

# CROSS- EXAMINATION

# CROSS-EXAMINATION

---

- ✘ So far, we have done very little to emphasize cross-examination. Why? Because novices have too much to work on all at once and so learning about the speeches is more important at first.
- ✘ BUT, now that you are more advanced you should learn that CX can be a very powerful tool. It can set you up to give better speeches and boost your speaker points.
- ✘ I have even seen a few debates where a series of CX questions was so devastating that it was clear who was going to win.

# PURPOSES OF CX

---

- ✗ Clarify anything that confused you. It is much better to ask in CX about something that you missed than to ignore it and hope that it goes away.
- ✗ Make a good impression on the judge.
- ✗ Setup your arguments.
- ✗ Highlight flaws in your opponents reasoning or evidence.
- ✗ Give your partner prep time.
- ✗ Get the other team to commit to the meaning of an argument that you do not want them to try to weasel out of later.

# NOT PURPOSES OF CX

- ✗ Embarrassing your opponent.
- ✗ Getting your opponent to concede the debate.
- ✗ Giving away arguments that you plan to make with super obvious questions.
- ✗ Nit-picking minor issues.

# GENERAL TIPS

---

- ✘ Be friendly and calm. If your opponent is rude DO NOT give in. If you stay calm they will look even worse in comparison.
- ✘ Stand firmly, speak loudly, and look confident.
- ✘ Do not waste your time in a paper shuffle—get evidence before CX, during prep.
- ✘ Face the judge, not your opponent.
- ✘ Use arguments from CX in speeches!

# GENERAL TIPS

---

- ✗ Also... IMPORTANT... many teams and judges think that “tag team” CX is OK. Here is why you should only CX when it is your assigned time:
  - + The person not assigned to CX needs to prep
  - + One person looks weak, the other looks pushy
  - + Judges remember a general impression of the debaters more than the exact wording of a question or answer
  - + It is harder for the judge to follow if everyone is competing for time
  - + It looks novice-ish. Top teams respect their partners, novices fight for time.

# TIPS FOR THE QUESTIONER

- ✘ Think about CX before the debate—you could even brainstorm particularly good questions against each case and DA to get you started.
- ✘ Keep CX moving—ask a number of questions and do not get bogged down trying to get them to admit one point. (The judge will usually understand the purpose of the question and so if they are avoiding the question, it will be obvious, and you need to move on).
- ✘ Try to ask close-ended questions like “What does your Smith evidence say is causing poverty? So, Smith does not think that it is just a lack of government action?” Open-ended questions like “How do you solve your case?” will just let them ramble for 3 minutes.

# TIPS FOR THE ANSWERER

---

- ✘ Hand over any evidence that they request quickly.
- ✘ If you do not know an answer... 1) try to think of something anyhow, 2) use your evidence for answers, 3) admit that you do not know but try to argue that the question was not important.
- ✘ Keep your answers open ended so that you have leeway later.
- ✘ It is OK to pause for a moment to think or ask the questioner to repeat themselves if their question was unclear.



# TIPS FOR ASKING QUESTIONS OF THE 1AC

- ✘ Start with the plan... make sure that you know exactly how the plan works because that is the basis of your whole strategy in the 1NC.
- ✘ Look for DA links. Imagine that you want to run a spending DA. You might ask them questions about the scope of their harms so that they exaggerate the scope of the problem (requiring an expensive solution).
- ✘ Look for logical case arguments.
- ✘ Think defensively... if they make a morality claim, ask if a DA could outweigh it and if not, press them to explain the warrants.
- ✘ **Let's use your 1AC as an example. Everyone brainstorm 3-5 questions that you might ask.**

# TIPS FOR ASKING QUESTIONS OF THE 1NC

- ✗ Get clarification of anything that confused you.
- ✗ Pay particular attention to any theory arguments (like topicality), you will need to make sure that you understand the arguments in order to respond.
- ✗ Look at the link cards to the DA—are they really about the affirmative case? (Often they are not).
- ✗ Once you also have to deal with counter plans, it is essential that you understand the CP text exactly. Same with the alternative to critiques—get the text!
- ✗ Let's use one of the DAs in the packet as an example. Can you think of 3-5 questions that the aff might use to challenge the DA?

# TIPS FOR ASKING QUESTIONS OF THE 2AC

- ✗ First, get all of the cards that the 2NC needs in order to prep.
- ✗ Then, fill in any arguments that you missed. Pay particular attention to any theory arguments made in the 2AC.
- ✗ Next, focus on the positions that you plan to extend in the 1NR. Why? You can make arguments that you set up but your partner is prepping and will not get as much use out of it. Also, the 2A might say that the answer is in a card and you will have to disrupt your partner's prep to retrieve the evidence.
- ✗ A good place to focus is on any offense on the DAs. Scrutinize link or impact turn evidence.
- ✗ If the 2AC read an "add-on", pay particular attention to this new advantage. Often, the evidence is rather weak.

# TIPS FOR ASKING QUESTIONS OF THE 2NC

- ✘ Identify anything new that the 2NC brought up— new DA links, a new theory argument, a new understanding of the CP text or critique alternative...
- ✘ Try to poke holes in their offense. Are there any unsupported logical leaps?
- ✘ NEVER point out that the 2NC has dropped something. Why? Because they can simply have the 1NR cover that point.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Period: \_\_\_\_\_

Assertion:

Reasoning:

Evidence:  
(exactly as it appears in the source)

Evidence:  
(Paraphrase in your own words)

Citation of Source:

More conclusions I can draw:  
(What does this mean for my case? What is the significance? Who does this effect?)

Names: \_\_\_\_\_

**DEBATE RUBRIC**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Mastery (5)</b>	<b>Above Standard (4)</b>	<b>At Standard (3)</b>	<b>Approaches Standard (2)</b>	<b>Below Standard (1)</b>
Opening & Closing Statements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extremely thorough, well-organized presentation of arguments</li> <li>- Opening statement engages the interest of audience; closing statement leaves no unanswered issues and resonates with the audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Well-organized and complete presentation of arguments</li> <li>- Opening statement successfully frames the issues; closing statement summarizes many arguments made in the debate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Organized and generally complete presentation of arguments</li> <li>- Opening statement outlines or lists arguments, but does not generate interest; closing statement does not reflect remarks made during debate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Somewhat organized presentation of arguments and evidence</li> <li>-Opening statement minimally outlines arguments; closing argument briefly restates the ideas offered in the opening statement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Arguments are unorganized, incomplete, or completely lacking</li> <li>-Opening statement and closing statements do little more than state the position of the team</li> </ul>
Rebuttal (When Applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responds to issues raised by opponents with concise, accurate, logical answers</li> <li>- Effectively challenges the arguments made by opponents with argument and evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responds to issues raised by opponents with accurate and generally concise answers</li> <li>- Challenges the arguments made by opponents; challenges are generally effective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responds to most of the issues raised by opponents with generally accurate answers</li> <li>- Offers arguments, but no evidence, to counter the arguments made by opponents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Seems to be caught off-guard by opponents; offers tentative, somewhat accurate, but possibly vague or illogical responses</li> <li>-Attempts to challenge arguments of opponents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Is unable to respond to issues raised by opponents in a meaningful or accurate way</li> </ul>
Effective use of evidence / content knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the issues, events, and facts relevant to the topic</li> <li>-Demonstrates thorough and accurate understanding of details as well as the ability to make original connections and interpretations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the issues, events and facts relevant to the topic</li> <li>-Demonstrates thorough and accurate understanding of details as well as the ability to make original connections and interpretations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Demonstrates a basic and accurate understanding of the issues, events and facts relevant to the topic.</li> <li>-Demonstrates the ability to make basic connections between facts and concepts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Demonstrates a general, accurate understanding of relevant issues, events and facts; may exhibit minor confusion; understands general ideas, but does not support ideas with relevant facts; OR, seems to understand facts but is unable to connect them into coherent arguments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Demonstrates an inadequate understanding of the facts relevant to the topic</li> <li>-Supports statements with vague or irrelevant information, or no information at all</li> </ul>
Use of persuasive appeals	Makes deliberate and effective use of logical, emotional and ethical appeals in order to persuade	Uses logical, emotional and ethical appeals to enhance effectiveness of argument	Uses some appeals to make argument more persuasive, but may not include a mix of logical, emotional and ethical appeals	Makes minimal use of persuasive appeals	Does not use persuasive rhetoric
Language Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uses language that is stylistically sophisticated and appropriate for debate</li> <li>- Uses challenging language to enhance the argument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uses language that is appropriate for debate</li> <li>- Uses challenging language to add interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uses language that is appropriate for debate</li> <li>- Uses clear, concise language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Generally uses language that is appropriate for debate</li> <li>-Uses basic but clear language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Uses colloquial, overly simplistic language</li> <li>-Uses language and syntax that is unclear</li> </ul>
Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exhibits confidence, energy, and passion in the course of the debate</li> <li>- Maintains respectful tone</li> <li>- Accesses preparation materials with ease</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exhibits confidence and energy in the course of the debate</li> <li>-Maintains respectful tone</li> <li>- Uses preparation materials effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appears nervous, yet somewhat confident</li> <li>- Maintains respectful tone</li> <li>- Use of preparation materials does not distract</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Lacks confidence</li> <li>-Maintains respectful tone</li> <li>- Use of preparation materials distracts from quality of performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Demonstrates little or no preparation</li> <li>-Fails to maintain respectful tone</li> </ul>
Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed on time and thoroughly</li> <li>-First constructive</li> <li>-Organizer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed on time, with some incomplete elements</li> <li>-First constructive</li> <li>-Organizer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed a day late</li> <li>-First constructive</li> <li>-Organizer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed later than a day after due date.</li> <li>-First constructive</li> <li>-Organizer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed for day of debate, but not sooner</li> <li>-First constructive</li> <li>-Organizer</li> </ul>

# Rhetoric: The Art of Speaking and Writing

# What are rhetorical devices?



- ❧ Rhetorical devices are techniques writers and speakers use to enhance their arguments and communicate more effectively.



# Ethos (Greek for 'character')



- ☞ Ethos is defined as the credibility or the respect of the speaker. This influences the listener or reader simply based on whether or not he or she respects the speaker.

To develop ethos use...

- ☞ Language appropriate to audience and subject;  
Restrained, sincere, fair-minded presentation
- ☞ Appropriate level of vocabulary
- ☞ Correct grammar

# Pathos (Greek for 'suffering' or 'experience')



- Pathos is the emotional appeal that the speaker or writer uses. If used properly with the right audience, this can be enormously effective. Anger is the emotion that is said to be the most effective to appeal to, but one must know the state of mind of the angry people, who they are mad at, and why they are angry.

To develop pathos use...

- Vivid, concrete language; Emotionally loaded language
- Connotative meanings
- Emotional examples
- Vivid descriptions
- Narratives of emotional events
- Emotional tone
- Figurative language

# Logos (Greek for 'word')



- ∞ Logos is the appeal to the logic or reason of the audience. This is tricky because if the audience is not reasonable or logical then this is not an effective strategy to employ.

To develop logos use...

- ∞ Theoretical, abstract language; Literal and historical analogies
- ∞ Definitions
- ∞ Factual data and statistics
- ∞ Quotations
- ∞ Citations from experts and authorities
- ∞ Informed opinions

# Additional Rhetorical Devices



You should be familiar with the following rhetorical devices. Keep in mind there are many rhetorical devices, but we will cover only some.

- ∞ Allusion
- ∞ Alliteration
- ∞ Analogy
- ∞ Anaphora
- ∞ Metaphor
- ∞ Rhetorical Question
- ∞ Irony (dramatic, situational, and verbal)

# Task:



∞ Watch the closing argument of the movie *A Time to Kill* and record where he effectively uses Ethos, Pathos, and Logos.



What techniques does Brigade use to convince the jury of Carl Lee's innocence?

# Political Speeches

Look at almost any political speech in the last few hundred years, and you'll find many clever uses of rhetoric.



# Debate Implementation



- œ Implement rhetoric techniques into your own speeches.
- œ Think about where emotional appeal is helpful
- œ Think about logically making your argument
- œ Are there rhetorical questions to be asked?
- œ Can you allude or make an analogy to something the audience would know about?



**Use this sheet to track the arguments as they are presented in the debate.**  
*Proposition:* \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

**Debate Flow**

<b>1AC</b>	<b>1NC</b>	<b>2AC</b>	<b>2NC</b>



Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Period: \_\_\_\_\_

## Debate Vocabulary

**Proposition:** This is the subject of the debate—this is the statement that gives the debate a direction. It is a statement about which reasonable people may accept arguments on either side.

Value Example:

Policy Example:

**Contentions:** The points that either support or challenge the proposition. Similar to pros and cons. These are points of argument for the affirmative and the negative team.

**Affirmative team:** This is the team that supports the proposition (usually 2 people).

**Negative team:** This is the team that challenges the proposition (usually 2 people).

**Constructive Speeches:** During the constructive speeches, each team builds its case, developing and defending the arguments and responding to the contentions of the opposing team.

**Evidence:** These are the facts, statistics or expert opinions that support the contentions made by the speakers. Both teams must present relevant and current evidence. These can come in the form of examples, statistics, common sense, or expert opinions.

- **Examples:** These are from your own experiences or from what you have heard or read of another's experience (i.e. when I walk by a smoker, I am forced to breathe smoke—even if I don't want to).
- **Statistics:** These are numbers from your research (i.e. every year there are 250,000 respiratory infections).
- **Common Sense:** Things that are well known (i.e. second hand smoke is unhealthy)
- **Expert Opinion:** Opinions from established individuals—this comes from your research (i.e. according to the Environmental Protection Agency...).

**Rebuttal speeches:** These are the final speeches in the debate, and are very short. The speakers will rebuild arguments and summarize the debate from their own perspective.

**Cross-examination:** During cross-examination, the opposing team will ask questions regarding the case and evidence that has been presented.

**Fallacy:** Errors in logical reasoning

**Judges:** Members of the audience who determine a victor.

**Inherency:** The claim that the problems with the status quo will not go away without the proposed plan. The affirmative will claim that the harms in their case will stay and get worse without adopting their plan.

**Solvency:** The claim that the problems will go away (or be "solved") if the affirmative plan is adopted.

**Status Quo:** The term used to represent the present state of affairs, the way things are now.

**Significance:** The claim that the problems with the status quo are worthy for the change called by the resolution.

Judge Name \_\_\_\_\_

1=Poor 2=Fair 3=Average 4=Great 5=Excellent

Name of Debater	1 <sup>st</sup> Affirmative					Affirmative Rebuttals					1 <sup>st</sup> Negative					Negative Rebuttal				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Organization																				
Knowledge & Evidence																				
Reasoning																				
Opposing case																				
Response to X-exam																				
Speaking skills																				
Effective Debating																				
Rhetoric (mix of appeals)																				
	/40					/35					/40					/35				

Affirmative TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

Negative TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

The More Effective Debate was done by: \_\_\_\_\_

Explain your reasoning:

---



---



---



---



---

# Lincoln-Douglas Planning Names: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>1. The Resolution:</b>	
<b>2. From a dictionary, define key terms from resolution.</b>	
Term:	Term:
Term:	Term:
<b>3. Explain what you think the resolution means for each side.</b>	
AFF:	NEG:
<b>4. List VALUES you could argue, then choose ONE value for each side and define.</b>	
AFF:	NEG:
<b>5. List claims (statements you will support with facts, moral statements, evidence). Claims MUST relate to Key VALUE and Resolution. You must also anticipate the opposition's claims here.</b>	
AFF Claim 1:	NEG Claim 1:
AFF Claim 2:	NEG Claim 2:
AFF Claim 3:	NEG Claim 3:
<b>6. Find current/recent events to support claims (linking Resolution and Key VALUE). Be sure to write some possibilities of what the opposition might say (thus you are prepared for their claims and evidence)</b>	
AFF:	NEG:
AFF:	NEG:
AFF:	NEG:

**7. Resources: What sources are you using to support your moral claims? Put your cited sources here MLA FORMAT**

AFF:	NEG:
AFF:	NEG:
AFF:	NEG:

## The structure for your constructive speech

Introduction	Quote and/or anecdote:
	Explain how the quote relates to your resolution.
	Explain how and why the anecdote illustrates your resolution.
	<b>I affirm/negate the resolution: RESOLVED: (State your resolution.)</b>
	Using the dictionary, define key terms from the resolution.
	Put the resolution in your own words. Discuss what you value and why.
	Therefore, <b>I value XXXXXXXX.</b>
	Define your value or use a quote to help explain your value.
Body	As in previous debates, clearly state your claims (called contentions).
	Support your claims with warrants. You may use current events or past events to help express why you support the resolution.
	Use reasoning to explain why your warrants justify your claims.
Conclusion	Express how and why you have demonstrated why your value is more important than your opponent's value and why you presented strong support for the resolution.
	Use a quote for a final thought.