

Cross X Debate



Style Guide

I. Introduction

Like other forms of debate, Cross-Examination (C-X) Debate focuses on the core elements of controversial issue. Cross-Examination Debate develops important skills, such as critical thinking, listening, argument construction, research, note-taking and advocacy skills. Cross-Examination Debate is distinct from other formats, with the exception of Parliamentary Debate, in its use of a two-person team. Cross-Examination Debate also places emphasis on questioning or cross-examination between constructive speeches. While specific practices vary, Cross-Examination Debate typically rewards intensive use of evidence, and is more focused on content than on delivery.

II. Rules of Cross-Examination Debate

This section highlights the important rules that govern the Cross-Examination Debate format. Because these rules focus on the goals and procedures of debate, they do not include all that might be considered, from a strategic perspective, principles of effective debate.

A. Resolutions and Preparation

The topic for Cross-Examination Debate is typically called a "resolution" or "proposition." Different types of propositions may be used in a Cross-Examination Debate, but policy propositions tend to be the most common. Different leagues, organizations or individual tournaments may use a particular resolution for a particular debate.

So that clash might occur in a debate, debaters should engage in research on both sides of the topic. Research is primarily the job of debaters. Teachers and coaches may conduct research in order to improve their job performance and to facilitate the learning of their students, but should limit the amount of research they conduct for debaters.

B. Interpretation of the Resolution

Cross-Examination Debate involves two teams, each consisting of two people. One team takes the proposition position and is responsible for defending and supporting the resolution. The other team takes the opposition and is responsible for refuting the proposition, which may be done in a variety of strategic ways.

The proposition team is responsible for the initial interpretation of the resolution, and for presenting a case that defends and supports the resolution. The opposition team may challenge this interpretation if they believe the proposition's team's interpretation is unreasonable.

1. Arguing a Case for the Resolution

The objective of the proposition team is to construct and present a case that defends and supports the resolution. An adequate case (one that meets a certain burden of proof) depends on what type of proposition is debated. Individual topics and tournaments determine what burden is required.

2. Arguing Against the Resolution

The objective of the opposition team is to refute the proposition case, which, by extension, is an argument against the resolution. Depending on the topic and the type of proposition, the opposition may have a variety of possible strategies available when refuting the proposition case.

C. Rules During the Debate

1. In-Round Research is Prohibited

Topic research must be completed prior to the beginning of a debate. Once the debate begins, the participants may not conduct research via electronic or any other means. No outside person(s) may conduct research during the debate and provide it directly or indirectly to the debaters. Debaters, however, are allowed to use a dictionary to determine the meaning of English words.

2. Citations are Mandatory

Debaters may cite or refer to any public information. When doing so, they should be prepared to provide complete source documentation to the opposing team and to the judge, upon request. A team's documentation of cited material must be complete enough so that the opposing team and the judge can locate the information of their own. Ordinarily, such documentation would include the name of an author (if any), the name and date of a publication, the URL of a Web site (if the information was retrieved electronically), and a page number (if available).

ADSA Rules for Cross-Examination Debate

1. Cross-Examination style debate requires all debaters to ask and answer questions as well as to perform the usual functions of a debater. "Cross-examination" means simply the questioning of an opponent: the questioner is referred to as the "examiner" while the "witness" replies to the questions asked.
2. The debate will be presided over by Madam Moderator. The Proposition team sits on the right hand side of the moderator; the Opposition team sits on the left.
3. The resolution for a cross-examination debate may take the form of a question; in this case, the Proposition team supports an affirmative answer to that question.
4. Debaters shall refer to the moderator by title, "Madam Moderator," but may refer to one another by their given names.
5. Debaters shall treat one another with dignity and judges should penalize debaters guilty of flippancy, discourtesy, browbeating or any attempt to belittle another debater. The moderator shall also attempt to protect debaters from such abuse.
6. Debaters will speak only when called upon by the moderator.
7. The Proposition must define the resolution. Their definition must be accepted unless it is undebatable or unreasonable. In cross-examination style debates, there is no opportunity for the Opposition team to formally object to the definition of the resolution. If there is a problem with the definition, the first Opposition speaker should state this in her/his speech. He/she should explain why the definition is wrong or unreasonable. They must, however, debate on those terms. The judges will take the conflicting definitions under consideration when scoring the debate.
8. If the debate is a policy debate (i.e. one in which the Proposition comes up with a plan or method of implementing the resolution), the Opposition may choose to propose a counter-plan. A counter-plan is a significantly different way of carrying out the resolution. If the Opposition does this, the debate becomes an argument about which is the better plan.
9. The examiner shall control a cross-examination. During questioning, the questioner should ask questions rather than make speeches. He/she may not insist on a yes or no answer and must allow the debater being questioned sufficient time to explain his/her answer. He/she may not ask any questions of a personal nature. The examiner should ask fair questions on relevant subjects.
10. The only question that a witness may ask during cross-examination is for a confusing question to be clarified. He or she may not answer a question by asking a question.
11. The examiner should ask fair questions on relevant subjects, but questions need not relate to the speech just delivered by the witness. Unless the examiner or his or her colleagues relate them to the resolution during the debate, of course, the question may carry no weight with the judges.
12. The debater being questioned must answer any questions, regardless of apparent relevance as long as they are not of a personal nature. He/she may request that the question be clarified but should not use this as a delaying tactic. Stalling will be penalized. Answers should not be longer than a sentence or two.
13. Witnesses must try to answer all questions directly and honestly: they should be penalized for evading questions or giving untruthful answers. Witnesses may not object to answering questions on the grounds that they are irrelevant or unfair.
14. The moderator shall not intervene when irrelevant remarks are made but if they are in response to a pertinent question, on the request of the examiner, he or she shall order the witness to answer the question directly.
15. During a cross-examination, examiners may only ask questions; accordingly, they should be penalized for making speeches or rebutting at this time. Judges shall evaluate examiners solely on their ability to elicit admissions from witnesses and must disregard any argument or evidence introduced by an examiner during a cross-examination period.
16. No heckling, Points of Order or Privilege, or other interjections are permitted. At the conclusion of each debate the moderator will give each debater an opportunity to point out any infractions of the rules or misrepresentation of his or her position by his or her opponents. When alleging such an infraction, a debater must identify the specific debate rule that has been broken or his or her remark that has been misconstrued and the debater accused of the violation or misrepresentation should be given an opportunity to defend himself or herself. The Moderator shall not rule on any such objections.
17. The functions of rebuttal, defence and summarization may be divided by the members of each team and, if so, judges will score debaters on how well they discharge their respective responsibilities.
18. During the rebuttal speeches, debaters may not bring up any new arguments or new evidence except in direct refutation of material which has already been presented.

III. Format and Roles in Cross-Examination Debate

In Cross-Examination Debate, both sides of the resolution have an equal amount of time to present their arguments. The format is composed of twelve parts, each of which has a defined purpose and set of rules. Eight of these sections consist of "speeches" -- uninterrupted presentations by a designated speaker. The remaining four sections consist of "cross-examination" -- a series of questions and answers involving one speaker from each side.

A. The format of a Cross-Examination Debate is as follows:

Junior High Cross-Examination (2 Person Teams)

	Beginner Level	Open Level
1 st Proposition Constructive	5 min	6 min
1 st Proposition cross-examined by 2 nd Opposition	2 min	3 min
1 st Opposition Constructive	5 min	6 min
1 st Opposition cross-examined by 1 st Proposition	2 min	3 min
2 nd Proposition Constructive	5 min	6 min
2 nd Proposition cross-examined by 1 st Opposition	2 min	3 min
2 nd Opposition Constructive	5 min	6 min
2 nd Opposition cross-examined by 2 nd Proposition	2 min	3 min
Break	5 min	5 min
Rebuttal Speech by 1 st Opposition	4 min	4 min
Rebuttal Speech by 1 st Proposition	4 min	4 min

Bilingual Junior High Cross-Examination

	(Both Categories)
1 st Proposition Construction in French (Definitions in both languages)	6 min
1 st Proposition cross-examined by Second Opposition in French	3 min
1 st Opposition Constructive in French	6 min
1 st Opposition cross-examined by 1 st Proposition in French	3 min
2 nd Proposition Constructive in French	6 min
2 nd Proposition cross-examined by 1 st Opposition in French	3 min
2 nd Opposition Constructive in French	6 min
2 nd Opposition cross-examined by 2 nd Proposition in French	3 min
Break	5 min
Rebuttal by 1 st Opposition in English	4 min
Rebuttal by 1 st Proposition in English	4 min

While the order and proportional length of speech time are consistent between different organizations practicing debate, there is variation in exact time limits for constructive speeches, cross-examination, and rebuttal. Each debate also includes preparation time, typically eight minutes for each team, which is determined by an individual tournament. This time is not scheduled in any particular place in the sequence of sections, and is instead taken at the discretion of each team, in whatever amounts the team desires.

B. Role of the Speakers

The Cross-Examination format embraces debate as a team activity. In the Cross-Examination format, each debate team is composed of two individuals who stay together through every round of competition. Each team alternatively debates the opposition and proposition positions in alternating rounds.

Although Cross-Examination Debate is a team activity, the only debater allowed to speak during a given moment in the debate is the one assigned by the format to do so (see above). Team members may not assist their teammates by offering suggestions or by answering questions on their behalf. During the cross-examination period, it is generally expected that only the examiner may ask questions, and only the speaker may answer them. Typically, no spoken communication is allowed between either the examiner or the speaker and their teammates. Some tournaments may have different policies regarding the method by which cross-examination may be conducted.

1st Prop. Beg – 5 min, Open – 6 min	Cross X Beg – 2 min, Open – 3 min	1st Opp. Beg – 5 min, Open – 6 min	Cross X Beg – 2 min, Open – 3 min	2nd Prop. Beg – 5 min, Open – 6 min	Cross X Beg – 2 min, Open – 3 min	2nd Opp. Beg – 5 min, Open – 6 min	Cross X Beg – 2 min, Open – 3 min	Break 5 min	Opposition Reply Speech 1 st Opposition 4 min	Proposition Reply Speech 1 st Proposition 4 min
Introduction	1 st Prop. Cross examined by 2 nd Opp.	Introduction	1 st Opp. Cross examined by 1 st Prop.	Introduction	2 nd Prop. Cross examined by 1 st Opp.	Introduction	2 nd Opp. Cross examined by 2 nd Prop.	Debaters use this time to work on reply speeches		Both reply speeches summarize their position and point out the basic flaws of the opposition. No new arguments can be introduced. Explain why your team should win and the other team should lose. Remind the judges of your arguments. Tell the judges why they should believe your arguments even after the other team's attack. Explain why the judges should not listen to the other team. Review critical evidence.
Definitions		If necessary, attack definitions		Show unity with Caseline		Show unity with Caseline				
Theme/ Caseline		Theme/ Caseline		Clash with Opposition arguments		Clash with Proposition arguments				
Model (if needed)		Clash with Proposition arguments								
Arguments in support of resolution		If necessary-counter model, otherwise arguments against Proposition		Additional arguments to support resolution		Further arguments against resolution				

The Task of the Proposition Team

- The Proposition will argue **for the resolution**
- Members of the Proposition team will provide contentions and arguments and evidence in support of the resolution
- If the Proposition Team's Position is, on balance, more credible than the Opposition, then the Proposition wins the debate

The Task of the Opposition Team

- The task of the Opposition is to argue **against the resolution**
- Members of the Opposition team will provide contentions and arguments and evidence in opposition to the Proposition and in support of the Opposition position
- If, on balance, the Opposition Team's Position is more credible than the Proposition, then the Opposition team wins the debate.

1st PROPOSITION SPEECH

The first speech should contain the following specific elements:

1. Introduction
2. Definitions
3. Model (if used)
4. Theme/Case line
5. Proposition Arguments
6. Conclusion

In the first proposition speech over eighty - five percent of the speech should be reserved for the constructive matter. The first proposition usually develops two constructive points in their speech giving each point equal time. For example in a six minute speech:

- The first minute would contain the introduction and definitions
- The next two minutes would present the first constructive argument
- The following two minutes would present the second constructive argument
- Last minute would summarize and conclude the arguments.

Introductions

Introductions can be as simple as “Mr. Speaker” and as complex as greeting all the members of the room, or just as effective is to grab the judge’s attention by starting the debate with some witty and pertinent information.

Definition and Model

Cross X does not allow squirreling of the motion (that is taking the debate out of the context in which it is supposed to be debated in). The test for definitions is “would an average person walking in off the street see the motion and agree with your definitions”. In addition to definitions it is important to, when necessary, propose a model. A model is an extension of the definitions that aims to add increased clarity to the motion. The model answers the four W’s of the debate. Who, What, When, Where. A good model creates more context and makes the debate cleaner by removing much of the debate from the implementing of a policy to the actual policy itself. The model must be fully explained in the first speech. An example of a model for the resolution This House would impose a carbon tax would be:

1. The government of Canada impose a \$40 dollar tax on each ton of carbon that companies produce
2. The money collected will be directed back in the form of subsidies and grants to companies that are investing in green energy and technology
3. The tax will increase at a rate of five dollars each year
4. The tax will come into affect in the year 2010

Case Split and Case Line

The case split can encompass a few different ideas. A case split is simply how the arguments are divided between the two speakers. The first, and most basic case split is just to inform the judges when each of the individual three to four arguments are going to be presented. The second, and preferred manner of presenting a split is to develop two themes. The first speech deals with the first theme, in which two separate arguments would be presented. The second speech deals with the second speech where the last of the arguments would be put forward. For example, in the resolution “This House would legalize all drugs” the case split could be presented as follows:

“The two themes we are going to be talking about in this debate are: 1st Drugs in Society and 2nd the Developing World. The first theme will be exemplified explained in my speech, while the second theme in my partners. Under the theme of the developed world we have two arguments: Freedom of Choice and Harm Reduction.”

A Case line is the central point idea that your case is going to prove. In essence it is your thesis statement.

1st OPPOSITION SPEECH

The first opposition contains the following elements:

1. Introduction
2. Counter Model (if necessary)
3. Outline “the split”
4. If necessary, attack definitions
5. Opposition team’s theme / caseline
6. Clash with Proposition arguments
7. Explain arguments for opposing resolution
8. Conclusion

It is usually the role of the first Opposition speaker to oppose the Proposition philosophy and, in turn, the resolution. In particular, the First Opposition attacks the points made by the First Proposition. The internal timing for the 1st Opposition Constructive Speech, is seventy five percent of the speech should be reserved for the constructive matter. The first proposition usually develops two constructive points in their speech, giving each equal time. For example in a six minute speech:

- The first minute and 30 seconds would be used for refutation and rebuilding
- The next two minutes would be used for the first constructive argument
- The next two minutes would be used for the second constructive argument
- Last thirty seconds would be used for a short summary and conclusion

Present Counter Models

A counter model is when the opposition team agrees with the goal of the resolution but believes that the goal can be reached or met in a more effective way. The negative team’s job is to fully outline this model in the first speech. In the resolution concerning a carbon tax, the opposition could present a counter model and propose the use of a cap and trade system for carbon emission. This would be fully acceptable.

2nd PROPOSITION SPEECH

The second proposition has fewer, yet equally, as important roles. At the end of this speech the proposition constructive case is over and no new constructive arguments/contentions may be introduced. It is customary for the 2nd proposition to only introduce a single new argument into the debate.

1. Introduction
2. Clash with points made by Opposition
3. Outline team's case approach
4. Further Proposition Arguments
5. Conclusion

The Second Proposition speech is the first opportunity the Proposition Team has to directly clash with the arguments of the Opposition's case. It is also the Proposition's last chance to present new contentions that support the resolution and their proposal. The internal timing for the six (6) minute Second Proposition Constructive Speech is three (3) minutes for construction and three (3) for refutation. For example in a six minute speech:

- The first thirty seconds would be used for the introduction
- The next two minutes for refutation of the opposition and rebuilding
- The next two minutes for construction of a single new argument
- The final thirty seconds for the conclusion

2nd OPPOSITION SPEECH

The second opposition's speech is the last constructive speech of the debate. Cross X Style is designed so that as you progress through the debate there is less and less constructive matter presented. During the last opposition constructive speech the elements are the same as the second proposition.

1. Introduction
2. Continue attack on Proposition
3. Outline team's case approach
4. Further arguments against resolution
5. Conclusion

This final constructive speech of the debate gives the Second Opposition speaker an opportunity not only to criticize the Proposition plan, but also to present the final contentions that complete the Opposition case. The usual split between for the Second Opposition speech is four (4) minutes for refutation and two (2) minutes for construction. It is good practice in a debate to only introduce a single argument in the second speech. For example in a six minute speech:

- The first thirty seconds is used for an introduction
- The next three minutes would be used for refutation
- The next two minutes would be used for the last constructive point
- The final thirty seconds to conclude the opposition side of the debate

THE REPLY SPEECHES

After the constructive speeches are concluded, both the proposition and the opposition teams get a final reply speech. The reply speech is the final place where each team presents their case of the judges. However, distinct from the constructive speeches the reply does not contain any new constructive arguments. Reply speeches are given by the first speaker on each team. Reply speeches occur in reverse order – the opposition replies before the proposition. The opposition team therefore has two consecutive speeches: the second opposition speech, followed by the opposition reply speech.

Reply speeches are not ‘more of the same’ – they are not merely a continuation of the second speeches. The aim of reply speeches are to give each team the opportunity to consolidate their ideas and review the debate, in order to present the debate in the most favourable light for each side.

The reply speeches should be different from the other four speeches in the debate. By the time the reply speeches are delivered, the debate is essentially concluded. The goal of the reply speech therefore, is not so much to win the *argument* as it is to step back and explain how your team won the *debate*. You can emphasize the reasons that your team won, and you can constructively criticize your opponents’ approach, explaining why they lost.

The simplest approach is to spend approximately half of your reply speech discussing your opposition’s case, and approximately half discussing your own. Of course, this does not mean giving an even-handed appraisal of the cases – naturally, you will analytically criticize your opposition’s case as you summarize it, and emphasize the strengths of your own case. Ideally, when you summarize your case, you will show how it answered the questions or problems posed by your opponents.

Instead of looking at the specific arguments that have been presented by both sides a reply speech looks at the overall themes within the debate. Offering analysis as to why each of the themes falls on your respective side of the debate.

Look for *specific* reasons that your opposition may have lost the debate. For example, your opposition may have established criteria that it has failed to meet, or promised to support a model that has not been mentioned since the first speaker. Similarly, your opposition may have forgotten to rebut one of your arguments – you should keep track of this, because it can be a significant point in your favour.

Cross Examination

In cross-examination, one debater, like the attorney, asks all the questions. This person is called the *examiner*. The other debater (the one who has just finished delivering a constructive speech) must answer all the examiner's questions and is known as the *witness*.

The cross-examination periods are interspersed among the constructive speeches and are designed, first, to gain valuable admissions which identify strengths in the examiner's case and/or weaknesses in his opponents' case and, second, to clarify points made during previous constructive speeches. The cross-examinations are not intended to be the high tension, emotionally-wrought spectacles portrayed in the movies and television but, rather they should be more in the tradition of a properly run court of law.

The examiner carries on a polite dialogue that is designed to draw out admissions through the use of lines of questioning and cunning. The examiner should not use tactics such as browbeating, intimidation, belittlement, or speech-making. The witness must respond to all relevant questions posed by the examiner. The examiner must allow the witness sufficient time to adequately qualify a response, but the examiner does control the time in the cross-examination period.

He may interrupt the witness if the witness is being verbose, evasive, or if the witness has had sufficient time to answer. The questioner may not demand a simple "yes" or "no" answer, as the respondent always has the right to explain a response. You should expect the teams to make use of the admission that they obtain in future constructive or rebuttal speeches.

After delivering a constructive speech, each debater is cross-examined by one opponent. You are always cross-examined by the member of the opposite team who is NOT speaking next. Cross-examination is a skill that is often practiced separately from speech-making. Although it is an integral part of cross-examination style debating, it requires special knowledge and strategy.

In cross-examination, one debater, like the attorney, asks all the questions. This person is called the *examiner*. The other debater (the one who has just finished delivering a constructive speech) must answer all the examiner's questions and is known as the *witness*.