons speak, though I am not sure about it.)

Motion Type	1.policy motion 2.analysis motion 3.actor motion	policy motion	1.policy motion 2.analysis motion 3.actor motion	policy motion	ethical problems	1.policy motion 2.analysis motion 3.actor motion
Based on...	Parliament	Court	Parliament	Court	?	?
Preparation Time	15	8	20/30 minutes	13	?	impromptu: 45-60mn given motions: few weeks before tournament
Role of Judges	a.decide on winner b.award speaker points c. give oral adjudication to clarify decision 1. In the preliminary rounds, teams are ranked 1 st -4 th , 2. In the knock-out rounds (other than the Grand Final, 2 teams are chosen to proceed to next round, 3. In the Grand Final a Champion is chosen)		a.decide on winner b.award speaker points c. give oral adjudication to clarify decision		ask question (in all other formats judges are observers mainly but not in ethics cup)	a.decide on winner b.award speaker points c. give oral adjudication to clarify decision

Fallacies (moves to be avoided)	1. Model 2. knife 3. Protected time/unprotected time 4. Barracking	sandbagging spreading	1. Model 2. knife 3. Protected time/unprotected time 4. barracking			1. Model 2. knife 3. Protected time/unprotected time 4. Barracking
	(I don't think Model is avoided in this format; it is largely left to the teams to decide based on the motion)					(I don't think Model is avoided in this format; it is largely left to the teams to decide based on the motion)

Considering the ADAB project's aspirations of virtuous + analytical conduct on the one hand and different positions taken by different debate formats on the other, we would like to ask you the following questions:

1. Contemporary debate formats work through certain time limitations. For example, the opening government speaks X minutes, and opposition is allowed Y minutes for a response. Concerning time limitations:

- What do you think are their benefits and drawbacks?

In competitive debate tournaments, time limitation is necessary for a few reasons:

a. Prioritisation of arguments

A time limit is necessary and practical as an important guide for the debaters to choose the most relevant content and prevent debaters from blabbering with irrelevant or less relevant materials. A time-limit directs debates to more pertinent areas. However, a debater must have enough time to build some clear ideas as well as the team to build a cohesive case. In some tournaments time is too short e.g., 5 minutes per speech which does not allow enough ideas to be built. In some other tournaments or rounds it is up to 8-10 minutes per speech which is a decent amount of time. When we speak about the time-limit, we must keep in mind that most of these tournaments are of impromptu format of debates and teams have no idea on what the motion will be about until 15-30 minutes prior to the round. In addition,

teams are not allowed to use the internet to collect information during that preparation time. Thus, a time-limit in these contexts is reasonable. In tournaments which allow opponents to offer point of information (POI), time limitation will further train debaters to effectively plan the delivery of their speeches.

b. Fair opportunities to all debaters

Setting a similar time-limit for all speakers in a competition provides a fair chance to all to compete in presenting the best arguments delivered in the best manner. Judges will therefore be expected to evaluate each speech by looking at the effectiveness of the speakers in presenting, responding, and rebutting each other's arguments within the given time-limit.

One of the drawbacks of time limitation is that at times debaters speak too fast to cover multiple ideas in a short span of speech-time. In some cases, involving the non-native speakers, time limitation can further heighten the pressure to construct precise arguments due to lack of language mastery. This can indirectly affect the strength and clarity of thought of the debaters. However, with judges it has not been an unmanageable problem as judges are used to listening to debaters who speak too fast although sometimes it takes away the beauty from their speech.

- **What other types of limitations can be conceived to replace them? What would be the benefits and drawbacks of moving away from time-limitations to limitations on, say, the number of arguments, premises, sources?**

While limitations other than time limitation may be conceived, I think time limitation is more practical and allows more freedom for the teams to plan. Restricting the number of arguments, premises or sources will massively restrict the freedom of thought of the speakers. I hold that such restrictions will encroach more on debaters' freedom to choose what they think will be important to speak about. Debate's contents, arguments are subjective. Even reliability and credibility of sources are also subjective. Any restriction along these lines will involve the organisers or judge's subjective decision to be imposed on the debaters.

On the other hand, a time-limit is objective in every sense. Irrespective the length of time allocated to the speakers, it will indirectly limit the number of arguments and premises. Longer time allocation allows for more arguments or

premises to be presented, and vice versa. As far as sources are concerned, in impromptu debate tournaments that are currently practised, citing the sources is not really a concern since they are not allowed to use any electronic gadgets or access to online materials, which significantly limit research opportunities. Although in most of the speeches in debate tournaments sources are not cited, judges assess the arguments, premises, and their credibility as a fictional 'average reasonable person'. In competitive debates, more often materials used are common knowledge which reduces the importance of citation. However, if the debate motions are released before the tournament begins, setting the criteria of sources and limiting it to only certain categories will ensure the authoritativeness of the arguments or premises which then can be further evaluated by the judges.

2. In the British Parliamentary Style, the participants are randomly appointed to certain positions, with the idea that this will help debaters to sharpen their critical thinking and open-mindedness. How would asking people to become opponents and proponents of positions that they prefer to hold make a difference? Meaning, say, if you are pro-choice or pro-life, you get to defend what you believe, for example. What would be the benefits and drawbacks of such a design?

Competitive debate tournaments are mostly to develop soft skills of the participants and enhance their understanding of issues with a view to prepare future leaders who understand issues, policies and are willing to negotiate. Truly debaters and individuals involved in similar activities do well in their respective career - be it in government or private sector. Given this purpose and logistics of tournaments like World Universities Debating Championships (WUDC) where near-about 400 teams participate, and topics come from every walk of life, it is logistically difficult to allow debaters to choose their positions on every topic. In addition, teams register without knowing what the motions are likely to be and not all participants have a fixed position or belief on those motions.

There is an interesting practice in the Australasian Debate and Asian Debate) which is to provide teams their sides (Proposition/Opposition) and then provide 3 motions to the teams one of which will be debated based on the choices of the teams in that particular debate. Thus, some elements of choice of motions by teams are involved. This may work out for teams that do not want to propose/oppose a certain topic to get their way out of it by vetoing that motion as there are choices of 3 motions. Still, this choice isn't anywhere close to allowing people to debate based on their free-choice or affiliations.

In public debates which are hosted by many renowned institutions (Like Oxford Union Debates), usually speakers are chosen based on their affiliation/views/expertise. It is practical and preferable in my opinion. Stark differences between a public debate and debates in tournaments are, among others:

- motions are announced way in advance in a public debate unlike in tournaments,
- tournaments involve mostly secondary or tertiary students, whereas public debate involves experts,
- public debate is a one-off affair whereas tournaments involve several days of rounds of debate to determine a champion. Thus, logistics of the two are very different.

3. In our ongoing work concerning an alternative debate model, we incline towards a one-on-one debate format, rather than towards debate teams. What would be the benefits and drawbacks of such a choice made in this domain? What are the benefits and drawbacks of having teams and team members? What are the uses of four teams competing as in the case of the British Parliamentary?

I have several comments and suggestions for any new framework of debating to be conceived:

- a. I prefer that, at least some rounds in all competitions and perhaps in all public/exhibition debates, motions are pre-announced. If all rounds are impromptu debates, the research opportunities and available contents of the debate are not fully utilised and explored. World School Debating Championship (WSDC) is perhaps a good mix of this.
- b. I believe that the restrictions to use electronic gadgets or the internet during preparation time that is applied in most tournaments should be lifted and teams or individuals should be given the freedom to access electronic materials.
- c. A one-on-one debating model could be great for experts to debate but will be restrictive if we are to consider students' skills development en-masse. A team debate tournament will allow more than 500 participants to practise, learn and hone their skills over a weekend or few days. A one-on-one format

of debate will take away more days to accommodate such a number of participants.

- d. Among the benefits of team debating are learning of teamwork and coordinating diverse ideas within the team into a cohesive case which is very often necessary in real life. No-man is an island and in society compromising ideals happens often. British Parliamentary debating where 4 teams with diverse viewpoints debate in the same room and work as a qualification to support or oppose a motion is very reflective of this real-life situation of diversity, disagreement, and cooperation.
- e. A proper debate tournament where experts or students debate based on their own choices of position on pre-announced motions is possible to be conceived. However, such a tournament's logistics must be well thought out to ensure that there is an equal number of debaters on both sides of all pre-announced motions. A one-off or disjointed rounds of one-on-one debate on issues based on debaters' preference will be easy to organise. But turning that into a tournament, will require lots of mechanistic issues of judges, rules, rounds (league or knockouts) to be sorted out.

References:

1. 'The World Universities Debating Championships- Debating and Judging Manual', by The Malaysia World 2015 Adjudication Team, et. el. Accessed on 9th January 2022 at https://debate.uvm.edu/dcpdf/WUDC%20Malaysia_2014_Debating_and_Judging_Manual.pdf
2. Constitution of the World Universities Debating Council, accessed on 9th January 2022 at <https://www.worlddebating.org/about-council/constitution>

Prepared by:

Muhammad Abdul Latif (Deputy Director, IIUM World Debate and Oratory Centre)

Mizan binti Muhammad (Director, IIUM World Debate and Oratory Centre)

How to judge (know and evaluate moves)

How to limit/control moves? Time issue

How to control trajectory of munazara – it is determined by the first move made.

In BPS they accumulate the best arguments and make them in the time allotted.