



Important Note: This document is provided for explanatory purposes only. Its content is not intended to interpret, augment or in any way supersede NCFCA [Event Rules](#) or [League Policies](#).

Lincoln-Douglas Value Debate

Judge Helps

Document Content

Distinctives of Value Debate

[What to Expect from Experienced Value Debaters](#)

[What NOT to Expect of Value Debaters](#)

Assigning Speaker Points

Choosing a Winner in Value Debate?

[Thoughts to Consider](#)

[What NOT to consider](#)

Distinctives of Value Debate

Value debate challenges students to think critically about the ideals held by individuals and societies. It seeks to discover which values should drive decision-making rather than advocate for a particular course of action. For example, the question of the environment for value debate is not “what should we do to protect the environment?” but rather “should we value the environment above the economy?”

Debaters use different ways to structure cases and arguments, but you can anticipate that many rounds will feature the following categories of argumentation.

- **Precise definitions:** The words in a value resolution often have different nuances of meaning, and precise definitions may be required to support an argument. Therefore, the selection and quality of key definitions can be important.
- **Hierarchy of values:** Debaters will appeal to values or ideals that they will contend their side of the resolution best supports.
- **Criterion or standard:** Debaters may offer a defined way to help explain, measure or evaluate which arguments best support the preeminent value they have identified.

What to Expect from Experienced Value Debaters

- **Solid argumentation:** Debaters should explain the logical connections between their assertions and the resolution. They may do this through examples, analogies, precepts of philosophy, cited sources, their own analysis, etc.
- **Clash:** Debaters should engage with their opponent's most important arguments, and explain why their own arguments are superior. They may legitimately decide to agree with their opponent on some issues, but they should also identify areas of disagreement and refute their opponent's positions regarding those points.

What NOT to Expect of Value Debaters

- **Perfect proof:** Positions on desirable but competing values cannot be absolutely proven as right or wrong, and debaters should not be expected to achieve complete proof for their position. They are responsible for proving their side of the resolution is more valid as a general principle.
- **A plan:** Value debate should not propose a plan for change but rather a defense of what should be most highly esteemed between two choices.
- **Answers to every argument:** With limited time, debaters must often choose which arguments to prioritize, so ignoring or "dropping" a lesser argument that is outweighed by a more important one should not necessarily be considered a losing move.

Assigning Speaker Points

Speaker points are awarded to each speaker individually on the ballot. There are six categories in which debaters can earn speaker points, and we have a [Speaker Point Rubric and Guide](#) available to help judges decide which scores best fit what they see from each debater.

Speaker point totals do not determine who wins a round. They are used for a separate set of awards in each tournament, and when necessary they are used to break ties between teams with equal win-loss records. Therefore, we ask that judges refer to the speaker point rubric and try to score as accurately as possible.

Choosing a Winner in Value Debate

Every round is different, and the deciding factors will vary. In close rounds, even experienced judges can disagree about who won, meaning that evaluating a debate round comes down to making judgment calls. We simply ask that you decide who was most persuasive to you. Considering the following factors may help you evaluate the round in a fair and reasonable way.



Important Note: This document is provided for explanatory purposes only. Its content is not intended to interpret, augment or in any way supersede NCFCA [Event Rules](#) or [League Policies](#).

Thoughts to Consider

- **Reasoning:** Which debater made the best logical connections between key arguments and the values highlighted as most important in the round?
- **Focus on the resolution:** Which debater best addressed the central question(s) of the resolution?
- **Clarity:** Which debater was easier to follow and understand?
- **Quality of arguments:** Which debater presented the best quality and depth of arguments in favor of their position?
- **Support:** Which debater provided the best support for critical points? When debaters support their arguments by referring to expert sources, look for a verbal citation and direct quotation so that you can judge the quality and accuracy of the evidence.
- **Clash:** Which debater best addressed and refuted the opponent's arguments?
- **Proof of principles:** Which debater best supported their side of their resolution as a general principle by the end of the round?
- **Conduct and ethics:** A debater who plainly behaves in a deceitful or rude manner toward an opponent should not be granted a win.

What NOT to consider

- **Personal opinions or biases:** Remember that your evaluation should be based on what the debaters said in the round rather than on what you personally believe about a topic. Approach the topic with an open mind; debaters have been assigned their sides, and they debate on both sides throughout the tournament. Be open to being persuaded on either side of the debate. Feel free to apply a filter of common sense, but try not to give debaters credit for any arguments that they didn't actually make, and don't dismiss an argument only because you do not personally agree with it.
- **Partiality:** Set aside partiality based on competitor name recognition, known levels of experience, appearance, etc.
- **Late arguments:** Debaters should present all of their main assertions and lines of argumentation in the constructive speeches. Therefore, judges should set aside any completely new lines of argumentation that were raised in rebuttal speeches because the opponent is deprived of an adequate opportunity to respond.
- **Speaker points:** It is possible for a less eloquent and/or less experienced speaker to win a round based on critical points of argumentation but be ranked lower in speaker points.