Debating Handbook: BACK TO BASICS!
The Speakers

There is a precise order of speakers: Affirmative 1, Negative 1, Aff. 2, Neg. 2, Aff. 3, Neg. 3, Neg. 1 (Final Reply) Aff. 1 (Final Reply).

Each speaker has a different function, and although there will be a difference of opinion by some on the nature of this function, the following system is generally accepted:

Affirmative 1
He must define the motion. He must be precise in the interpretation of the words within the motion, and make it abundantly clear what the Affirmative team is arguing.

This speaker then introduces his team and mentions the different standpoints they will adopt – without, however, giving away their arguments too early.

Finally, he states the main argument for the Affirmative side, plus (possibly) one or two subsidiary arguments.

...therefore, we of the affirmative team are going to prove to you that the world is flat!

Negative 1
He now accepts, challenges or refines the definition. This can be a tense moment in a debate since there is nothing worse than one side arguing against a case which the other side has not proposed, or (even more frustrating) arguing a parallel motion because of the way a motion has been interpreted.

Take, for example, the motion that ‘NZ Police should be Armed’. The Affirmative team may have proceeded on the humorous and literal basis that NZ Police need ‘arms, as well as legs’, and the Negative team take the expression in its popular and correct sense that the Police should have ‘firearms’. This type of motion, if taken literally, or circumnavigated by an obscure interpretation, may be funny to start with, but eventually spoils the debate and Adjudicators will penalise the offending side.

The Negative side MUST TAKE ON THE MOTION AS PROPOSED BY THE AFFIRMATIVE unless it is obviously ridiculous. If it is ridiculous, then the Negative team must show why it is ridiculous.

Next, as with Affirmative No 1 speaker, he introduces his team and outlines their attack – again, without revealing too much.

Having successfully completed the above, the speaker now rebuts the Affirmative team’s main argument as briefly as possible, while introducing the main thread of his own team’s objections.

Though members of the Negative team may put up an alternative argument, they must remember they are a negative team and simply have to refute the other side’s main thread.
Affirmative 2

He immediately reminds the floor of the main proposal as put forward by his team's first speaker.

The rest of his time should be a mixture of direct rebuttal of the Affirmative team's proposals, and putting his own team's arguments.

A skilful debater mixes the two elements. He does not stop negating the other side with a flourish, put down one set of notes, and pick up his own preconstructed arguments. Rather, his standard line should be something like this: "... They have claimed such-and-such, but, on the other hand, we put it to you that... ."

It helps if this speaker adds at least two or three novel elements to his side's argument.

Negative 2

His role is very much the same as Affirmative No 2's. But he must remember that he now has two speakers to rebut, and will need to concentrate more on this element than on the construction of new arguments.

Affirmative 3

This speaker is one who should have been busy during the preceding part of the debate making critical notes on what the Opposition has said.

At the outset, he need introduce only one or two new elements to the argument, (simply to keep the other side on its toes). His main task is to persuade the audience that the Opposition has not really said anything worthwhile.

Nevertheless, it is important, that, as a speaker of the Affirmative side, he ends on a positive note supporting the motion.

Negative 3

His role is virtually the same as the previous speaker's, but he ends his speech on a negative note.

Now the No 1 speakers for both teams make their final addresses. The speech (for either side) is sometimes called The Summary, sometimes The Final Reply.

Negative 4

In his speech (with only half the normal speaking time), the No 1 speaker must not introduce any new material.

He simply states his side's objections to the motion and summarises his team's main arguments.

The speech should conclude with a final and strong denial of the motion.

Affirmative 4

Again, the No 1 speaker rises to conclude his team's argument. He should carefully mix his rebuttal of the other side's arguments with a summary of why the motion is sound. He concludes with a positive flourish for the motion.

Questions

Sometimes, while the Adjudicators adjudicate, the audience can direct questions at particular team members or at the whole team via the Chairman. This element does not affect the marksheet.
commencement of the preparation period. Each team numbers the subjects from one to three, where one is their preferred subject and three is the subject they would least like to debate. When both teams have finished numbering their subjects, both the number threes are dropped. If there is then just one subject left, this will be the subject debated. If there are two left, a coin is tossed to determine which subject is debated.

There are many tactics that can be employed in trying to manipulate this selection process. We suggest that they are fraught with difficulties. If a team simply ranks the subjects based on its genuine preferences, then it is guaranteed not to get its third choice and has at least an even chance to get its first choice. When teams try to second-guess the other team, as often as not they end up with their third choice, which can be some bizarre phrase which the adjudicator saw on the way to the debate (for instance ‘That we should just do it’) and is not intended to be a real subject.

A Model for Preparation

Our suggested model for preparation involves 14 stages:

1. **Brainstorming**: Before any discussion whatsoever, each speaker should write down the first ideas that occur to him or her upon hearing the subject. This should include possible issues, interpretations, areas of substantive material, jokes and examples. It must be stressed that this brainstorming process must occur before any discussion at all, because otherwise some channelling of thought processes will occur from the discussion which might prevent good ideas being raised.

2. **Form**: The first thing to consider is the ‘form’ of the subject; that is, the type of phrase. For instance it could be a paradox, a slogan or a quote. It is important to identify what sort of phrase it is, if possible, so that one can understand how it is meant to be read. For instance, in the subject ‘That Australia is the Lucky Country’, if you were aware of the quote’s original context you might decide that the subject should be defined ironically.

3. **Focus**: The main issue of the subject should be considered. For instance, ‘That we should do our own thing’ could be defined in a number of ways, but one might decide that the overall focus should be on conformity.

   Sometimes a subject will not present one obvious issue. There will be either no obvious issue (e.g. ‘That we should use the Yellow Pages’) or more than one (e.g. ‘That we should keep off the grass’, which could refer to conformity or to the merits of marijuana usage). In both cases it is necessary to choose one (and only one) issue from which to produce a definition (see Chapter 4 on isolating the issue).

4. **Reasonable person’s interpretation**: Consider what the hypothetical ‘reasonable person’ might think that the subject means. This, of course, is an age-old adage of limited practical value. Most importantly, you should remember that taking an obscure or wilfully obtuse definition is likely to lead to a definition debate, in which you may well attract the ire of the audience for trying to be too clever for your own good.

   In finding the reasonable person’s interpretation, it is often useful to look at the way in which the phrase or words are used in various contexts — such as common speech, popular phrases, or the media.

5. **Alternative meanings**: Consider other possible definitions and interpretations. On the affirmative side, one ‘reasonable’ definition should be chosen. On the negative, while a team should focus on one interpretation, a range of possible definitions should remain on the agenda. The negative would generally be unwise to reject a definition
which is essentially on the same issue that it has prepared, but merely differs on the specifics. The reason for this is that the negative will generally gain favour with the adjudicator for seeming to be dynamic and flexible. For instance, when one side defines ‘we’ as Australia and the other side wants to talk about the world, it is simply not worth creating a real definitional conflict. It is very important that a team eventually settles on one interpretation only by the time the first speaker speaks.

6. **Burden of proof**: The burden of affirming the subject always lies with the affirmative team, funnily enough. The negative side, however, does not have to prove the negative of the subject, merely negate it. For instance, in the subject ‘That greed is good’, technically the negative side only has to show that greed is not good; it does not have to prove that greed is bad. In practice this distinction will often prove to be illusory, and the negative side will have little to gain by relying upon its technical right.

7. **Degree**: Criteria for proof should be established during preparation. (what is referred to as a ‘yardstick’; see Chapter 4).

8. **Scope**: In most subjects it is desirable to define the scope of the subject. The most important aspects are time and place. For instance, the subject ‘That federalism is the answer’ could be defined in two distinct time settings: (i) to mean that federalism is the answer to many of today’s international problems; or (ii) to mean that *generally* federalism is beneficial. Approach (i) defines the subject in the present; (ii) defines it universally.

   It is also desirable to consider the geographical bounds of the subject. For instance one might decide to limit the subject ‘That we should spend more on the arts’ to the ‘developed’ nations, as it might be rather difficult to show that underdeveloped nations should be spending more money on the arts when they are having difficulty feeding themselves.

9. **Specific definition**: By this stage of preparation the general definition should be fairly clear, but it is important that the whole team clearly understands the specific wording of the definition and the justification that will be given.

10. **Review of arguments and examples**: Go through the substantive material and examples in some detail. Make sure that all speakers have a consistent understanding of the case and the material to be presented. For many subjects, one useful way to try to come up with further material is to run your mind through the various government ministries.

11. **Case line**: While the case should be clear by this stage, it is important to write a case line — a short encapsulation of the main argument being put by the team; that is, a statement of the reason why the subject is being affirmed or negated. For instance, in the subject ‘That Australia should become a republic’, the affirmative case line could be ‘... because Australia is an independent nation in everything but the law’ (this may not be the best case available, but it has been argued in the past). Every speaker on each team should state their team’s case line at least once, word for word, as a catchcry.

12. **Possible counter-arguments**: It is worth very briefly considering how the other side might respond to your team’s argument, and also any proactive arguments (that is, arguments which are not directly responsive to the other side, but are independently devised) that they might develop. This should not be taken too far. Speakers should not try to pre-empt the other side’s
arguments or rebuttal to the extent that their case is purely defensive.

13. Allocation of material: The team's material should be allocated between the first two speakers in such a way as to give each a sufficient amount to say, and to provide for case development. An allocation is not just a technical requirement that should be complied with by an arbitrary split. Some allocations are used simply out of habit, such as 'Australia/The World' or 'Social/Political'. Such splits should generally be avoided as they rarely fit the subject well, and they are trite and hackneyed. Two other common allocations to avoid, as they will lead to a hung case (see Chapter 5) are: 'Practical/Theoretical' and 'What is the case/Why that is good (or bad)'.

A good allocation is not always easy to come by, but should add something to the structure of the team's case. Try to find the natural division within the subject area. For instance, take the subject 'That our media is free'. A good allocation for the negative side would be for the first speaker to deal with direct controls and regulation, and for the second to look at indirect influences which limit freedom. This allocation provides for a separation between the two major, areas of substantive material.

It is usually a good idea, as noted earlier, to avoid allocating individuals material with which they are more than casually acquainted, because they may assume too much knowledge on the part of the audience or, worse, bring in irrelevant material as they become involved in their own lecture.

14. Case evaluation: In the final stage of the preparation each speaker should give a short summary of his or her speech. The team members should try to stay awake during this stage to make sure that there are no inconsis-
tencies or aspects that need clarification or further development. Fourth speakers (where they exist) are particularly useful in this respect.

---

Preparations Short and Long

So-called 'impromptu' debates can allow from 15 minutes to one hour preparation. It is crucial that this short time be used effectively, to allow a well-organised preparation. Very often, teams spend too much time arguing about what the subject should mean and fail to leave themselves enough time to develop a strong case. There is simply no time for lengthy discussions or arguments. The team captain (or person chosen to 'lead' the preparation) should run the preparation session fairly and rapidly. He or she should allow each team member to briefly state their point of view, and then try to find some consensus if there is disagreement (sometimes this consensus will need to be coerced).

While it will no doubt be contrary to the practice of many teams, we suggest that 'long' preparations be treated in much the same manner as 'short' preparations. If two weeks have been allocated to you to prepare a subject, then set aside an hour or two and prepare. Otherwise the preparation will drag on for two weeks, taking up too much time and probably not producing a better result.

Sometimes, of course, subjects are deliberately set as 'long' preparations to encourage teams to do some research. Where a subject requires specific knowledge (which should be fairly rare if all the team members have good general knowledge), then it might be worth doing some light research to gain an understanding of the subject area. Very seldom will it be necessary to do any in-depth research, as quoting academic papers and so forth is normally not viewed favourably by adjudicators.

Any preparation must be a dynamic and responsive process. Teams should not follow guidelines for preparation
mechanically, but should adapt them as necessary to take into account such things as the specific subject, the experience of the team and the time allowed for preparation. As teams become more experienced, they will be able to spend more time looking at tactical considerations and less time on going through substantive material in detail.

It is very easy for one person to dominate the preparation. However, even if this person has a lot of useful things to say, it is still a waste of resources not to adequately utilise the other people available (this means, for instance, that the team should always run through everybody's brainstorming efforts).

**General Knowledge**

A good general knowledge of current affairs is essential for every debater. In a short preparation research is obviously impossible, and even in a long preparation research should not be relied upon unless absolutely necessary.

Developing a sound understanding of current affairs is not simply a matter of studying or of taking notes during the television news service. The only way that one can effectively increase one's understanding of the world is to develop a genuine interest in what is going on.

The best way to start is by making an effort to read a broadsheet (that is, not a tabloid) newspaper as often as possible. (Generally, quoting from tabloid newspapers is unlikely to win favour with an audience or adjudicator.) One should read the newspaper virtually from cover to cover, paying particular attention to the editorials, the opinion page and the international news.

Some magazines and journals are also an excellent source of current affairs information. For international news and balanced opinion the best in-depth analysis is provided by the *Economist* (a weekly). Another good source of international news is the *Guardian Weekly*, which contains articles from the *Guardian* (UK), the *Washington Post* (US) and *Le Monde* (France). Both the *Bulletin* and *Time* provide quite good coverage of Australian and international events, and are worth looking at.
Matter is often considered the most important aspect of debating. You can liken it to the ingredients of a recipe – if one of them is missing then the final product can be unpalatable. The five components of matter are:

- the definition
- the case
- the arguments
- the rebuttal
- the summary

The definition

Defining what you understand the topic to mean is essential in any debate. Both sides are required to define the topic and may need to justify their own interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES FOR THE DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>we:</strong> Does it mean the world? humankind? Australians? our state? the people in the room?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>must/should:</strong> <em>Must</em> implies a greater degree of proof than <em>should</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>want/need:</strong> Although often mistakenly interchanged, these words can have very different meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>better than:</strong> Requires you to make a comparison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>too:</strong> Requires a discussion about the degree to which something is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUIDELINES FOR THE DEFINITION (CONTINUED)

- A topic will be presented in the past, present or future tense. If, say, the future tense is used, you will need to think carefully about your choice of material, e.g.: 'That the Internet will be a failure' may require you to look into the future more and not find examples from the past.
- If your definition is nearly similar to your opponents' definition, and you feel you can still argue the topic, just accept it.
- If the other team's definition fails to cover a key word, remove any doubt by clarifying the uncertainty to the audience.
- Use the 'reasonable person' justification. What would the average reasonable person understand by this topic? It can also be described as the commonsense way of defining a topic.
- Some topics are metaphorical, not literal. If this is so, the topic needs to be defined in a metaphorical way. For example: The Asian tiger has lost its bite. The Asian tiger would be representative of Asian nations, while losing its bite would refer to their influence over world affairs.

The case

This is also known as the team line or the key theme. It is basically a short statement that states the main reason why the topic is true.

GUIDELINES FOR THE CASE

- The ideal is to have a theme of no more than a couple of sentences. These would state 'why' the topic is true and also 'how' this is so.
- A theme should be able to be repeated without appearing repetitive to the audience.
- The theme is argued completely by each speaker. One speaker does not cover only one side of the case and leave the other side to the other speakers.

The argument

It is essential that you prove your team line. Proof means providing an explanation which justifies your point of view.

GUIDELINES FOR THE ARGUMENT

A recommended structure for proving a point includes:
- stating the point
- giving the arguments for why it is true or untrue
- using examples or illustrations
- summing up your point and relating it back to your team case

Examples are effective when they give concrete proof of the point. They should be real and up-to-date.
GUIDELINES FOR THE ARGUMENT (CONTINUED)

- Current affairs and historical events are good sources.
- Historical examples are another good source.
- Material from reference texts, magazine articles and statistics can all strengthen your case by offering convincing viewpoints.
- Hypotheticals are not a good source.
- Very particular or local examples will probably lack relevance.
- Use comparisons to prove individual points, eg if you wish to prove that Australia is a country of sports-loving people, compare it with another country that the audience would know.

The rebuttal

Rebuttal is how you criticise the case and arguments of your opposition and it must be done (to varying degrees) by every speaker other than first affirmative.

GUIDELINES FOR REBUTTAL

Do not merely assert that your opposition is wrong.
- Attack their case.
- Attack their arguments.
- Explain and give examples of why they are wrong.

The summary

Every speaker in a debate should have a summary and then a brief conclusion.

GUIDELINES FOR THE SUMMARY

- Attempt to do more than merely repeat your illustrations and arguments, and conclude with a repetition of your topic. The summary does more that list arguments; it shows how they fit together to prove the topic.
- The summary clarifies the arguments you have presented in the order they were proven.
- Begin with the theme, then show how your speech adds to the overall team case. Finally, show how your arguments mesh together to prove the team case.
- A summary ends with a strong conclusion. Devices such as quotes, sayings or triplets could all be used.
- When the first and second speakers hear the bell, they should conclude the point they are making and begin their summary.
- Third speakers should aim to begin their summary shortly before the first bell.
Linking together the components of your speech gives a stronger sense of unity and makes it easier for the audience to follow from one point to the next. This is done with what we call connectives.

**Connectives in debating**

An important way to tie ideas together is the device of **connectives**. These bind your speech together. Without these, it becomes disjointed and hard to follow and has less impact on your audience. The first type of connective is called a **transition**.

Transitions serve as a link between two ideas. They enable the audience to go from one point to the next and to understand how these points are related. Examples of transitions are:

- more importantly
- therefore
- likewise

- in addition to
- consequently
- however

- on the other hand
- to contrast our argument
- of further concern is

The second type of connective is called a **signpost**. One quite specific way in which a speaker can improve their manner stems from how they signpost the various parts of their speech. Signposts show your audience that you are in control of the situation and that you know where you are heading. The opposite to this is the speaker who rambles without any semblance of structure to the **Pause, vocal variety and a change of stance are other ways you can signpost your speech.**
presentation. Signposts can be placed at the start of a new point. In this way they allow the audience to understand how this part of the speech is organised. For example: 'I want to start by examining the issue of ...' Placed at the end of a main point they re-focus the audience on what was covered previously. For example: 'I'm sure you'll agree that the subject can be summed up this way ...'

**What to signpost in debating**

- definitions
- themes
- outlines/arguments
- summaries
- rebuttal
- linking of points

**Signpost examples**

| Definition phrases | Let's tackle the definition ...  
| One of the first areas is that of the definition ...  
| The negative team defines the topic as ...  
| A reasonable definition of this topic ... |
| Theme phrases | My team's theme can be clearly stated as ...  
| The basic theme that the Negative wish to present ...  
| It is the framework around which our theme ... |
| Outline/argument phrases | Our arguments to support this case can be divided into two key areas ...  
| I now want to turn to the second of my key arguments ...  
| Allow me to illustrate ...  
| Certainly the most effective example of this situation is ...  
| I would like to look at two issues, firstly ...  
| So to my first point ... |
| Summary phrases | So in summary it is obvious that ...  
| In summary to look at our case ...  
| In summary, we argued very succinctly ...  
| In summary, we showed that it was unreasonable to discuss ...  
| In summary, tonight I have talked to you ...  
| In summary, let's take a step back from the issue and ... |
## Signpost examples (continued)

| Rebuttal phrases | I have three major problems with the opposition's case ...  
|                 | Let's consider what the opposition have offered us tonight ...  
|                 | The Affirmative have failed to convince me of the merits of their argument ...  
|                 | The opposition would have you believe ...  
|                 | The point ... simply doesn't hold up when examined in any depth.  
|                 | When we look at the argument as a whole ...  
|                 | Another major problem ...  
|                 | Secondly the ongoing relationship between the first speaker's ...  
|                 | What we have from our opposition is a particularly ...  

| Linking of points phrases | Let's consider the situation ...There have been three main issues we have looked at ... 
|                          | Finally we must address ... 
|                          | Finally I would like to look at ... 
|                          | They even went on to further claim ... 
|                          | This brings me to another issue that has come out of tonight's debate ... 
|                          | The final issue I will touch on ...  

---

**Remember that an audience has only one opportunity to hear your presentation.** If you are able to link it together clearly, they will be more inclined to follow its logical progression. Make a collection of signposts to guide your listeners down the path of understanding, and use them to link the ideas in your speech.
In all forms of speaking, how you say something is at least as important as what you say. Well-prepared content can often be ineffective if the manner of delivery does not reinforce it. The two main areas to consider are your visual and vocal mannerisms.

Visual mannerisms

Stance
As a speaker, you will have a particular way in which you stand. As long as this is natural, use it. Ask others to provide you with some feedback about your stance. There may be distracting mannerisms such as rocking on your feet or touching your face that you are unaware of. The 'speaker neutral' stance is one where you stand with feet shoulder-width apart and hands relaxed by your side. From this position you are best able to use gestures.

Eye contact
Without doubt, the part of body language that contributes most to a debater's credibility is eye contact. Eye contact means what it says – making contact. That means looking at someone in the audience long enough to meet their eyes, so that for those few seconds you are talking just to that person. Try to look at your audience whenever you are speaking, even if it means a slower delivery. Look down at your notes or palm cards; read them, then look up and speak.

Gestures
Gestures should add to a speaker's presentation. Your hands and face convey many of the unspoken messages that you wish to make. For example, size can
be shown by use of your extended arms, numbers by use of fingers, body movement by change in posture. An open hand gesture (where your palms face the audience) is a sign of warmth, honesty and trustworthiness.

*Use of palm cards*

These should be small enough to fit in the palm of the hand. Avoid writing out your entire speech on the cards and then reading it. An audience does not want to be read to, rather they want to be persuaded by your whole manner. Write out sufficient material to prompt you in what you want to say. Maintaining eye contact is more important than remembering every word. As you become more experienced you will require less notes. One way to improve in this area is to practise impromptu speaking. Techniques for mastering this skill are found in chapter 14.

*Vocal mannerisms*

*Volume*

The volume must always be loud enough to be heard by every member of the audience. A speaker should try to use as wide a range as possible – without speaking too softly or shouting. A louder voice might suit when a point needs to be emphasised. A softer one would be more useful for providing contrast.

*Pace*

Ensure that the pace fits the meaning of what is being said at the time. Variation in pace is similar to volume in that a wider range will enhance your manner.

*Tone*

The tone of voice used has considerable effect on the audience. Aim for variety to gain impact. Practise various tones of voice (such as impassioned, humorous, conversational and questioning) and try to use a full range as part of your delivery skills.

*Pauses*

One of the most effective ways to use the voice is when it is not used at all. Pauses allow the audience to ‘catch up’ or prepares them for important material to come. The more important the point the longer should be the pause that follows it.
Articulation

How clearly the words of a speech are said determines how well your speech is understood and accepted. Poor articulation is often a result of speaking too quickly.

The use of humour

A touch of humour can enhance any spoken presentation. However, a debater is not a stand-up comedian and should not aim for raucous loud laughter so much as a smile or chuckle. Some general guidelines to follow:

- Keep it relevant – to the subject and audience. The best lines to use are those which relate closely to the topic of the debate.
- Most speakers will have more success by reworking existing funny lines than by trying to write completely original ones.
- Humour works best when placed in the opening or body of a speech. If used in the conclusion it can distract the audience from the main issues of the debate (unless, of course, the purpose of the debate is purely humorous).
- Always be clear why humour is being used. Its greatest uses are to gain the audience’s attention, to keep their interest and to make the speech more memorable.
- Delivery skills add a great deal to the success of humour. The use of pause, vocal tone and facial expression deserve attention.

Leaving a lasting impression

Often you can prepare apt, innovative or witty openings and conclusions to your speech. Try to leave your audience with a lasting impression. Some ways of doing this are:

- Look to include references to the topic and current events.
- Include images and metaphors.
- Adapt a funny line you have heard into the context of the debate.
- Use contrast to highlight the differences between the two cases of the teams.

Have someone from your team provide feedback of your vocal and visual mannerisms. Think of trying to prepare some phrases, images or metaphors that you might be able to use. Don’t read your notes or palm cards. The manner that will work best for you is the one with which you feel most comfortable.
20 Method in debating

Although method is only allocated 20 per cent of the marks, it is often the decisive factor in a debate. It covers the way in which a speaker organises the presentation of material and the way in which a team structures its complete argument.

Method is concerned with:
• the specific tasks each speaker should do
• the order in which these tasks should be done
• the amount of time to be spent on these tasks

The tasks of the speakers

First affirmative

Introduction
• Explain clearly what your team case will be.

Definition
• Explain how your team defines the topic.
• Give precise meanings of key words or phrases.

Theme
• Explain what theme your team has.

Team outline
• Explain what proof your team will provide.
• Outline what you and your second speaker will talk about.

Individual speech/arguments
• Provide examples which support your team’s theme and case.

Summary
• Provide a summary of your arguments.
Speaking and debating with style

- Link in how they prove your team’s case.
- Final concluding comments.

First negative

Definition
- Make a statement in which you:
  - agree with the definition of the affirmative
  - challenge the affirmative definition if you disagree with it
  - accept the affirmative definition with some minor variation (which you justify)

Argument
- Argue against and rebut the opposition’s theme and key points.
- Provide counter argument.

Theme
- Explain what theme your team has.

Team outline
- Explain what proof your team will provide.
- Outline what you and your second speaker will talk about.

Individual speech/arguments
- Provide examples which support your team’s theme and case.

Summary
- Provide a summary of your arguments.
- Link in how they prove your team’s case.

Second affirmative
- If the first negative has rejected the affirmative’s definition you need to argue that your definition is more acceptable.
- Attack and provide rebuttal of the negative theme.
- Attack and provide rebuttal of the negative proof.
- Provide the remainder of the affirmative’s supporting proof.
- End with a summary of the arguments provided.

Second negative
- Attack and provide rebuttal of the affirmative theme.
- Attack and provide rebuttal of the affirmative proof.
- Provide the remainder of the negative team’s supporting proof.
- End with a summary of the arguments provided.
Third affirmative

- Make clear what issues the two cases have presented.
- Explain why the negative’s key arguments are unacceptable.
- Explain how and why your own case, theme and supporting arguments are better.
- You should not introduce new matter.
- End with a summary of the affirmative’s case.

Third negative

- Make clear what issues the two cases have presented.
- Explain why the affirmative’s key arguments are unacceptable.
- Explain how and why your own case, theme and supporting arguments are better.
- You should not introduce new matter.
- End with a summary of the negative’s case.

Timing

Being able to time your speech accurately is vital for good method. This applies in two ways: to the actual intended length of the speech and to its internal structure. Going overtime or being too short is a weakness of method and incurs a penalty. The usual rule of thumb is that 30 seconds either way is allowable.

Often the matter mark is also affected by time as a brief speech may not contain sufficient material to support your theme. Similarly, a lengthy speech may be rambling and lack organisation. Most debates are based on time allocation for each speaker of either five or eight minutes. The table at the end of this chapter illustrates a possible time frame based on five and eight minute time allocations for each speaker.

Method and teamwork

One of the lessons that all debaters learn is that debating is not an individual pursuit but very much a team effort. You will have your individual opportunity to show ‘your stuff’ but never forget it is the team’s argument and case development that is the key priority. Work together so that:
- your arguments support your theme and case
- your total team case is seen as cohesive
your rebuttal is united and consistent
A team member who contradicts the other speakers or introduces new material will invariably lose method marks.
Allocate one member to write down the opposition's definition, theme, case, split of material between speakers and main arguments. This can then be used to accurately summarise the opposition's arguments.

Elements of a speech

5-MINUTE SPEECH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Affirmative</th>
<th>1st Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal introduction</td>
<td>Definition agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or definition argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme and elaboration</td>
<td>1 to 1.5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds to 1 minute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 minute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 2.5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1.5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8-MINUTE SPEECH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Affirmative</th>
<th>1st Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal introduction</td>
<td>Definition agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or definition argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds to 1 minute</td>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme and elaboration</td>
<td>1.5 to 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 to 2 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Method in debating

### 5-Minute Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Affirmative &amp;</th>
<th>3rd Affirmative &amp;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Negative</td>
<td>3rd Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
<td>Formal introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 to 2 minutes</td>
<td>20 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First speaker summary</td>
<td>Clarification of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual outline</td>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>2 to 3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td>Comparison of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 2.5 minutes</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1.5 minutes</td>
<td>1.5 to 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8-Minute Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Affirmative &amp;</th>
<th>3rd Affirmative &amp;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Negative</td>
<td>3rd Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
<td>Formal introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 minutes</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First speaker summary</td>
<td>Clarification of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>30 seconds to 1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual outline</td>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td>Comparison of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 to 4.5 minutes</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 to 2 minutes</td>
<td>1.5 to 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Try This*

Deliver your speech to someone who has never heard your case before. After your presentation, ask them to recount the key elements, i.e., theme, arguments, examples, and adjust your speech if necessary.
The aim of rebuttal is to prove that the other team’s case is wrong. The key to effective rebuttal is effective listening – by noting the opposition’s definition, theme, split, outlines and arguments you provide the basis for a successful rebuttal. It requires analysis of the opposition’s total effort rather than merely listing examples.

Always ensure that you only attack their case – never attack your opposition with personal comments.

**Targets for rebuttal**

★ *Their definition*
   For example: they may present a definition of a word that you can challenge.

★ *Their theme*
   For example: the theme may not be compatible with their definition.

★ *Their main arguments*
   For example: their argument could be based on one example or their arguments could lack substance.

★ *Have their facts been proven and connected?*
   For example: your opposition may not provide sufficient evidence to support their case.

★ *Has their summary been suitable?*
   For example: your opposition may not repeat all the arguments presented.
Methods of rebuttal

Error of fact
Show that the facts of an opposing argument are incorrect. If the debate was about increasing violence in our society caused by a lack of respect for individual rights, the negative could reply by stating that the media highlight it more now. The fact is therefore challenged. The negative can also challenge the interpretation by arguing that it could be caused by an increased use of drugs or the availability of violent x-rated videos.

Cause and effect flaws
Show that the opposition, by claiming certain things are caused by others, have made incorrect links. You might mention a further cause or effect they may not have thought about.

Even if …
Show that you may even accept some of their case but an examination of the point will show its error. In a topic ‘That we need an extra year of schooling’, the affirmative argued that school leaders were immature and undeveloped. The negative argued they were not and even if they were this is not a valid excuse for doing it because of a number of reasons.

Provide an alternative
By offering an alternative you can often take the initiative away from the opposition and even force them to address an issue for which they are unprepared. If the topic of debate was ‘That boys are more interested in sport than girls’, you can argue that it is in fact girls who are more interested. By setting up the necessary comparison with proof, the original statement fails to stand.

Not generally true
This approach shows that your team is prepared to accept the truth of a topic in some circumstances but follow it with a proof that it is not true in a significant number of circumstances.

Irrelevant material
This rebuttal shows that an argument has been made which is not relevant.
One method of presenting rebuttal

- Make an opening statement which summarises your position.
- Identify the speaker.
- Summarise exactly what the speaker said.
- State how and why what they have said is wrong.
- Follow through with an example or illustration.
- Link in your rebuttal to your own case and prepared matter.

A very common practice is the following:

_I have three major problems with the opposition's speech and these are:

- their lack of ...
- their assertion that ...
- their mistaken view that ...

Let me now turn to the first point of the first negative ..._

TRY THIS

Listen carefully to the opposition's argument, thinking about its weaknesses. Do not be overawed by the apparent strength of their argument – remember, every argument has flaws and you need to highlight these and provide reasons why they are wrong.
The reply speech

Many debating competitions now have a right of reply which comes after the third speakers of each side have spoken. The order of the replies is negative first followed by the affirmative. Usually the first speaker (or sometimes the second) gives the speech. The third speaker cannot present. The time of the speech is half the time of the main speeches.

The purpose of a reply speech

The reply speech provides an overview of the debate. It also enables the speaker to compare and contrast the two cases or team arguments. Analysis of two or three important points is the best method to approach the task. The speech is neither rebuttal nor summary but corresponds more closely to a summary.

Hints for the affirmative

- You have the considerable advantage of speaking first and last in the debate. Make sure that you leave the audience in no doubt about your team’s views.
- Don’t attempt to respond to everything the third negative and negative reply has just said. Focus only on a couple of the key issues.

Hints for the negative

- As you present directly after the third negative, be wary of making specific rebuttal points.
- Compare and contrast the two cases.
- Look to have a manner of approach that is different from your third negative.
Speaking and debating with style

A possible structure could be:

- Formal but brief introduction.
- Mention the main issue(s).
- State where each side stood on the crucial issue(s).
- Give a summary of the proofs that have been used by each team.
- Argue persuasively for your team by either making a point by point comparison or giving the entire case of your team and then indicating how you have countered the opposition’s points.
- Finish with a summary of your team’s case.

The manner of a reply speech

Your speech is one of the final acts of the debate and it has the potential to either be a great positive or negative for your team. It is a particularly good opportunity to use your skills of persuasion. You can leave the adjudicator with the view that your team has been more convincing on all the key issues. Consequently, your manner needs to reflect the spirit of a summary and a comparison. Aim for a reasoned and precise manner rather than the more aggressive style of a third speaker.

In pairs, attend a debate where no reply speech is given. Summarise the main points of contention and the specific arguments of both teams. Both of you can then practise a reply speech aiming to convince the other of the superiority of your case.
COMMON TOPIC AREAS & PRACTICE TOPICS...

**Education**
- That parents should have the right to educate their children privately.
- That children should be given sex education in schools, or should this be the responsibility of the parents.
- That students in higher education should be charged tuition fees.
- That Higher Education should be funded by a tax on graduates.
- That Physical Education in schools should be compulsory.

**Sport**
- That the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sport should be legalised.
- That blood sports should be banned.
- That children should not be allowed to work in the performing arts or professional sports.
- That Wimbledon and other sports competitions should offer equal prize money for men and women.

**Women’s Issues**
- That the numbers of women in the legislature should be raised artificially.
- That popular consumerist images of women affect women negatively.
- That women should not be allowed to serve in combat roles in the armed forces.

**Media & Technology**
- That government ownership of the broadcast media should end.
- That the USA and its allies should withdraw their forces from Iraq immediately.
- That terrorist acts should not be allowed publicity through the internet, media, news services etc.

**Health**
- That we should stop eating other animals.
- That genetically modified food should be banned.
- That those who choose to consume tobacco products should be denied, or have greatly limited, access to state healthcare provisions.

**Environment**
- That developed countries should force developing countries to protect the environment by making it a condition of aid.
- That more urgent action is needed to halt the Global Warming Trend.
- That the economic development of developing countries is more important than protecting the environment.

**Politics**
- That religious ministers should not be allowed to hold political office.
- That intellectuals should be more involved in politics.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR DEBATING CHAIRPERSON

Thank you for chairing this debate. When you arrive at the room please check that the room is set up appropriately. Make sure:

- There is a clean white board
- There is a desk for the adjudicator (centre back)
- There are 4 desks either side of the chairperson’s desk (centre front)
- You write the names of each of the team members up on the board, leaving a space beside their name to record the length of their speech
- You write the topic clearly on the board
- You record the details on this sheet- for times of speeches see attached sheet

Here is what you need to say when the adjudicator has indicated that they are ready to start...

Good afternoon ladies & gentlemen

On behalf of Monte Sant Angelo Mercy College I would like to welcome you to round ____ of the ISDA Debating Competition.

The topic for this evening’s debate is

______________________________________________________________

On my right I have the affirmative team from Monte Sant Angelo Mercy College:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Team Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On my left I have the negative team from

______________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Team Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each speaker has ____ minutes to present their case. A warning bell will be sounded at ____ minutes and final bell given at ____
minutes. Should a speaker continue 1 minute after the final bell a continuous bell will be sounded.

Our adjudicator for this afternoon’s debate is

I would now like to invite the 1st speaker for the Affirmative Team to open tonight’s debate.

At the end of each speech the adjudicator will need a little time to record their thoughts. When the adjudicator indicates they have had enough time you should introduce the next speaker.

**Order of Speakers following the 1st Affirmative...**

- I would now like to ask the 1st speaker for the Negative team to open their case.

- I would now like to ask the 2nd speaker for the Affirmative team to continue with their team’s case.

- I would now like to ask the 2nd speaker for the Negative team to also continue with their team’s arguments.

- The 3rd speaker for the Affirmative team will now conclude their team’s case.

- I would now ask the 3rd speaker for the Negative team to conclude this evening’s debate.

**AT THE END** wait for the signal from the adjudicator.

I would now like to call upon the adjudicator to give this evening’s result.

I now call upon a member of the __________________ (team that lost) to give their congratulations to the team from __________________ (team that won).

I now call upon a member of the __________________ (team that won) to give thank the team from __________________ (team that lost) for their efforts and contribution to today’s debate.

**CHAIRPERSON-** At the end of the debate you need to...

- Check the room you have chaired and assist in setting it up back to normal
- See Miss Lizzio and give her the pencil case, the instruction sheet, stop watch and bell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th>Speaking Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary A &amp; B</td>
<td>4 minutes (warning bell at 3 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>5 minutes (warning bell at 3 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>5 minutes (warning bell at 3 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>6 minutes (warning bell at 5 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>8 minutes (warning bell at 6 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior A &amp; B</td>
<td>8 minutes (warning bell at 6 mins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONS FOR DEBATING CHAIRPERSON

Thank you for chairing this debate. When you arrive at the room please check that the room is set up appropriately. Make sure:

- There is a clean white board
- There is a desk for the adjudicator (centre back)
- There are 4 desks either side of the chairperson’s desk (centre front)
- You write the names of each of the team members up on the board, leaving a space beside their name to record the length of their speech
- You write the topic clearly on the board
- You record the details on this sheet- for times of speeches see attached sheet

Here is what you need to say when the adjudicator has indicated that they are ready to start...

Good afternoon ladies & gentlemen

On behalf of Monte Sant Angelo Mercy College I would like to welcome you to round ____ of the Archdale Debating Competition.

The topic for this afternoon’s debate is

On my right I have the affirmative team from Monte Sant Angelo Mercy College:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Team Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On my left I have the negative team from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Team Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each speaker has ____ minutes to present their case. A warning bell will be sounded at ____ minutes and final bell given at ____ minutes. Should a speaker continue 1 minute after the final bell a continuous bell will be sounded.
Our adjudicator for this afternoon’s debate is

I would now like to invite the 1\textsuperscript{st} speaker for the Affirmative Team to open tonight’s debate.

At the end of each speech the adjudicator will need a little time to record their thoughts. When the adjudicator indicates they have had enough time you should introduce the next speaker.

\textbf{Order of Speakers following the 1\textsuperscript{st} Affirmative...}

- I would now like to ask the 1\textsuperscript{st} speaker for the Negative team to open their case.

- I would now like to ask the 2\textsuperscript{nd} speaker for the Affirmative team to continue with their team’s case.

- I would now like to ask the 2\textsuperscript{nd} speaker for the Negative team to also continue with their team’s arguments.

- The 3\textsuperscript{rd} speaker for the Affirmative team will now conclude their team’s case.

- I would now ask the 3\textsuperscript{rd} speaker for the Negative team to conclude this evening’s debate.

\textbf{AT THE END} wait for the signal from the adjudicator.

I would now like to call upon the adjudicator to give this evening’s result.

I now call upon a member of the \underline{________________________} (team that lost) to give their congratulations to the team from \underline{________________________} (team that won).

I now call upon a member of the \underline{________________________} (team that won) to give thank the team from \underline{________________________} (team that lost) for their efforts and contribution to today’s debate.

\textbf{CHAIRPERSON-} At the end of the debate you need to...

- Check the room you have chaired and assist in setting it up back to normal
- See Miss Lizzio and give her the pencil case, the instruction sheet, stop watch and bell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th>Speaking Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>3-4 minutes (warning bell at 3 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>4-6 minutes (warning bell at 4 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>5-7 minutes (warning bell at 5 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>6-8 minutes (warning bell at 6 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>6-8 minutes (warning bell at 6 mins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEBATERS!

Arrange a chairperson
Each team is responsible for arranging their own chair. This can be an extra team member, a friend at Monte or another debater. It CANNOT be your coach or family member.

Ensure uniform is IMPECCABLE!
Each debater must ensure that their uniform is clean, ironed, neat and tidy. Full school uniform is to be worn at all times. You do not debate in your jumpers; take it off or put on your blazer. Do not scrunch your blazer sleeves up; we live in 2008, not 1988. Sports uniform, sports socks and sports shoes are NOT to be worn during a debate, even if you are chairing. Remember you are representing Monte and your presentation effects how outsiders think about the school.

Demonstrate Monte Manners at all times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE BEHAVIOURS</th>
<th>INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whispering to your team mates when the opposition are speaking</td>
<td>Giggling, speaking loudly, and being rude. Watch your facial expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing notes to your fellow team members</td>
<td>Throwing them across the desks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening attentively when the adjudicator is giving their feedback</td>
<td>Looking around the room, chatting to each other, passing notes, giggling and being generally disengaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being polite and kind to the opposing teams, thanking them for hosting and congratulating them when appropriate</td>
<td>Being rude and arrogant, laughing at their school at away debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating all adults with the utmost respect. Teachers, parents, adjudicators, coaches etc.</td>
<td>Being rude and disrespectful, ignoring them when they ask you to do something, or not completing a task to the best of your ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking all your rubbish with you out of prep rooms and debate rooms, cleaning the board and setting the room up when required</td>
<td>Leaving your rubbish behind and the rooms you have used in an unsatisfactory state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure when unable to attend a debate
You must give Miss Lizzio 24 hours notice **IN WRITING** if you are unable to attend a debate. It is YOUR responsibility to find a replacement debater for when you are absent. Failure to do so will jeopardise your chances to debate in the future.

Attending **ALL** training sessions
Girls are required to attend **all** training sessions of their team. There are at least 2 trainings per team: one with your coach and the second during a lunchtime with a teacher focussing on current affairs. Failure to attend any of these sessions will result in that individual not debating that round.

Any girl who does not choose to take on the responsibilities above should rethink her desire to debate for Monte. If any teacher needs to speak to you to address these issues, you will be given a notification.