

# Advanced CX Debate

**Judge Adaptation**

## Purpose of this Presentation

1. To understand why adaptation matters
2. To identify the various types of judges you may encounter in CX Debate
3. To analyze vocabulary that will help demystify judge paradigms
4. To utilize information about different types of judges to prepare for rounds

## Why Judge Adaptation Matters

1. Because you're learning to persuade – the judges provide feedback on your effectiveness
2. Because not all judges are looking for the same thing in a round
3. Because your ability to persuade is audience-dependent
4. Because some judges are “regulars” on your circuit
5. Because the judges sign the ballot and assign your speaker points

# Types of Judges

**Tabula Rasa** – “blank slate”

**Policy Maker** – evaluating the efficacy of your policy proposal

**Stock Issues** – traditional debate, prioritizes foundational elements of debate

**Kritikal** – interested in philosophical applications and social implications of the resolution

**Games-player** – will entertain different types of arguments (theory, traditional, critical, real-world, parallel worlds).

**Lay Judges** – volunteers who may or may not know a lot about the event

# Tabula Rasa



## Paradigm:

“I’m a blank slate”

Will not finish arguments or assume impacts for you.

Will not make inferences from things you say

**Example:** Former debaters, may be college students or debate coaches.

## How to Adapt:

Follow-through with your arguments

Verbalize the impacts of your arguments

If you want the judge to consider it - don’t just mention it, tell them why it matters and how that should impact their decision in the round.

**Example:** If the other team drops the Topicality argument, you have to tell the judge that they dropped it, why dropping it matters in the round, and why you’ve won Topicality on the ballot.

# Policy Maker



## Paradigm:

Wants the focus of the round to be on the affirmative plan, it's efficacy, and workability.

Is interested in real-world arguments about public policy.

**Example:** Former CX debaters, may be college students or debate coaches; current professionals in public policy (city council members, school board members, politicians); political science majors/professors.

## How to Adapt:

AFF - focus on how great and viable your plan is and how awful the world is going to be if we don't enact your plan. Do ALL OF THE work when researching your plan, have an answer for every attack.

NEG - take out the affirmative plan! If you run a counter plan it should be unconditional and a viable alternative to the plan with a clear net benefit.

**Example:** May entertain funding arguments ran against plan that are real-world/reasonable.

Will listen to counter-plans as legitimate alternatives to the affirmative plan.

# Stock Issues

## Paradigm:

Will tend to prefer NO SPREADING and will dock speaker points

At the end of the round they WILL vote on one or more Stock Issue. Period.

AFF: has to win ALL 5 stock issues

NEG: only has to win 1 stock issue

**Example:** Older coaches, coaches from smaller conferences, ex-debaters who debated Stock Issues



## How to Adapt:

Language EVERY argument you run in terms of which stock issue it addresses: Significance, Harms, Inherency, Topicality, Solvency

## Example:

If you win T and that's the only argument you win, you could win their ballot.

***NOTE:** They typically will vote on either Topicality or Solvency... but have been known to vote on other stock issues as well.*

# Kritik Judge



## Paradigm:

Primarily concerned with debaters as young advocates.

Will listen to philosophical challenges to the resolution and to the affirmative plan; meta analysis of the arguments and the debate space.

Interested in social implications of the debate

**Example:** Younger judges, college students; ex-kritikal debaters; debate camp instructors/lab leaders; philosophy/social science/women's studies majors/professors.

## How to Adapt:

Run Kritikal affirmatives

Run Kritiks on the Neg

KNOW THE PHILOSOPHY/ER you are quoting.

Research commonly used kritikal arguments and prepare answers to them ahead of time.

**Example:** Cap K, Frege, & Foucault are welcome here!





# Games Player

## Paradigm:

Interested in Debate theory arguments.

Will listen to unconventional arguments or ways of debating.

Creativity may be appreciated.

**Example:** Coaches, former CX debaters. Typically younger.

## How to Adapt:

Don't panic or accuse your opponents of cheating when they try something unconventional.

You can try running contradictory arguments here. It might work for this judge.

Try out those unconventional arguments you've been holding back.

Be sure to run FULL arguments, this judge still wants to hear the analysis and the impacts.

**Example:** Will entertain "competing worlds" arguments; impact turns.



# Lay Judges (a.k.a. Parent volunteers/bus drivers)



## Paradigm:

They may or may not have ever judged before.

They might be a professional (attorney, politician, teacher/professor, etc.)

They are NOT acquainted with debate jargon.

They will NOT flow the round.

**Example:** the mother of a member of the host team; the state representative who lives in the host school's district.

## How to Adapt:

Adapt your language away from debate jargon and toward commonly used language.

DO. NOT. SPREAD.

DO. NOT. RUN. THEORY.

**Example:** “The affirmative has failed to show how their plan will solve the problems they have identified in our current world related to cyber security. In addition, we, the negative team, have demonstrated that their plan will actually cause more harm than good by deteriorating our current relations with our allies.”

# It's NEVER the judge's fault that you lost a ballot

1. Your job is to make good, understandable arguments for your case.
2. Your judge can only “hear” the language(s) they speak.
3. Your judge can only judge from their experience level.
4. You are the one trying to learn and grow in this activity.
5. Exposure to a varied judging pool in the Fall and early spring is the BEST preparation for advancing at state and national tournaments.
6. NEVER disrespect a judge because they are the “wrong type.” Every type of judge pushes you to learn your craft better.

