

New Global Learning



Exercise Book

New Global Learning



Authors on the project:

Fundacja Polska Debatuje
Radoslaw Czekan
Pawel Sieprawski

International Debate Education Association
Anastazija Stupar
Daan Welling

Asociace Debatních Klubů
Jakub Hlaváček
Jakub Okruhlica
Nga Thi Nguyen

Learning Wizard
Čedo Velašević

We also want to acknowledge and are grateful to all of our volunteers who tested and gave feedback on these materials throughout the project.

This project supports the production of:

1. Training modules for youth workers and trainers;
2. A youth worker toolkit on approaching contemporary issues;
3. A digital learning environment.

This project was funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



Introduction and Toolkit Pedagogy

How to use these tools to teach global citizenship through debate

Before you, you find a toolkit with lots of nifty tools and tricks to help young people explore global issues through debate. Just as you wouldn't start hammering blindly when opening a toolkit, so the instructions in this pedagogy toolkit are vital to help you get the most out of the materials provided.

We start by giving you an overview of what is in the toolkit, and how it relates to other materials that were developed by the project "New Global Learning". We then look at the unique benefits of debate education, why it works and what conditions you want to meet as an educator. We then zoom in on this specific toolkit and how you can use it with young people.

What is the New Global Learning project?

Global citizenship education is vital for today's youth. It teaches understanding, respect, and cooperation across cultures. By exploring global issues, young people become more aware and responsible. It empowers them to make better decisions, fostering tolerance and inclusivity. Global citizenship creates engaged citizens for a better, more connected world.

By providing youth workers with a set of methods, case studies, and exercises, we enable them to help bring global citizenship education in practice. This project builds on existing global learning guidelines by incorporating innovative and digital methods to create practical training modules and toolkits.

The specific educational focus we use is called "debate education". Debate education helps develop critical thinking and communication skills. It encourages open-mindedness and understanding of different perspectives. It is proactive and collaborative.

What's in this box?

In this box you find three big things:

Topic: Globalisation, wealth, and poverty	Topic: Climate and Sustainability	Topic: Religion, Identity, Migration, and Border Crossings	Topic: News, Noise, and Neutrality
The Global South and the free market	Climate reparations	Lessons of religions in school	Fake news and social platforms
Deindustrialisation in the Global North	Geo-engineering	Mandatory diversity trainings in companies	State-funded media should not exist
Chinese investment in the Global South	Biodiversity and management of endangered species	Cultural integration of refugees in the EU	Political campaigning on social media
Economic migration to the Global North	Adaptation or mitigation strategies for climate changes	Human trafficking and its causes	Fairness doctrines

1. An overview of Thinking Models and Strategies that people want to master if they want to get better at debating;
2. A set of case studies on a wide variety of different topics related to global citizenship
3. A set of worksheets on each Topic to help students build their analytical skills

What are in the other boxes?

The project includes two other sets of tools for you.

1. Training Modules, or content manuals, that give you a better conceptual and factual understanding of the topics discussed. These manuals come equipped with exercises that help students get that same level of understanding. You can see the Toolkit as helping students build analytical skills, and the Manuals as helping students be better-informed.
2. A digital learning environment, where the materials in the manuals are presented for individuals to learn at their own pace. This environment can supplement work in the groups, or be an alternative if there's no group around for you to learn.

Why debate education?

Debate education has long been recognized for its ability to foster critical thinking, collaborative skills, and good citizenship. Engaging in debates helps students develop essential skills that can lead to a lifetime of educational and social success.

Outcomes of debate education

Critical Thinking

One of the most significant benefits of debate education is the development of critical thinking skills. Critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information. Many studies have found that students who participated in debate programs exhibited improved critical thinking skills compared to their non-debating peers, because debate helps scaffolding students' thinking in collaborative and analytical settings.

Collaborative Skills

Debate education also helps students develop collaborative skills. As participants work together to build and defend their arguments, they learn the importance of cooperation, communication, and active listening. By engaging in debates, students learn to respect diverse opinions, negotiate, and find common ground, which are invaluable skills for working in group settings and navigating a diverse workforce.

Active Citizenship

In addition to academic benefits, debate education plays a vital role in promoting active citizenship. Debate encourages students to develop a sense of social responsibility and global awareness, as debaters are exposed to various local and international issues.

In what way does debate education achieve these outcomes?

Lets see how debate education achieves those aims, and what you need to have in place during a debate session. Here are a few mechanisms present in most forms of debate education:

1. **Active learning:** Debate education involves students in active learning, where they must engage with the material, think critically about it, and apply it to real-world situations. Crucially, active learning often increases the level of students' motivation.
2. **Structuring and scaffolding of information:** As students practice debate, they learn to analyze and reorganize information in order to construct persuasive arguments. This process of cognitive restructuring enables them to view problems from different perspectives, fostering intellectual flexibility and problem-solving skills.
3. **Practice and reinforcement:** Debate education offers students the opportunity to practice and reinforce their critical thinking, research, writing, and public speaking skills. Through repetition and exposure, students gradually improve their abilities and gain confidence in using these skills in various academic and professional contexts.
4. **Social interaction:** Debate is inherently a social activity that requires participants to engage with others, consider different viewpoints, and respond to opposing arguments. This process helps develop important social skills, such as active listening, empathy, and negotiation, while promoting tolerance and respect for diverse opinions.

Building blocks of debate sessions

Debate education offers a few building blocks that are always present in order for these mechanisms to occur. These building blocks are independent of the specifically chosen debate format (such as Worlds Schools, British Parliamentary, or Lincoln-Douglas).

1. **Clear objectives and expectations:** Establishing clear objectives and expectations for students is crucial. You should communicate the purpose of the debate activities and explain the skills they aim to develop for each specific session. For advanced students who have internalised the complex set of requirements that are involved in scoring a debate format (such as matter, manner, and strategy), feedback can follow some multiples of these lines. For students who are not as far along their debate journey, you want to tailor your objectives to specific goals.
2. **Structured format:** A well-structured debate format, such as the Worlds Schools Debating Championship format, provides students with a framework to organize their arguments and follow the flow of the debate. This structure fosters logical and coherent arguments while promoting an orderly and respectful exchange of ideas. However, the complexities of debate formats mean that they are not always the best avenue for teaching debate skills.

3. Skill development: Instructors should explicitly teach skills such as critical thinking, effective communication, active listening, and collaboration. Integrating activities that focus on these skills, such as brainstorming sessions, rebuttal exercises, and group discussions, will help students find a better way to specifically hone their skills.
4. Topic selection: Choosing relevant and engaging topics is essential to pique students' interest and stimulate intellectual curiosity. Topics should be debatable, challenging, and fair. Topics can be student-generated, or selected by you - if you have a good grasp on what your students may find interesting. Topics selected in this toolkit have been chosen by educators who have a large amount of experience working with young people in these areas.
5. Research and preparation: Effective debate education requires students to conduct thorough research and prepare their arguments. You should provide guidance on research methods, credible sources, and argument construction. Emphasizing the importance of evidence-based arguments and acknowledging counterarguments will help students develop well-rounded perspectives.
6. Feedback and assessment: Providing constructive feedback and assessment is essential for student growth. Instructors should offer personalized feedback on students' strengths and areas for improvement. Implementing a fair and transparent assessment rubric can help track progress and measure the effectiveness of the debate education program.
7. Encouraging a supportive environment: Fostering a respectful and inclusive atmosphere is crucial for effective debate education. You should emphasize the importance of active listening, empathy, and mutual respect during debates, while also promoting open-mindedness and the value of diverse perspectives. Debating can be seen as a stressful activity, and we are less receptive to new information and learning experiences when we are stressed. Supportive environments and positive feedback helps bring a feeling of safety for students.

From these seven building blocks, you can determine that a session should always include:

1. A learning goal for the lesson that is tailored to a specific skill or set of interrelated skills that you want your students to improve upon;
2. An exercise or set of exercises that help students hone these specific skills;
3. A guideline or rule that students should hear, uncover, understand, ingratiate, or master that helps them develop these skills;
4. A supportive environment and positive teacher that is motivated to help students on their path.

[Analysing the tools in this box](#)

As mentioned above, debate education is an awesome but challenging tool. The need we identified is to help bring down the complexity of teaching debate, which is often done by focusing on practicing competitive debate formats. Moreover, we see that debate involves challenging concepts and themes that students may not have much prior knowledge or experience with. The tools in this box

We recommend that you first read the Thinking Models and Strategies section, to familiarise yourself with the main theory of motion and argument analysis that you'll be helping the students explore.

The worksheets and case studies are used together. Students can use the worksheets to analyse the case studies in further detail. They are also prompted to build their own case studies, which help strengthen their analytical skills and understanding of the topics.

Below you will find a matrix where we looked at the worksheets and case studies, and identified which specific thinking models and strategies are best suited to each of them. We also give a suggestion for which topic is suited for which experience level.

This matrix is best seen as a guideline. As with all models, in order to provide easy categorisation, some nuances had to be omitted. We think that you can experiment with using challenging or easier exercises, for instance. Choosing topics on the basis of students' interest or tailoring feedback to your students' level can ensure that an exercise plays out differently from how this matrix is envisioned. If you make a choice that is different from this matrix you can consider whether this choice is made to help maximise one of the seven building blocks mentioned above.

Rough guidelines for “basic”, “intermediary”, and “advanced” are as follows:

- Basic includes students who are new to debate up till a maximum of one semester of experience;
- Intermediate includes students who have gone through a basic programme familiarizing themselves with rules of debate (a rough equivalent of five to seven meetups), until the first to second year of attending debate ; if you bring debaters to tournaments, the equivalent would be until they speak average speaker scores at the tournament or reach final rounds;
- Advanced students include those who have passed the “intermediate’ marks

	Basic	Intermediate	Advanced	Session Focus (Thinking Models)	Group Size
Topic: Globalisation, wealth, and poverty					
The Global South and the free market			X	Competing proposals or stances	6-20
Deindustrialisation in the Global North		X	X	Problem identification, stakeholder analysis	6-20
Chinese investment in the Global South			X	Competing proposals or stances, stakeholder analysis	6-20
Economic migration to the Global North		X	X	Problem identification, arguments about consequences, stakeholder analysis	6-20
Topic: Climate and Sustainability					
Climate reparations		X	X	Arguments about values and duties	6-20
Geo-engineering		X	X	Arguments about consequences	6-20
Biodiversity and management of endangered species		X	X	Arguments about consequences	6-20

Adaptation or mitigation strategies for climate changes	X	X		Arguments about consequences, competing proposals or stances	6-20
Topic: Religion, Identity, Migration, and Border Crossings					
Lessons of religions in school	X	X		Arguments about values, competing proposals and stances	6-20
Mandatory diversity trainings in companies	X	X		Stakeholder analysis, arguments about consequences	6-20
Cultural integration of refugees in the EU		X	X	Stakeholder analysis, arguments about values, problem identification	6-20
Human trafficking and its causes		X	X	Arguments about consequences, competing proposals or stances	6-20
Topic: News, Noise, and Neutrality					
Fake news and social platforms	X	X		Arguments about consequences, competing proposals or stances	6-20
State-funded media should not exist	X	X		Arguments about values, competing proposals or stances	6-20

Political campaigning on social media		X	X	Problem identification, arguments about consequences	6-20
Fairness doctrines		X	X	Arguments about consequences, competing proposals or stances	6-20

Note: we have excluded the Motions for Further Practice in the worksheet from this matrix. These exercises are analogous across all different topics, and applicable to all different levels, group sizes, and thinking models. The variation here is given by the instructor. You can instruct different levels

Assessing debate skills

In the previous section we have given you an understanding of what a “beginner”, “intermediate”, or “advanced” debater is. You may want to get a more refined understanding of these categories, and what type of skills belong to each of these levels. We have given descriptions of competency at different skills for these levels. You can use this to determine where you feel the students you work with are, and to determine which session you want to use for your students.

These skills are described following the European Qualifications Framework. This is a standardised set of norms that are used to track process for the lifelong learning of individuals. The “levels” are the level of capacities a debater should have to be considered to be placed in that level for a given “capacity”. The “capacities” are the different components that make up a good debater. The starting point is the “zero level” of a skill that someone can possess. If someone starts debating for the first time, they may already possess a capacity that is in line with a different level of skill, as they may have gained that knowledge through other forms of learning.

This matrix starts with explanations of the categories and levels that we use in the framework. It then offers descriptions of different competences that exist in debating at the different levels.

Level	Starting point	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
<p>Equivalent Description in EQF</p>	<p>0: zero level, indicating lack of skills or serious errors in ability.</p> <p>Indicators of students who have not yet shown capacities. This does not correspond to an EQF level - it predates it.</p>	<p>1: Basic general knowledge</p>	<p>2: Basic factual knowledge of a field of work or study</p>	<p>3: Knowledge of facts, principles, processes and general concepts, in a field of work or study</p>
<p>Skills</p> <p>In the context of EQF, skills are described as cognitive (involving the use of logical, intuitive and creative thinking) and practical (involving manual dexterity and the use of methods, materials, tools and instruments).</p>	<p>None to limited ability to successfully carry out simple tasks</p>	<p>Basic skills required to carry out simple tasks</p>	<p>Basic cognitive and practical skills required to use relevant information in order to carry out tasks and to solve routine problems using simple rules and tools</p>	<p>A range of cognitive and practical skills required to accomplish tasks and solve problems by selecting and applying basic methods, tools, materials and information</p>

<p>Responsibility and Autonomy</p> <p>In the context of the EQF responsibility and autonomy is described as the ability of the learner to apply knowledge and skills autonomously and with responsibility</p>	<p>None to limited ability to understand how to approach tasks</p>	<p>Work or study under direct supervision in a structured context</p>	<p>Work and study under supervision with some autonomy</p>	<p>Take responsibility for completion of tasks in work or study; adapt own behaviour to circumstances in solving problems</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Level	Starting point	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Description of when a student likely conforms to each bracket	We expect students to showcase this level before any debate training. They may showcase some elements which fit a higher range if they have had previous exposure to debate/public speaking/communication/analytical thinking through other means (e.g. taught in school)	We expect students to showcase this level after 1-2 months of debate training, after novice debate training is over.	We expect students to showcase this level after 6 months - 1 year, after they have regularly attended debate sessions and may have attended debate events (competitions, training camps, etc.)	We expect students to showcase this level after 1-2 years, after regularly attending debate sessions and events, and having shown commitment to debate, for instance through starting to judge or coach.
Category	Starting point	Novice	Intermediate	Advanced
Style: comprehensiveness	<p>Speaking Style: Slurred words, too fast or quiet to hear, jumbled sentences or some other reason why the audience can't understand what the speaker is saying.</p> <p>Structure: no structure to the delivery of the speech</p>	<p>Speaking Style: audible, speed or volume of delivery may be imperfect but is not an active impediment to understanding what the speakers.</p> <p>Structure: sentences themselves are understandable even if not always forming a part of a cohesive and structured whole argument or speech. A basic structure is announced but not always kept to.</p>	<p>Speaking Style: Pacing is not always good but this does not impact on the persuasiveness of the speech</p> <p>Structure: Speaker keeps to announced structure, and arguments contain an internal structure.</p>	<p>Speaking Style: Complete sentences, clearly spoken so no difficulties in understanding.</p> <p>The speaker shows understanding and conviction in what they are saying.</p> <p>Structure: Speaker announces and uses structure of speech, arguments are well-constructed (following patterns such as SEXI) and easy to follow, transition between points in speech goes without flaws</p>

<p>Style: rhetoric</p>	<p>Voice: Bland and boring tone of delivery. (Particularly monotone)</p> <p>Language: language is unstructured, chaotic, and confusing.</p>	<p>Voice: Tone varies. Some emotional impact; it may sometimes be misplaced so that it detracts from the arguments (such as unwarrantedly strong use of emotions)</p> <p>Language: attempts are made to use examples, sayings, or style figures to get point across. These attempts regularly don't add an increased understanding or emotionality to the argument, may be cliché, or imprecise.</p>	<p>Voice: Emotion does not outweigh argument, and is adapted to argument. Speaker comes across as genuine: seems to believe in the case they are presenting.</p> <p>Language: regular usage of style, such as introductions, examples, and sayings.</p> <p>Language fits the argument but may not always elevate the persuasiveness of the argument.</p>	<p>Voice: speaker varies their use of voice and speaks with appropriate gravitas for the content of their speech.</p> <p>Language: style is used with ease and conviction, and adds to the persuasiveness of the argument on logical and/or emotional grounds.</p>
<p>Matter: reasoning</p>	<p>Analysis: Arguments are not logically made, claims not sustained, may be self contradictory (or have two arguments contradict each other or contradicts a previous speaker on own side).</p> <p>Argument is implausible or not relevant to the motion.</p> <p>Evidence: Provides no supporting evidence for arguments.</p>	<p>Analysis: some attempts at using a argument model such as SeXi. Some explanation is given, but leaves lots of gaps.</p> <p>Evidence: examples, facts and statistics are sometimes given with some relevance to the argument presented.</p>	<p>Analysis: Arguments generally follow the SeXi model. They are labeled and analysis is provided that follows "why" steps, although may leave easily exploited gaps for opposition or miss some important links.</p> <p>Evidence: Arguments are almost always backed up by credible-sounding examples, facts, and/or statistics.</p>	<p>Analysis: A clearly structured speech that has a clarity of purpose throughout.</p> <p>Arguments are logical and easy to follow, explained in depth. They follow the SEXI model with argumentation explained.</p> <p>Evidence: Each claim is backed up with clearly relevant evidence. Unless obvious relevance is explained – the audience is presumed to be intelligent but new to the topic.</p>

<p>Matter: Strategy</p>	<p>Strategy: Does not point out the main issues in debate or connect arguments to the motion.</p> <p>Role Fulfillment: does not fulfil the role that the speech has to fulfil in that particular debate format</p>	<p>Strategy: arguments can often implicitly be understood to belong to the main issues in the debate. Speaker may argue around the motion's key issues. Links to the motion are occasionally attempted.</p> <p>Role Fulfillment: the role is fulfilled in its basic, although not with a clear intent.</p> <p>Definitions are given, but may not add. Clashes in reply speeches are announced but don't add clarity to the debate.</p> <p>New arguments may be given in later speakers but do not advance the case.</p>	<p>Strategy: speaker signposts the burden that they try to achieve, and mostly identifies the correct burden. Speaker does not yet shift the burden in response to opposition's case.</p> <p>Arguments have impact for the motion.</p> <p>Role Fulfillment: the speaker does not make any errors in their role fulfilment, and choices made within the categories of role fulfilment help make their speech work better (useful definitions; correctly-identified clashes; clear rebuttal, etc.).</p>	<p>Strategy: Speaker is clear on their burden, their burden is accurate, and speaker may respond to the burden identified by the other side.</p> <p>Role Fulfillment: the speaker has a flawless execution of its role in the debate and provides what is needed within the speakers' role.</p>
<p>Matter: Rebuttal and Engagement</p>	<p>Does not engage with previous speaker's arguments.</p>	<p>Some engagement but does not get to the heart of the argument. Not an effective rebuttal.</p>	<p>Frequent engagement with the main idea of the other argument. May not always defeat other argument.</p> <p>Attempts are made to differentiate between explicit rebuttal and interwoven rebuttal, if the format allows for it. Speaker has occasional attempts to make comparisons between arguments and cases in the debate, but can't show the comparative importance of their own argument or case.</p>	<p>Shows us why the other side's argument is irrelevant, wrong, flawed, insufficient, or generally inferior to the arguments presented by the speaker's own side. It is a clear part of the structure of the argument rather than simply tacked on and then ignored. Speaker frequently compares material in the debate in a comparative manner, including explanations that shows their material to be more compelling.</p>

<p>Soft Skills: Teamwork</p>	<p>Teamwork: No teamwork; no referring to others arguments, contradict teammates points. Listening: Speaker does not pay attention to what has gone before in the debate. Speaker does not remark on what happened before in the debate during speeches.</p> <p>Contribution: no contribution during preparation from the student.</p>	<p>Teamwork: Refers to teammates work but does not successfully build on it.</p> <p>Listening: Some attempt to note pervious debaters' arguments. (Usually just rebutting the speaker immediately previous).</p> <p>Contribution: some contribution during preparation from the student, not always focused or understandable for other members of the team.</p>	<p>Teamwork: it is clear from the beginning what the team will do. Speakers after that mostly follow this structure, but may deviate from it.</p> <p>Listening: can follow the rest of the debate and does not misrepresent the debate, but may miss some details or ideas when responding.</p> <p>Contribution: contributes regularly and brings ideas to the table. Critiques other partners. Is not obstructive in the preparation.</p>	<p>Teamwork: What the team as a whole will do is clearly laid out by first debater in team. The team sticks to their plan (except for any necessary reactions to opposition) building on each other's arguments and ensuring the team covers all the most important points.</p> <p>Listening: Speaker has clearly listened to all previous speakers and understood them; their speech seeks to build on teammates and negate what opponents have said.</p> <p>Contribution: contributes with own ideas and helps partners in a constructive manner.</p>
------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thinking models and strategies for critical analysis of contemporary issues

Radosław Czekan Fundacja
Polska Debatuje

Preview

This module is intended to provide essential tools for debate trainers to run debate practice about contemporary issues with the usage of knowledge and context introduced in the previous module. Debating complex and constantly changing topics about i.a. migration or economy might be at first overwhelming for students and trainers (especially non-experts in the field). Therefore debate thinking models for motion and case study analysis should make the process more accessible, more structured, clearer, repeatable, and universal. Mastering debate methodology makes critical thinking easier for students and trainers.

While there are various ways motions and cases are and could be analyzed, this module uses the one approachable for both beginners and advanced debaters. However, it is not an exhaustive and exclusive model, so a reader is encouraged to question, test, and adapt it to their needs.

Any debate motion can be analyzed through 4 questions:

- a) What is the problem or decision to be made?
- b) What are the burdens of proof?
- c) What are the contested proposals or stances?
- d) What are the arguments?

This chapter explains the analysis of the questions in detail, while case studies and worksheets provided later demonstrate how to put theory into practice.

Problem or decision

The American legendary debate professor Alfred Snider once said that debating is about changing the world. And he was right because motions boil down to debating what we should think about the past or present and what we should do differently to make the world a better place. If the world was perfect, there would probably be no debating. Unless it is otherwise the first step in motion analysis should be to find out and define what is the problem to be discussed.

What is the problem?

The problem is a situation that could be improved. Here are several questions to be used to find out and define what is the subject problem.

- Why do we debate it?
- What does the status quo look like around this topic? Why is it bad?
- What group or stakeholder is not satisfied with their situation? Why?
- What happened in the last weeks or months, that makes the debate relevant?

Does the problem matter?

Any problem is not enough for a balanced debate. When you think about the problem try to answer those questions:

- Is the problem real or hypothetical?
- Are there any Real Life Examples of the problem?
- Is the problem pressing or not?
- Does the problem address important stakeholders?
- Are there satisfactory alternative solutions to the problem?

The Proposition should attempt to prove that the problem is real, and pressing, about the significant stakeholders with no working alternatives, and Proposition should support it with Real Life Examples.

The Opposition should look for reasons why the problem is not real, not urgent, about not essential groups, or/and there are working solutions already. The Opposition can also prove that there are more important problems or more critical stakeholders to focus on.

Moreover, Opposition can question the scope of the problem (“too broad” or “too narrow”), the legitimacy of the problem within the debate game due to squirreling (interpretation of the motion that makes the debate imbalanced or undebatable), or place-setting or time-setting (setting up a debate in specific place or time, unless stated by the motion). What is the reason behind the problem?

Moreover, debaters should characterize the causes of the problem (cause-and-effect). A Proposition should prove that the problem is caused by something, which the proposal or argumentation suggested by the motion will address. The opposition could challenge it with the following attacks:

- The problem is not caused by X. There are different causes.
- The problem is caused by X, but it is not the decisive factor. There are other more significant causes.

Problems or decisions or evaluations?

Problem identification is not only useful for policy motions (“This House would do X”) or first-person motions (“This House, as Y, would do X”), but also for other motions about decisions and evaluations (This House believes that X does more harm than good, This House regrets X, This House supports X). In the latter, there is always some suboptimal situation to be evaluated and decided about. Take for example:

- This House regrets social media
 - Problem: social media are popular and addictive
 - Evaluation: are the benefits worth it?
- This House prefers a world without social media
 - Problem: social media are popular and addictive
 - Decision: would it be better to live in a world without them?
- This House believes that parents should ban their children from social media
 - Problem: social media are popular and addictive
 - Decision: should parents ban it?

Burdens of proof

The burden of proof is an assumed obligation to prove something by someone. A failed obligation to fulfill a debater's burden of proof might be a reason for the lost debate.

Burdens of proof should be anticipated or recognized as early as possible. Burdens of proof originate from:

- a) Assigned side
- b) Motion and motion type
- c) Team strategy and claims

In the motion "This House supports social media", Proposition needs to prove that social media is desirable. The opposition needs to prove that social media is undesirable. This burden is based on the side and motion type (This House supports...), which is an evaluative motion, where we weigh all pros and cons.

If the motions would read "This House would ban social media", the Proposition would need to prove not only that social media are undesirable, but also that they are so harmful or immoral that we need to ban them and that ban is better than other feasible alternatives. Why? Because the Opposition can claim that social media are not perfect, but should not be banned or that other feasible alternatives (like regulation) are good enough.

By default, the burden of proof lies on the team that claims something. If Proposition claims that social media are addictive, they are obliged to prove it sufficiently. Otherwise, the claim should be ignored or discounted to the extent it was proven.

Questions to be asked:

- What is the motion type? What burden of proof is implied from the wording?
- What burden of proof is implied for different sides?
- What should a team prove to win a debate?
 - What are the criteria for resolving this debate?
- What burden of proof should be implied from our claims?

Competing proposals or stances

Criticizing Proposition ideas most of the time is not enough to win a debate. Listing the benefits of the Proposition ideas is not enough to win either. Debates are always comparisons of available policies or scenarios or characterizations or facts or values etc. Therefore any argumentation should be selected and proved comparatively. It is much easier to do if we clarify first what are the competing proposals or stances.

Example:

This House would ban social media.

- Proposition proposal: We should introduce a ban on using social media
- Opposition proposal: We should keep it as it is: free and available to anyone.
- Proposition stance: Ban is the only way to prevent destructive addiction.
- Opposition stance: Regulation for youth and self-regulation for adults are enough to ensure sanity.

For policy motions, the following aspects should be considered in a model (policy specification presented by Proposition):

- Agent
 - Who will conduct it? A government? UN? European Commission? A parent?
- Action
 - What will be done exactly?
 - What will not be changed?
 - Is the policy exclusive to our team?
- Alternatives
 - Are there any alternative solutions? Are they sufficient (or not)?
- Practice
 - How would it look and work in real life?
- Extreme scenarios exclusion:
 - What extreme cases should not be included?
- Examples or Analogies of similar policies?
 - Are there any existing solutions like this?
 - Are there any analogies that make the policy realistic?

For retrospective motions (e.g. This House regrets X) Proposition needs to identify a counterfactual and prove it was a feasible alternative.

For evaluative motions (e.g. This House supports X. This House believes that X...”) teams need to formulate their stance, which might be general (e.g. X brings more benefits than harms) or specific (e.g. addiction to social media is a more pressing problem than access to news)

All stances or proposals are relevant only to the extent they are mutually exclusive. If both sides can claim educational campaigns or status quo laws, then it is not necessary or useful to debate it.

Arguments

A debate cannot happen without arguments. A common mistake among debaters is to come up with arguments as fast as possible at the start of their preparation time. This leads to arguments, which are the easiest to think of, not necessarily to arguments that are the best to think of. Previous analysis of the problem in question, burdens, and stances should already direct debaters into the right place, but to maximize strategic thinking it is helpful to qualify arguments in a debate.

Nearly all claims within a debate fall under one of the three categories:

1. Arguments about the problem or assumptions
2. Arguments about the values, rights, and duties
3. Arguments about the consequences

Arguments about the problem or assumptions

The proposition could argue that the problem is real, and pressing, about the significant stakeholders with no working alternatives to deal with it. Moreover, Proposition might argue that the status quo looks like X and that supports their diagnosis and solution (characterization and model).

The opposition could argue that the problem is not real, urgent, or important, with existing preferred alternatives to the problem. Additionally, the Opposition can argue that the problem is mischaracterized or has different causes. Moreover, the Opposition might argue that the status quo looks like Y and that opposes the Proposition diagnosis and solution (counter-characterization).

An effective challenge of problems or assumptions can undermine all other arguments and win a debate. If there is no problem, the duty to carry out a policy is not present and there should not be a discussion about consequences.

An ineffective challenge might spoil the debate because there is no agreement on fundamental facts and goals.

Arguments about values, rights, and duties

The teams might agree on the problem and/or characterization of the status quo but can disagree on values, rights, or duties. For example, they agree on addiction problems related to social media and when the Proposition prefers care and mental health of youth, the Opposition chooses to defend personal liberty (values). The Proposition will argue that social media violates rights and the Opposition will argue that social media require consent and it is our right to take risks and face the consequences of them. The proposition will argue that the state has an obligation to intervene (duty), while the Opposition will argue that the state has an obligation to abstain (duty).

Effective argumentation about values, rights, and duties (or principles) can effectively outweigh consequential argumentation because consequences are compared based on the value society assigns to them.

Arguments about the consequences

The debaters can agree on the problem and values but disagree on the consequences (e.g. of the ban). They may also disagree on whether consequences from the past were caused by specific factors.

For example in the debate: This House would ban social media The

proposition's arguments might look like this:

1. Problem: Social media are addictive
2. Duty: The state has to protect citizens from dangers
3. Consequences: The ban will decrease addiction.

Opposition's arguments in this debate might go differently:

1. Problem: Social media are not the reason for addiction. Addiction can be prevented by ongoing regulation
2. Right: People should make free choices about their social life

3. Consequences: Ban will encourage a black market and online abuse

Stakeholder analysis

One of the most useful techniques is to conduct a stakeholder analysis, which means looking for and evaluating the impact of the motion on particular groups of interest.

Step 1 - Identify various stakeholders in a debate

Questions to ask:

- Which groups are affected by the motion?
- What subgroups can we identify within them?
- How the groups' are affected by the motion?

Example: Within the migrant group, we identified economic migrants and refugees as stakeholders. In the motion "This House supports welcoming and liberal public policies toward migration", both groups are affected because it is easier to enter, stay and work in the hosting country.

Step 2 - Recognize and rank the comparative importance of each stakeholder

Questions to ask:

- Which affected group is the biggest in members?
- Which group is affected most intensely?
- What responsibilities and duties do we hold to different stakeholders?
- Which stakeholders are the most important?

Example: Economic migrants are a much more numerous group, but refugees face much harsher conditions and require much more urgent state support. There is also a stronger moral obligation toward those persecuted or fleeing their homes. That's why refugees will be the most important stakeholder.

Step 3 - Build arguments and framing based on your priority stakeholder

Questions to ask:

- What are the stakeholder's interests?
- What are the stakeholder's incentives?

- What are the short-term gains and losses for the stakeholder?

Example: Refugees have various interests, but their most important needs are safety, shelter, and legalization of stay, so they can continue with their lives as soon as possible. Even if in the shorter period, liberal laws will create a backlash, in the long term refugees will be much more accepted within society.

Evaluating Arguments

Once arguments have been made by both teams, teams assess each other's arguments and try to persuade listeners that their arguments carry the most weight towards adopting or rejecting a Motion. To understand the tools to weigh arguments, we use a concept known as Impact.

Types of Impact

There are many ways in which arguments can be compared. The most frequent ones used are:

- Probability
- Scale
- Severity
- Unavoidability
- Duration
- **Probability** refers to how likely the impact is going to happen. Claims about probability are assessments of the arguments about consequences.

Scale looks at the size of the impact: how many stakeholders are affected.

Severity looks at the type of impact: how deep is the impact? To illustrate the difference: in a debate about smoking, the impact of a ban has a large negative scale effect on the enjoyment of smoking, as likely most smokers enjoy the activity. However, it has a positive severity impact on the minority of smokers who develop serious diseases.

Unavoidability looks at whether the harms identified necessarily come about due to the policy or are removed by the policy, or whether alternative options exist to remove for or compensate for the harm.

Duration (or scale) looks at when and for how long an impact may occur. A short-term harm may be traded off against a long-term gain. For example: banning smoking means tobacco stores may have to close, but in the long term leads to more health benefits.

Comparing within and between arguments

This framework can be used to analyze the internal logic of an argument. For example, in the ban smoking debate, an argument in the Opposition may be that this restricts freedom of choice. Debaters can look at the type and scope of the impact - how fundamentally is this choice restriction, for instance? They also have to look at whether it applies in all cases. For example: does the freedom of choice to smoke restrict the freedom of choice of people exposed to second-hand smoke?

At the same time, they evaluate this claim versus other claims, for instance, the ability to live a long and healthy life. In doing so, impact statements are used to compare arguments.

Questions to ask

- What are the impacts of my arguments?
- What are the impacts that the other teams claim?
- How do their impacts compare to our impacts?

Summary

Motion analysis in debating uses structured thinking models to instill slow and critical thinking among students as well as to maximize clarity of reasoning. Sometimes it requires self-discipline and rigor, but it easily brings substantial benefits for any productive disagreement, and debates and hopefully brings us closer to the truth and the better world.

To analyze contemporary, controversial issues accordingly follow the above- mentioned steps:

1. What is the problem or decision to be made?

- a. Is it a real issue?
 - b. Is it an important issue?
 - c. What are the causes of the issue?

2. What are the burdens of proof?
 - a. What does the motion imply to prove?
 - b. What does our side need to prove to win?
 - c. What do our claims require us to prove?

3. What are the contested proposals or stances?
 - a. Are they clear?
 - b. Are they mutually exclusive?

4. What are the arguments?
 - a. What are the real problem and basic assumptions of the motion?
 - b. What are the values, rights, and duties to be applied?
 - c. What are the consequences for important stakeholders?

5. How do we compare the arguments?
 - a. What are the impacts of my arguments?
 - b. What are the impacts that the other teams claim?
 - c. How do their impacts compare to our impacts?

Read the following chapters to see how motion analysis thinking models are applied in real-life contemporary debates.