

---

## Role of Teams

**Affirmative** – build something up, provide something solid to be examined or assessed.

**Negative** – focus on attacking what the Aff has built up – directly attack, and tailor substantive material to attack their case.

## Roles of Speakers

*Affects individual speaker marks and teamwork marks*

### First Affirmative

#### Requirements:

- definition
- set up
- team split
- substantive material

#### Focus / Main Aim

- set up the **parameters of the debate** – clarify and explain the issues;
- laying the groundwork of the debate – awareness that a good set up by itself doesn't win a debate, but a poor/unclear set-up puts you back a step.

#### Substantive Material

- clearly lay out material – make sure all the links are there; show how they relate to the issues identified in your set-up.

### First Negative

#### Requirements

- brief discussion/acknowledgement of Aff's definition – tidy up if necessary, ie missing words/concepts not defined; criteria, onus

#### Rebuttal

- set up/ identify the fundamental problem with the Aff case – **clash**
- explain how your team is fundamentally going to challenge it
- try not to focus on individual points but on the **big ideas** the Aff is bringing up

#### Substantive Material

- tailoring to attack other team's case ie make it relevant to the context/parameters of this specific debate
- "pointy" rebuttal at this point, if appropriate – tagging where the cases meet

### Second Affirmative

#### Rebuttal

- respond to the Neg's response to your case

- 
- how is the Aff team going to deal with the Neg's approach? Eg does their line actually attack you directly, is it insignificant, does it miss the crucial point of your case?
  - BIG rebuttal – identify the issues for the debate and/or Neg's case – include tagged reference to individual points that have been made BUT attack issues

#### Substantive Material

- Must Move onto it
- Kick arse – contribute something concrete to the case
  - Solid examples
  - Clear, well explained reasoning
  - Work within the parameters/set-up of your first Aff

### **Second Negative**

#### Rebuttal

- More specific rebuttal than 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff
- Same approach as 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff – identify the big issues, tag the Aff points that come within these issues and then attack the issue

#### Substantive Material

- Develop Neg case – remember emphasis on destruction/tailoring of material to attacking Aff's case within parameters of debate
- Try to maintain consistency of approach, ie listen to approach of your 1<sup>st</sup> Neg

### **Third Affirmative**

#### Rebuttal

- One eyed parochialism
- Focus on the clash – identify it and identify the Neg approach to the clash ie how did they make a clash with your case?
- Focus on destroying the Neg's approach to your case and
- Rebuilding and clarifying what your team said – showing that the Aff has proven stuff, established things
- Rebuttal should be consistent with team approach ie 1<sup>st</sup> Aff set-up – keep tying it back in

### **Third Negative**

#### Rebuttal

- Essentially the same as 3<sup>rd</sup> Aff
- Emphasise what your approach to the Aff case was and how it was effective

[The NZ Schools' Debating Council thanks the Coaches of the Canterbury Speaking Union Team 2000 for making this document available.]