Debate

Description	Using a debate to help students understand argument and ethical and sustainability issues
Task Type	Tutorial Activity or Assessment
Time	20 minutes for debate + 10 minutes for review
Level	Introductory or Development
Class Size	Any class size but will work best in class size of less than 30
Learning Outcomes	At the end of this activity students should be able to: ✳ Make an argument for or against a particular point of view ✳ Evaluate the arguments of others ✳ Understand the concept of counterarguments ✳ Apply ethical/sustainability theories to help make an argument
Graduate Capabilities Demonstrated	✳ Critical thinking (developing an argument based on appropriate, substantiated sources, critical questioning) ✳ Communication skills (presenting, influencing) ✳ Professional judgment (evaluating information sources, developing and analysing arguments, judging arguments)
Method	Students are put into two groups of 3. Three argue for the point of view and three argue against. Lecturer acts as adjudicator. The rest of the class act as the "jury". Jury is provided with the template given below. They are required to evaluate the arguments made by each team. Team A – Person 1 presents the argument for the topic (2 min) Team B – Person 1 presents the argument against the topic (2 min) Team A – Person 2 presents further arguments for the topic and argues

	against some of the arguments made by Team B (3 min) Team B – Person 2 presents further arguments against the topic and argues against some of the arguments made by Team A (3 min) Jury is allowed to ask questions of the two teams (5 minutes) Team B – Person 3 sums up their arguments against the topic (2 min) Team A – Person 3 sums up their arguments against the topic (2 min) Jury votes on who wins the debate.
Concluding Activity	"Jury" discusses their evaluation of the arguments OR hand in their evaluations which can be assessed.
Assessment	Template provided below can be marked as assessment. Debate itself can also be marked as assessment.
Tips	Ideas for topics (many of these provided by Jenny Grant of ACU). These topics are based on ethical or sustainability issues. ✱ Affirmative action is a form of discrimination. ✱ A little overstatement in advertising is expected and is not a question of ethics. ✱ Initiatives such as the UN Global Compact and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) will do more to promote corporate social responsibility than legislative measures. ✱ Any case of justifiable whistle blowing will be a case of heroic action. ✱ Ethical trading is for idealists not business managers. ✱ All people should have the right of free speech. ✱ Integrity in management consulting is a contradiction in terms. ✱ Globalisation is good for developing countries. ✱ CEO's get paid too much. ✱ Insider trading should be legalised. ✱ The Internet should be governed. ✱ The Government should stop spending money on new roads and invest in public transport instead. ✱ Carbon trading schemes are unethical.

Student Instructions	Students participating in the debate are provided with the method above. Students are asked to research a particular topic and argue for or against the statement.
Additional Materials	Template for jury to use in evaluating the arguments made by each team. Rubric for evaluating debate.

Evaluating Arguments Presented in the Debate (Jury template)

TOPIC	
ARGUMENTS FOR THE TOPIC Choose what you consider the best three arguments in favour of the topic. How were they substantiated?	ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE TOPIC Choose what you consider the best three arguments against the topic. How were they substantiated?
Were there any arguments made for the topic that you consider based on poor facts, not ethical/sustainable or not well substantiated?	Were there any arguments made against the topic that you consider based on poor facts, not ethical/sustainable or not well substantiated?

Rubric for Evaluating a Debate

Criterion	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
Organisation of Debate as a Team	• provides little evidence of the ability to develop an organized debate as a team	• is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas as a team	• develops and organizes ideas satisfactorily as a team	• develops ideas clearly, organizes them logically, and connects them with appropriate transitions from one team member to the next	• develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically, and connects them with clear transitions from one team member to the next
Justification of their side of the argument	• fails to present and justify their side of the argument	• offers little support to justify their side of the argument	• presents and justifies their position and argues against the position of the opposing team	• clearly presents and justifies their side of the argument while arguing against the contrary views of the opposing team	• effectively supports their side of the argument with well-reasoned, integrated arguments • able to effectively argue against the other teams points
Verbal Debating Skills	• fails to engage with the audience	• limited engagement with the audience	• engages with the audience at a superficial level	• engages well with the audience	• engages effectively and creatively with the audience
Ethical issues and/or sustainability issues embedded in argument	• fails to deal with the ethical or sustainability issue of the topic	• limited embedding of the sustainability or ethical issues in making their arguments	• includes arguments from a sustainability or ethical viewpoint	• effectively argues from a sustainable or ethical viewpoint	• is able to convince the audience of the ethical and sustainability issues of their viewpoint