| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House supports the use of fear to instill values in children |
| --- |

| 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:  Let’s illustrate this - what do we mean by consequence, what do we mean by teaching them valuable things? Give me examples!  Set-up   * Good work clarifying what extreme iterations of this debate are not about! We can provide more details rather than saying prison cells; is it threats of punishment like time-outs or grounding, is it verbal warnings, is it scary stories and characters? * We need to do more world-building! Establish how this is a debate about early childhood education - for instance, that this is about teaching them that lying is bad, or not to put mud in their mouth. Make it about a specific situation or circumstance; for instance, that this is about moral values, or certain critical beliefs in the very early years of childhood learning. * What is the counterfactual? What does Opp bench have to defend?   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? * We need to first characterise what children are like! Why is this the only way to teach them?   + Before children develop sophisticated language skills, complex explanations about toxicity or danger are often ineffective. Fear, being a primal emotion, transcends language.   + For instance, young children, especially toddlers and preschoolers, are inherently curious and explore the world through their senses, including taste. This makes them particularly vulnerable to ingesting harmful substances. They might not register reasoning and explanation. * Why can the counterfactual not achieve this? Why can’t parents reason with their kids? Why can’t they explain that lying is bad, or that stealing is bad? * On crime - good work grounding this, but we can provide a greater range of actions/behaviours! Maybe they become more moral people/less likely to be bad to other people? We don’t have to jump to crime. * What is the impact of this? What kinds of actions/behaviour does your side avoid that they get? Give examples!   Did we consider what closing could run when choosing this case strategy + line? They could make it about the inability of young children to understand language based reasoning!  04:53  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Giselle Yap |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House supports the use of fear to instill values in children |
| --- |

| 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is our set of rhetorical questions achieving? Is this proving anything? What value is this adding? Our opening should be clear and efficient, rather than open-ended?  Set-up   * What are these other things? What is the distinction between aggression on your side and the fear that they support? * Slow and patient - encouragement; these are good illustrations of what your side can support; how does this interact with the aggression we talked about earlier?   + Why will kids listen to their parents/why does this work? Why will they be more accepting? We need to analyse why this is true.   Why is understanding these values so important + why is it possible at such a young age? Explain why parents are able to talk their children through circumstances, why they internalise it, why these lessons stay with them?  Rebuttal   * Effective learning of values; sure they link it to negative consequences - but why is this ineffective? It may be a negative time, but why is this bad?   + Why is this trauma bad? What does it lead to? We could analyse how fear makes learning worse for children - and hence why this harm is a metric for violating freedom. Instilling fear in children can create lasting psychological trauma, leading to anxiety, phobias, and other mental health issues. * We never explain why this will be internalised in the way you claim. Explain WHY this will be done in a harmful way; fear in and of itself is not bad; you have to characterise it to be bad.   Our time management is off - did we ever get a chance to get into our arguments?  We could analyse how fear makes learning worse for children - and hence why this harm is a metric for violating freedom. Instilling fear in children can create lasting psychological trauma, leading to anxiety, phobias, and other mental health issues.  We could impact this to harm the parent-child relationship - children could withdraw and start disliking their parents.  05:03  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Valerie Shek |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House supports the use of fear to instill values in children |
| --- |

| 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:  We need to start with an actual hook, rather than going into a direct response; you can make this response INTO a hook, and that would be fine, but we need a hook. Use your opening strategically!  Why wouldn’t it occur in this way? Explain why parents are good actors, and have incentives to do this well - we just assert it to be true!  We need to do more world-building! We’re missing out on controlling the debate through strategic observations - establish how this is a debate about early childhood education - for instance, that this is about teaching them that lying is bad, or not to put mud in their mouth. Make it about a specific situation or circumstance; for instance, that this is about moral values, or certain critical beliefs in the very early years of childhood learning.  Rebuttal   * Explain WHY children are more likely to respond to fear based reasoning; characterise the way in which children work. For instance, explain how before children develop sophisticated language skills, complex explanations about toxicity or danger are often ineffective. Fear, being a primal emotion, transcends language.   + We hint at this analysis by referencing fight or flight, but aren’t actually unpacking and explaining this + questioning the comparative they present. * Why doesn’t this fear go too far, and develop into trauma? Explain why the negative consequences won’t lead to trauma; we need to engage with the harms they push on their side. * On being influenced through external sources; don’t concede here! The point is that fear becomes overridden as you grow older and can reason for yourself - which is why trauma doesn’t last. * Why can the counterfactual not achieve this? Why can’t parents reason with their kids? Why can’t they explain that lying is bad, or that stealing is bad? * What is the impact of this? What kinds of actions/behaviour does your side avoid that they get? Give examples!   We’re missing weighing + strategic observations; what do all of the above responses mean in the context of OO’s case?  Did we consider what closing could run when choosing this case strategy + line? They could make it about the inability of young children to understand language based reasoning!  Don’t just stop speaking - give me a proper conclusion!  05:06  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Angela Qian |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House supports the use of fear to instill values in children |
| --- |

| 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:  Make the opening about trauma, and unpack how this hurts young children - we never explain why this will be internalised in the way you claim.  Explain WHY this will be done in a harmful way; fear in and of itself is not bad; you have to characterise it to be bad. Use this to spell out how this hurts children, and then move on.  Rebuttal   * Good work analysing how trauma occurs; you need to impact it. Why is this trauma bad? Why is it long-term? What is the impact here? * We could analyse how fear makes learning worse for children - and hence why this harm is a metric for violating freedom. Instilling fear in children can create lasting psychological trauma, leading to anxiety, phobias, and other mental health issues. * On development - why and how does this happen on your side? What is the comparative? Why will kids listen to their parents/why does this work? Why will they be more accepting? We need to analyse why this is true.   Argument 1   * Good work explaining how reactions to fear occur; good impacting here too. Analyse why this is true!   + How old are these children?   + In which ways are the parents explaining this to them/or have to do so in Opp’s world? * Why is understanding these values so important + why is it possible at such a young age?   + Explain why parents are able to talk their children through circumstances, why they internalise it, why these lessons stay with them? * Why do patience and knowledge work when teaching a 5 year old? What are these lessons, how do they apply them? Capacity to do this exists, likelihood and implementation analysis are missing. * We could impact this to harm the parent-child relationship - children could withdraw and start disliking their parents.   We’re missing weighing + strategic observations; what do all of the above responses mean in the context of OG’s case?  05:14  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House supports the use of fear to instill values in children |
| --- |

| 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:  Your opening should tell me what your path to entry is; don’t say ‘the clash I observed’ - but rather phrase it like: opening spends time talking about whether fear traumatises you and shuts you down, or if it’s the only thing that sticks with kids; they largely just assert this; I’m going to be the first person in the round to tell you what the nature of children is, why reasoning can’t work, and why this won’t end up traumatising kids.  We need to do more world-building! We’re missing out on controlling the debate through strategic observations - establish how this is a debate about early childhood education - for instance, that this is about teaching them that lying is bad, or not to put mud in their mouth. Make it about a specific situation or circumstance; for instance, that this is about moral values, or certain critical beliefs in the very early years of childhood learning.  Good work recognising you need to characterise children!   * Good on realistic obedience levels; go further and characterise the way in which children work. For instance, explain how before children develop sophisticated language skills, complex explanations about toxicity or danger are often ineffective. Fear, being a primal emotion, transcends language.   + OG only hints at this analysis by referencing fight or flight, but aren’t actually unpacking and explaining this + questioning the comparative they present. * POI: I will await your response; but the growing up response does work.   + Why doesn’t this fear go too far, and develop into trauma? Explain why the negative consequences won’t lead to trauma; we need to engage with the harms they push on their side. The point is that fear becomes overridden as you grow older and can reason for yourself - which is why trauma doesn’t last.   Echo-chamber; this normally has negative connotations, so don’t use this; say it’s reinforced or internalised instead. Why can the counterfactual not achieve this? Why can’t parents reason with their kids? Why can’t they explain that lying is bad, or that stealing is bad? What is the impact of this? What kinds of actions/behaviour does your side avoid that they get? Give examples!  This is a job well done! We need to spend more time explaining why the contributions we’re making put us above the opening half; the strategic comparisons after each contribution are missing!  05:15  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sophia Tan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This House supports the use of fear to instill values in children |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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 opening, but spell out why this is the big chunk that the rest of the debate misses out on; is it that fear debilitates, and means that when you end up in that situation - because that is inevitable for young kids - it actually hurts rather than helps? Spell out how the other teams missed out on this - this strategic commentary is missing!  Where is your signposting? What is the structure of this speech?  Rebuttal   * Why are they slaves to these values? In which ways are the parents explaining this to them/or have to do so in Opp’s world? The crux is that you must explain WHY this will be done in a harmful way; fear in and of itself is not bad; you have to characterise it to be bad. Use this to spell out how this hurts children, and then move on.   Where do these shades of gray come from? Why is fearing the same thing a bad thing? I don’t understand this point I’m afraid?  Is it true that we learn this in everyday life, or do these core values actually come from this early childhood learning by parents?   * We could analyse how fear makes learning worse for children - and hence why this harm is a metric for violating freedom. Instilling fear in children can create lasting psychological trauma, leading to anxiety, phobias, and other mental health issues.   Why does curiosity matter? Why is this unique, exclusive, and debate winning?  How does your side achieve better values? What even are these values? What is the comparative? Where does burn-out come from?  Our extension needs to be spelled out and justified like every other argument!  05:14  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |