| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house regrets the increasing commercialisation of 'self care' |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 6 minutes’ long.]  I like the initial call-out in the hook but there actually has been analysis on Opp on why accessibility and affordability increases, e.g. economies of scale for mass production.   * When we highlighted that the comparative is better on Prop, we’re not stating any mechanistic pathway as to HOW products that help self-care become cheaper or accessible on your side.   Excellent rebuttal on the profit incentives of companies to increase their profit margins and gatekeeping these products.   * But bear in mind that it’s also true for companies to have competitive business models on reducing prices to garner more consumers.   + So we can afford to be more comparative here to explain why consumerism is so overwhelming to the point that consumers are exploited into paying higher prices, and there’s collusion among industry giants to keep market prices here.     - Otherwise, more demand does not actually equal high prices, because competition between multiple providers among a wide consumer base would also drive prices down.   Since this isn’t a policy motion, we have no Prop fiat to assume that products and services relating to self-care will be widely available or affordable on your side.   * We can’t stop at saying that there’s no price tag on your side. You have to re-characterise the status quo’s level of awareness on self-care and explain where the supply is coming from. Who is making these products and distributing them for free? Who is talking about these things online without corporate advertising and influencers?   We’re conflating self-care into beauty products, and that’s not an immediately foregone conclusion.   * We need to deal with Opp’s idea of wellness and mental health, which is more intuitively what self-care is. * While I understand the analysis that companies have the power to define what products dominate the wellness industry, I’m not exactly hearing the incentive of companies to focus on beauty products instead of the therapy apps that Opp says the debate is about. So we still have to clarify why the debate falls more heavily in your context.   We’re kind of explaining the hedonistic treadmill problem without using those terms, unpacking well-established concepts would lend you a lot of credibility here. The analytical focus here is excellent.  It’s a losing battle in arguing on the clash of accessibility if we don’t engage with Dominic’s argument!   * While poor consumers cannot access a lot of these products, more products become more available in the market on Opp's side. What can poor people access on your side in your comparative?   + To take this down, we have to deal with Opp’s analysis on stigma on issues pertaining to mental wellness. We have to explain why the corporate incentive to convert this into aesthetics will dominate instead.   + At best, I can accept this as a good mitigation, but not enough to tip the scales to proposition on the issue of accessibility. So we’re better off concluding with a trade-off analysis here.     - To still win this clash, you can question the quality of these products like online therapy, some of them like BetterHelp do actually more harm than good to the mental health of consumers.   Can we work on speech structure and flagging please!  Good job offering POIs today!  6.15 | | | | | | |