| **Student Name:** Sarah Han |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers the subscription model to the advertising model in social media. |
| --- |

| 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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening should focus on what is contentious - realistically, on influence - advertising takes this, because they have more access. Your focus should be on the predatory nature of data collection - and how we need to move away from this.  Set-up   * Fair on incentive to price reasonably. * We should characterise what advertising looks like in the status quo - to explain what goes away. Is it internal, is it external? To what extent does data collection a la Cambridge Analytica go away? * On propaganda - what do you mean by this? Do you also do away with personalisation of content? * At the end of set-up, it is unclear what social media looks like on your side.   Argument 1   * So do we keep personalisation of content? What if someone genuinely wants right wing ‘propaganda’? * Political campaigns likely exist anyways, i.e. Trump might not run targeted advertisements as videos you see in between stories on Instagram, but his profile still exists and you can still choose to follow him. * On the principle justification; is the right you’re upholding of information, or choice, or what? We can’t randomly just throw in a line on a principle. * POI - explain how the incentive gets fulfilled through the subscription fee, as well as analysing how corporate accountability is far more likely to exist on your side. This is an incredibly important argument for Prop to make.   + If a platform fails to meet their expectations regarding privacy, content moderation, or other issues, users can cancel their subscriptions, directly impacting the company's revenue. In contrast, with the advertising model, users are the product, not the customer. While users can still voice concerns, the platform's primary accountability is to its advertisers, not its users. * I think there is an argument to be made re politics, and how it is better when we decouple revenue from engagement - which can disincentivize the spread of misinformation and manipulative content often used for political manipulation or foreign interference. Platforms driven by ad revenue often prioritize engagement metrics, which can be easily exploited by bad actors seeking to spread propaganda or sow discord. This is not the argument you are making at the moment.   Argument 2   * Why can’t further regulations deal with this? Identity checks etc. What is exclusive about this? If it is monetary, this needs to be honed in on more specifically. Why is this such a check against membership?   06:50 - let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers the subscription model to the advertising model in social media. |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good identification - give me the upshot quicker, which is that a subscription fee is an insufficient replacement wrt revenue compared to advertising/status quo. This means data collection and mining STILL happen, or have to happen. Your upshot is that the subscription has to cost more instead. What’s the unique harm here, given you haven’t unpacked access/social change etc. yet? We took roughly a minute and a half to explain this; and it should have been more clearly structured and digestible.  Rebuttal   * Foresight, not future sight… * Most of the harms they spell out re politics, still exist on their side i.e. Trump might not run targeted advertisements as videos you see in between stories on Instagram, but his profile still exists and you can still choose to follow him. They need to explain why this goes away. * Additionally, if they still have personalisation, echo-chambers still form - you can still get caught up in right wing talking points etc. * A lot of their other harms are also easily dealt with - ask them why can’t further regulations deal with this? Identity checks etc. What is exclusive about this? If it is monetary, this needs to be honed in on more specifically. Why is this such a check against membership? * Did we flip both arguments by the end of your rebuttals?   Argument 1   * I buy that this has to be priced higher than Prop says - explain why this is especially true for the developing world + poor. Explain how inclusivity is crucial for social media's role in communication, information sharing, and community building. We jump to the community angle for it, but don’t unpack this enough in great detail. * You need to consider the social change angle here - social movements, especially in authoritarian states, are organised through these mediums; see Arab Spring, BLM etc. Who does Prop lock out from this? * Community isn’t the good being lost out on - it’s information! Link this to the functioning of a democracy; access to information allows citizens to make informed decisions about political issues, candidates, and policies. Explain what happens when information is treated primarily as a commodity controlled by private companies!   There’s also an argument to be made on innovation; the advertising model makes this more likely. Platforms are constantly striving to improve their services and attract users and advertisers, leading to better features, more engaging content, and improved accessibility.  Let’s ask POIs consistently  07:05 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers the subscription model to the advertising model in social media. |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  I don’t get the opening I’m afraid.  Rebuttal   * Why do we have to specify there are four layers? What does this do here? * On privacy - why are subscriptions sufficient to keep these companies going? You need to explain this very clearly, otherwise Opp is able to win over the number of people on social media.   + Point to the success of existing subscription-based platforms like Netflix, Spotify, and various news outlets. Netflix has geographically specific membership fees. These demonstrate that consumers are willing to pay for quality content and ad-free experiences.   + They can also offer tiered models, and have such huge user bases they can benefit from economies of scale. * Community - you need to prove access exists on your side first. Then, explain why the QUALITY of community is higher, because people can choose the social media platform more specific/utile to them, rather than a spread out presence without as much enjoyment. * You can’t wash out poor people - you have to explain why there is more liability to abuse on Opp. Advertising is more likely to lead to a monopoly. Platforms that successfully attract a large user base gain a significant advantage in the advertising market. This can create a network effect where the largest platform becomes increasingly dominant, making it difficult for smaller competitors to gain traction. The winner-takes-all dynamic of the advertising market can lead to a concentration of power and potentially stifle innovation in the long run. This lets you claim social movements/organisation + communities. * On regulation - why don’t they have the capacity?   Extension   * Thesis missing. You’re giving me analysis I don’t know what to do with! * We should characterise what advertising looks like in the status quo - to explain what goes away. Is it internal, is it external? To what extent does data collection a la Cambridge Analytica go away? * On screen-time addiction; so you want less people to be on social media/want to diminish control? The analysis is very tense here. * We must analyse how corporate accountability is far more likely to exist on your side. This is an incredibly important argument for Prop to make. If a platform fails to meet their expectations regarding privacy, content moderation, or other issues, users can cancel their subscriptions, directly impacting the company's revenue. In contrast, with the advertising model, users are the product, not the customer. While users can still voice concerns, the platform's primary accountability is to its advertisers, not its users.   Let’s ask POIs consistently!  07:23 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house prefers the subscription model to the advertising model in social media. |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  They give some analysis re why this is a sufficiently large enough user base + why there are incentives to price well; you have to engage with this. Then, give me the upshot which is that a subscription fee is an insufficient replacement wrt revenue compared to advertising/status quo. This means data collection and mining STILL happen, or have to happen.  Fair on co-opting young people/why this doesn’t change on Prop.  On data privacy - you need to analyse the incentives of companies beyond saying ‘profit’ means they will engage in selling data anyways. How do you deal with this on your side anyways? What’s the comparative - SQ asks you this as a POI and you conveniently wash it out.  Most of the harms they spell out re politics, still exist on their side i.e. Trump might not run targeted advertisements as videos you see in between stories on Instagram, but his profile still exists and you can still choose to follow him. They need to explain why this goes away. Additionally, if they still have personalisation, echo-chambers still form - you can still get caught up in right wing talking points etc.  Extension 1   * On social movements - why didn’t 1st run this, this is a really important argument. In order for this argument to work, you need to be able to justify companies price people out of accessing the platform. The argument is contingent on this. * We need to explain how social movements are contingent on social media for organisation + dissemination of information. The principle angle doesn’t really work - what is the duty these organisations have to the poor (none); but the information and organisational tools present these people do indeed deserve. We gave ZERO examples on this. See Arab Spring, BLM etc. Who does Prop lock out from this? * Good on quantity of platforms. * Link this to the functioning of a democracy; access to information allows citizens to make informed decisions about political issues, candidates, and policies. Explain what happens when information is treated primarily as a commodity controlled by private companies!   Extension 2   * Explain how or why these regulations are more likely to exist because this mass gets angry/this becomes a voting issue.   There’s also an argument to be made on innovation; the advertising model makes this more likely. Platforms are constantly striving to improve their services and attract users and advertisers, leading to better features, more engaging content, and improved accessibility.  This is not a comparative speech - you just wash, don’t disprove and flip.  Let’s ask POIs consistently.  07:14 | | | | | | |