

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 cannot 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 <u>Math & Science</u>	Hi / Lo No proof: why math scores will improve.	Large / Small well defended: necessary for economy	Strong / Weak / None Very little AD
Advantage 2 <u>Gap Private/Public</u>	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 <u>Teacher's Burden</u>	Hi / Lo Only little increase: AFF attacks were good	Large / Small No explanation of the significance	Strong / Weak / None Close to none
Disadvantage 2 <u>Free Time</u>	Hi / Lo Not defended	Large / Small Not explained	Strong / Weak / None Forgotten by the NEG
5. Compare the net sum of the issues:			
<input type="radio"/>	AFF won: If AD 1 + AD 2 > DA 1 + DA 2		
<input type="radio"/>	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	<i>Every</i> 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. 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

全国高校生英語ディベート連盟(HEnDA)

審査委員会

1. ジャッジの基本理念

「全国高校生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udging（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、その論点はおもしろ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」と論じることもし得る。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

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はなく、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る。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	2. Probability	× 3. Value (Impact)	= 4. Strength
Advantage 1 <u>Math & Science</u>	Hi / Lo No proof: why math scores will improve.	Large / Small well defended: necessary for economy	Strong / Weak / None Very little AD
Advantage 2 <u>Gap Private/Public</u>	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 <u>Teacher's Burden</u>	Hi / Lo Only little increase: AFF attacks were good	Large / Small No explanation of the significance	Strong / Weak / None Close to none
Disadvantage 2 <u>Free Time</u>	Hi / Lo Not defended	Large / Small Not explained	Strong / Weak / None Forgotten by the NEG
5. Compare the net sum of the issues:			
<input type="radio"/>	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. 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	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.

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. 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。