The State-of-the-Art of Case Construction in Parliamentary Debate

Susan Hellbusch
Jennifer Parker
Creighton University

Rationale

Intercollegiate competition in parliamentary debate as governed by the National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) is a fairly new activity that continues to change and evolve every year. Since the organization was founded in 1991, NPDA has grown and developed tremendously to become "the largest parliamentary debating organization in the world" (Knapp & Galizio, 1999, p. xiii). Parliamentary competition exists all over the world, but only recently began in the United States to provide college students with a form of debate that was more receptive to the needs of a public audience than other forms of debate. While watching a parliamentary round, any audience member can actively learn about logic, current events, philosophy, social sciences, or humor. This means that while the NPDA participants can only be college students, the judges can be anyone.

Unfortunately, scarce amounts of quantitative research have been done regarding parliamentary debate. The original purpose of parliamentary debate was to provide a logical and extemporaneous form of debate in which the average well-read college student with no past debate experience could participate (Johnson, 1999, p. 1). It is necessary to see if this goal is being reached, but no such examination exists. The very first speech, the Prime Minister's Constructive (PMC), in a parliamentary round lays the foundation for the entire discussion. An examination of this speech can be used to determine if NPDA is fulfilling its original mission. The speaking manner and format used in parliamentary debate will provide relevant information by which to critically evaluate the components of the Prime Minister's Constructive speech. Finally, the resolution, thesis, criterion, and value used in a Prime Minister constructive will provide the necessary information by which to begin a quantitative analysis of the PMC.

A brief history of NPDA is necessary to clarify the purpose behind the event. Many other forms of debate existed on the collegiate level for decades before the formation of NPDA. The National Debate Tournament (NDT) and the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) are both policy based types of debate that rely heavily on the use of evidence and research. Both NDT and CEDA use only one or two topics for the

entire year, and the emphasis is on "evidence, acceptance of a more rapid delivery style, [and] focus on policy questions" (Wood & Midgley, 1989, p. 15). Significant high school experience is needed to be successful at these policy types of debate, because a heavy debate theory background is essential to success. While Lincoln-Douglas debate is slower, it is also a policy form of debate that requires devotion to research and extensive knowledge of debate theory.

NPDA was created in response to these styles of debate. Parliamentary debate was first offered in 1991 at the United States Air Force Academy. Coaches had determined that there should be a more practical form of debate for college students with no high school experience. In parliamentary debate, high school debate experience is not necessary since the activity was created with the average well-read college student in mind. The well-read competitor is the most successful, because the topic is changed every round. This means that a "well-prepared parliamentary debater should have general understanding of debate rhetorical theory, current evens, social sciences, hard sciences, liberal arts and humanities, and business and economics" (Epstein, 1996, p. 3-4). This shift in focus makes parliamentary debate more educational on a wide variety of topics instead of providing extreme depth in one or two subject areas. The popularity of NPDA rapidly grew as the first national tournament had 52 teams in 1994 and more than two hundred in 1999 (Johnson, 1999). Parliamentary debate also has a different delivery style than policy based forms of debate, because it requires its participants to use an extemporaneous form of delivery. This means that arguments are not scripted for the student; on the contrary, they are delivered fluently in an impromptu fashion.

The first speech of a parliamentary debate round is the Prime Minister's Constructive (PMC). This speech lays the framework for the entire round by determining what the debate will be about and how it will be debated. NPDA has no set rules regarding the format of the PMC. The NPDA constitution does not include any information regarding standards to be used on case theses, criteria, values, or interpretation of resolutions. NPDA does not make any strict rules regarding these case components in order to facilitate a healthy learning environment.

To create an effective PMC, the government team must first evaluate the resolution given to them at the beginning of the round. This resolution can be just a statement or it can be stated in terms of "This House" doing or believing something. Resolutions can be either literal or metaphorical. Within these categories, they can be either questions of fact, value, or policy. Resolutions of fact are "propositions which assert a factual claim or assert a relationship between two objects or concepts." Resolutions

of value "evaluate a single object or compare two objects with respect to some value." Resolutions of policy are most common in parliamentary debate, and they "suggest some action based on evaluation" (Trapp, 1999, p. 15). The government determines how to interpret the resolution into a government thesis by first deciding into what categories the resolution falls. For example, the resolution "This House would make a change" implies that the government team should take some sort of action with a particular body. Therefore this statement is a policy resolution.

The thesis that the government team decides to debate can either be implied in the case itself or explicitly stated. It is usually delivered when the Prime Minister defines the terms of the resolution. The Prime Minister defines the terms of the resolution to crystallize the topic and demonstrate how future argumentation given by the government team will be topical. The thesis changes every round with the resolution, and it can be about anything from a current event to value judgment to a way to change the *status quo.* Since little quantitative research has been done in this area, it is hard to say if competitors are putting the well read standard to use by exploring a variety of topics. It is also not known if competitors are debating cases that are based more in policy, fact or value.

The government team members can use many different types of structures when setting up the PMC as long as they "define the terms of the resolution, prove the resolution true, [and] provide a debatable case" (Knapp & Galizio, 1999, p. 52). Generally, the terms of the resolution are defined at the beginning of the debate. Most government teams define what "This House" should mean in order to make the resolution more clear. By defining "This House," the government team is showing what body will be enacting a policy or an ideal. "This House" serves as an agent of action. No other norms regarding structure exist past definitions. The structure of the PMC can be one that presents a specific proposal and criterion at the beginning, middle, or end of the speech. The speech can contain many contentions and main ideas. Ultimately, the government's goal is to provide a clear and structured case that fulfills all of their burdens.

It is the responsibility of the government team to provide a case that is in debate terminology, *prima facie.* This means that the case must "establish grounds sufficient to make the judgment for which the topic calls" (Gill, 1989, p. 54). Generally, the PMC is the speech where the weighing mechanism for the round is given either implicitly or explicitly. Many teams use a criterion to determine which side should win the round. In logic, criteria are used as grounds or standards by which an argument is proved appropriate or true (Toulmin, 1958, p. 45). Likewise, many debaters use a criterion to make a more concise round that can be weighed more easily.

Common criteria include cost-benefit analysis, utilitarianism, security, well being, and comparative advantage. Some teams present the criterion along with a specific proposal. When a criterion is presented, a definition of its implications is usually helpful but not required. Since no study has been done on criteria in parliamentary debate rounds, it is impossible to tell which weighing mechanisms are used most, which are most successful, or if criteria are usually included in the PMC. This information could be helpful in determining how various criteria should be defined, weighed, and used in future rounds.

Whenever a conflict arises, the root of it is usually over which side is upholding a specific value better or which side's value is better if the two are in conflict. Likewise, in parliamentary debate values are debated in every round despite the type of question that the resolution asks. Some parliamentary teams chose to explicitly state the value they find most important, while other competitors choose to implicitly debate their value through their argumentation in the round. The value in a parliamentary debate round "allows the judge to see by what standard the round should be judged," or if there are two conflicting values in the round, "the debate revolves around which is a more important value" (Knapp & Galizio, 1999, p. 28). Many teams use both a value and a criterion explicitly in the PMC. Other teams state one explicitly and debate the other implicitly. Some commonly debated values include justice, fairness, freedom, and well being. It is usually advantageous for teams to clarify the meaning of their value by offering a definition. Like the criterion, no information regarding which type of values are used is available. This information could be used to see what parliamentary debaters deem important with regard to various topics. For instance, if the value of safety is commonly used, it would imply that parliamentary debate has a great deal of policy debate influence since that is a more common value upheld in cross-examination rounds. This is because most policy debates use human death and suffering impacts in order to prove a position true. However, upholding a variety of values could demonstrate that competitors are adequately fulfilling the goals of an extemporaneous and public style of debate.

While information defining the elements of a PMC exists, no studies regarding how they are used in rounds is available. This information is valuable, because it can show whether or not NPDA is meeting the goals it set out to achieve when first formed. Additionally, conclusions regarding the qualities of a successful PMC could help parliamentary debate progress. The majority of the debate rounds won are opposition, perhaps because it is easier to disprove something than it is to build something up without the use of evidence. Since it is the responsibility of the government to provide a case that is *prima facie,* it necessarily follows that the opposition has more

opportunities to disprove any one element of the case. The opposition only needs to show one element false in order to prove the entire government case invalid. As the NPDA debates strategies to address this problem, information regarding the attributes of a successful PMC could help level the debate playing field. Finally, the structure of the speeches in parliamentary debate is tenuous right now. By bringing light to what is most often done in the PMC, norms can be discovered and created to help every competitor decide what a successful structure is and how it should be executed.

The history behind NPDA is short, but its goals are long-term. By examining the history behind NPDA, the goals and original purpose of making debate more public and accessible to students with no experience can be seen when contrasted with other forms of existing debate. The format of parliamentary debate is easy to follow with an emphasis on extemporaneous delivery. This allows the debate to become more conversational for a public audience. The PMC provides the framework for the round. Since little to no research has been done on the PMC, no information exists concerning norms about topic selection, criteria, values, and structure. This is problematic because research about the PMC can give insightful information into the original intent of NPDA.

Therefore a justification for further research into the PMC has been demonstrated. A special emphasis needs to be put on the evaluation of structure, topic, criterion, and value since these elements are so essential to the entire government case, and the debate round as well.

Research Questions

Based on the previous analysis of academic literature, we arrive at several questions. At their core remain the central issues for investigation; namely, what are students doing in parliamentary debate and is it what was originally intended when the activity was conceived? What strategies will make students more successful and what should students do in terms of case construction if they want their cases to be cutting edge? To begin to answer these questions, the following were proposed.

The first question will allow us to examine the breadth of topics currently being presented as the subject of parliamentary debate rounds.

RQ1: What cases are government teams proposing in the Prime Minister's constructive speech?

The next two questions build upon research question one by again

telling us what kind of cases are being debated. Research question three also will reveal which kind of case is most likely to be competitive.

> **RQ2:** Are government teams most often proposing a case that is a question of fact, value, or policy?
>
> **RQ3:** Which is the most successful case type; a question of fact, value, or policy?

The next question is simply designed to further describe Prime Minister's Constructive speeches and to give us a better understanding of the state-of-the-art.

> **RQ4:** How many contentions are being discussed in the Prime Minister's constructive speech?

Literature in debate suggests that a team should outline a criterion for the round to be adjudicated. Research question five investigates the presence of a criterion, whereas question six further refines that description, determining what criteria are actually presented. Finally, question seven correlates competitive success with the criterion.

> **RQ5:** Do Prime Ministers present a distinct criterion in the PMC as a means for the judge to determine the winner of the round?
>
> **RQ6:** What criteria are most often presented in the Prime Minister's constructive speech?
>
> **RQ7:** When a government team wins a round, what criterion is used most frequently?

Some believe that the value is a critical element of the PMC, while others believe it is unnecessary. These questions will tell us whether teams outline a value in the PMC and what values are most often discussed.

> **RQ8:** Does the PMC usually explicitly include a value?
>
> **RQ9:** When a value is included in the PMC, what is most often presented?

The following question also aims to provide more information about the state of government constructive speeches and, hence, government cases in parliamentary debate, this time by determining who is presented as the agent of action in the PMC.

> **RQ10:** How is "this house" defined in the PMC?

Methodology

Procedures

For this study, questionnaires regarding the Prime Minister's constructive speech in preliminary rounds were distributed to all judges at the 1999 Nebraska Double-Up tournament hosted by Creighton University and Concordia (NE) University held at Creighton University October 1-3, 1999. The pool of judges and debaters represents a convenience sample. The judging pool included coaches, graduate students, law students, former competitors, and faculty members from Creighton and Concordia. Data from six preliminary rounds representing 62 debate teams and approximately 30 schools was analyzed.

Because Creighton will host NPDA nationals in March of 2000 and because there was a great deal of geographic diversity of schools in attendance at this tournament, this sample will reveal a great deal about parliamentary debate. Moreover, because the authors are affiliated with Creighton, judges were easily accessible at this tournament.

Questionnaires were stapled to ballots and judges were asked to complete them after watching the round. Questionnaires were collected at the ballot table. Questionnaires contained eleven items.

Analysis

Participants

At the tournament, 186 questionnaires were distributed. Of those, 140 were returned, representing a response rate of 75%. To insure anonymity, no demographic data were collected.

Data Analysis

The ten research questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The open ended responses for questions 1, 6 ,9, and 10 were content analyzed. Finally, for questions three and seven, cross tabulation was conducted to tabulate success and case type as well as success and criterion.

Results

Coding

Research question one investigated case theses proposed in the PMC.   Initial examination revealed 118 different cases proposed by

government teams. To lend clarity to this data, researchers developed 14 coding categories and grouped cases into the appropriate category. Categories included death penalty, don't know, foreign affairs within other countries, NATO policy, philosophical/value, sports, U.S. court/justice reform, U.S. domestic policy, U.S. economy, U.S. education, U.S. elections, U.S. foreign economic policy, and United Nations policy.

In analyzing research question one, results revealed a great diversity of government case theses. Of these, cases dealing with the United States justice system were most frequently presented (12.86% of all cases), followed by cases focusing on the United States' educational system (11.43% of cases) and finally cases concerning foreign affairs (9.29%) either within other countries or the United States' foreign policy. Case theses as grouped by category are listed below.

Distribution of Thesis Categories (rounded to the second decimal place)

Thesis	%	Thesis	%
Death penalty	3.57%	U.S. economy	5%
Don't know	3.57%	U.S. education	11.43%
Foreign affairs (within other countries)	9.29%	U.S. elections	2.86%
NATO policy	2.14%	U.S. foreign economic policy	6.43%
Philosophical/value based	7.14%	U.S. foreign policy	9.29%
Sports	2.14%	United Nations policy	3.57%
U.S. court/justice reform	12.86%	**Domestic Topics**	**73.58%**
U.S. domestic policy	20%	**Foreign Topics**	**15%**

Research question two asked whether government teams most often propose cases that are questions of fact, value, or policy. Data for research question two revealed that cases on questions of policy were most often presented (56.4% of total cases) followed by questions of value (24.3% of cases) and questions of fact (12.9% of cases).

Results for question three investigated which is the most successful case type; a question of fact, value, or policy. Results were not significant, with resolutions of value winning 47.06% of the rounds resolutions of fact winning 38.89%, and resolutions of policy winning 35.44%.

Research question four examined the number of contentions presented in the Prime Minister's constructive, data revealed that speeches most often contained three (50.7%), four (17.1%), or two (16.4) contentions.

Question five investigated the presence of a criterion in the PMC. Teams usually did include a criterion in the speech (79.3%). Twenty percent of judges reported that the constructive speeches they judged did not include a criterion.

Research question six examined the specific criterion presented. Criteria were quite varied. Cost benefit analysis was the most popular criterion, employed in 27.9% of cases, followed by utilitarianism (5.7%), and well-being (2.9%). However, because twenty per cent of judges reported that the constructive speeches they judged did not include a criterion, in answering item five on the questionnaire, 17.9% of judges did not answer or indicated that they did not know that the government's criterion was. "Other" criteria were used in 43.6% of cases. Those criteria are reported below.

Distribution of Criteria Used (rounded to the second decimal place)

CRITERION	%	CRITERION	%
American welfare	1.43%	Oeo-Political Realism	0.71%
Aristolian Justice	0.71%	Justice/Due Process	3.57%
Autonomy	0.71%	Membership in National Teachers Union	0.71%
Best defended argument	0.71%	No Criterion	20%
Best for Washington DC	0.71%	Number of examples	0.71%
Best upholds value	2.14%	Opposition proves resolution wrong	0.71%
Comparitive Advantage	10.71%	Peace	1.43%
Cost-Benefit Analysis	27.90%	Preference through action	0.71%
Oiplomatice Flexibility	0.71%	Social Benefit	0.71%
Don't Know	2.14%	Social welfare	2.86%
Economic stability	2.86%	Speed	0.71%
Education	2.14%	Upholding UN Charter	0.71%
Equality	2.14%	Utilitarianism	5.70%
Exigence and Saliance	1.43%	Well-being	2.90%
Freedom	1.43%	Winning election	0.71%
Functioning Democracy	1.43%		

Research question seven inquired about the criterion most often used when a government team wins a round. Data did not show one criterion to be significantly more successful than another (CBA won 41.03% of cases, utilitarianism won 50%, well being won 75%).

Question eight asked whether a value was outlined in the PMC. In 37.9% of speeches a value was included, and in 62.1% of speeches one was not included. Question nine investigated the specific values presented.

Well-being was most often used (6.4% of all cases with a value), with justice, fairness, and freedom also being presented often (5.7% of cases, 4.3% of cases, and 2.1% of cases, respectively). A diversity of values was also discovered. These are listed below.

Distribution of Values Used (rounded to the second decimal place)

Value	%	Value	%	Value	%
Choice	0.71%	Freedom	2.10%	No value given	62.14%
Competitiveness	0.71%	Future	0.71%	Peace	1.43%
Cooperation	0.71%	Interest	0.71%	Platonic moral due	0.71%
Diplomacy	0.71%	International stability	1.43%	Quality of life	2.14%
Due Process	0.71%	Justice	5.70%	Safety	1.43%
Economic stability	2.14%	Liberty	0.71%	Social order	0.71%
Education	0.71%	Life	0.71%	Well-being	6.40%
Equality	0.71%	Marriage	0.71%	World betterment	1.43%
Fairness	4.30%				

Question ten examined government teams' definitions of "This House" A definition of "This House" was presented in 87.86% of constructive speeches analyzed. The United States government was the most popular definition (41.4% of all cases) followed by U.S. State (5%), and the people present at the debate (3.6%). Other definitions presented are listed below.

Distribution Definitions of "This House" (rounded to the second decimal place)

This House	%	This House	%	This House	%
American people	5%	International Monetary Fund	0.71%	Republican party	1.43%
CEC	0.71%	Labor unions	0.71%	School boards	0.71%
Center for Disease Control	0.71%	Major league baseball	0.71%	Supreme court	1.43%
Defense Department	0.71%	Military crisis situation	0.71%	Time-Space	0.71%
Democratic party	0.71%	Monaco	0.71%	U.S. Congress	2.86%
Department of Education	0.71%	National Football League	0.71%	U.S. Court System	0.71%
Drug Enforcement Agency	0.71%	National Teacher's Association	0.71%	U.S. Federal Government	41.40%
European Union	1.43%	None given	12.14%	United Nations	2.86%
Federal Commerce Commission	0.71%	North Atlantic Trade Organization	2.86%	United state(s)	5.71%
Federal Reserve	0.71%	People in the room	4.29%	Venezuelan Constitutional Committee	0.71%
Government of India	0.71%	Police Force	0.71%		
International Criminal Court	0.71%	Recreational Investors	0.71%		

Discussion

Results indicate that parliamentary debate is fulfilling its mission as an approachable, audience-friendly style of debate open to students from a variety of backgrounds. This assertion is supported by evidence indicating a diversity of case theses, criteria, and values.

Research question one examined case thesis. The surprising breadth of cases suggests that NPDA does indeed offer something for everyone, both audience and debater. Cases ranged from proposals to militarize the European Union to cases proposing that Major League Baseball should revamp its union. Students seem able to tailor their cases to their own interests and expertise. Moreover, the variety in cases constructed might indicate that "canned" or prepared cases are not a significant problem. Also interesting is the number of judges who indicated that they didn't know what the government was proposing, 3.57%. If a judge cannot determine what proposal he or she has just spent the last 45 minutes listening to, some teams may still need to focus on clarity of case construction.

Conventional wisdom suggests that a speaker should include three or four contentions in a constructive speech to use his or her time effectively. Data from this study supports that assumption.

Analysis of criteria used indicates that CBA was popular, which is logical because cases investigating a question of policy were also popular and this criterion is a standard means by which to evaluate a policy proposal. Results indicate that teams do present a weighing mechanism in the round, and the breadth of criteria discovered may indicate that students are carefully selecting a criterion appropriate for the case being presented. Although well being was successful in 75% of all cases which employed it as a criterion, this criterion was only used four times in rounds at the tournament, so drawing a conclusion based on such limited data would be irresponsible.

However, data did suggest that if a team chooses not to include a criterion on the Prime Minister's constructive speech, that team is not likely to win the round. When teams did not include a criterion, they only won the round 28% of the time. When the criterion was vague, and the judge could not determine what it was or if one was even present, the government team won only 33.3% of the time. Of interest is the clear indication that not presenting a criterion predicates a loss in the round. Clearly the judging fulcrum must be outlined if a government team is to be successful.

Analysis of values outlined in the PMC found that values are excluded more often than they are explicitly included. Perhaps this is

19

because a team's values are often implicit in the case they present. For example, a team who wished to reform the educational system is clearly valuing quality education. Hence, teams may view the inclusion of a value as redundant.

Research question ten, examining definitions of "This House," again found diversity and variety. While the United States Federal Government was a popular definition, data again suggests that teams are operationalizing an agent of action appropriate to the case they are presenting. As membership of the NPDA debates the necessity of including the words "This House" in resolutions for debate, this study indicates that the majority of teams do provide a definition of "this house," again giving further insight into the state-of-the-art.

While these results are both illustrative and interesting, research at a different tournament could yield entirely different results. It is possible that these results are only representative of NPDA in the Midwest. Although teams from all over the country were in attendance, the tournament was heavily influenced by debaters, judges, and resolutions, representative of this region.

Results could also be influenced by the fact that many judges answered more than one questionnaire. Hence, if a judge is mistaken about a questionnaire item (the difference between a question of fact, value, and policy, for example), that could influence the entire data set. Moreover, the study is heavily dependent on judge knowledge and is only valid insomuch as the pool of judges at the tournament is knowledgeable about parliamentary debate. While we have confidence in the coaches and hired judges employed at the Nebraska Double-up, the number of judges who reported that they did not know a team's thesis, criterion, value, or etc., causes to us bring into question the knowledge of either some judges or some debaters.

In grouping case theses by type, no coders were used, so researcher bias is a possibility. In each of the cases where frequencies were calculated, an interesting question arises: when a highly unusual case type, value, or criterion repeats itself is it possible that certain teams have chosen to repeat that which has worked for them in previous rounds? For example, were the three sports cases all proposed by the same team? Was the criterion of exigence and salience, which was twice presented at the tournament, presented by the same team in both rounds?

Overall, results show an exciting present and future for parliamentary debate and reveal it to be a diverse, approachable, and varied form of debate. The state-of-the-art seems a very positive one.

Suggestions For Future Research

While this study provides insightful information into the composition of the Prime Minister's Constructive, it only scratches the surface of a full understanding of parliamentary debate. In the future, more quantitative research should be devoted to a variety of topics concerning parliamentary debate.

For instance, our research indicated only what the competitors preferred to do, because it focused on the Prime Minister's Constructive. In the future, researchers might want to discover what judges and audiences prefer. While we were able to make some conclusions as for what elements a successful case should have, this did not adequately address what the judge prefers, only what they do not prefer, such as not having a criterion.

Additionally, this research focused on only one side of the debate, the government. Further research could be done into the opposition side by examining the structure and elements of the Leader of Opposition's Constructive. Furthermore, rebuttals were not addressed. Research into the structure and persuasive nature of rebuttals might show a different picture than the analysis of constructive speeches only.

Finally, the results of our research showed that some of the judges may not be that familiar with the nature of the activity or the theory behind debate. It would be interesting to survey parliamentary debate judges in order to determine the background and knowledge of the judging pool. In this same manner, it would be interesting to look at the background of the debaters themselves to see if NPDA is fulfilling its original purpose.

Future research might also repeat the study in a different region, or across several tournaments to give a more comprehensive view of the PMC and to address limitations present is this study. While our research showed insight into the Prime Minister's Constructive, there are other elements to a parliamentary debate round. These further research suggestions could lead to a more comprehensive, quantitative view of parliamentary debate.

References

Epstein, S. (1996). What about research: How to be "well read." *Parliamentary debate* 4 (Summer): 3-13.

Gill, A. (1989). Affirmative case approaches. As published in Wood, S. & Midgley, J. (Eds). (1989). *Prima facie: A guide to value debate.* Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Johnson, A. (1999, June). An early history of the NPDA. [Online]. Available: http://www.parlidebate.org/npdahistory.html

Knapp, T. & Galizio, L. (1999). *Elements of Parliamentary Debate: A guide to public arguments.* New York: Longman.

Toulmin, S. (1958). *The uses of argument.* Great Britain: Cambridge.

Trapp, R. (1999, October). Parliamentary debate. [Online]. Available: http://www.parlidebate.org/parliamentary.html

QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR RESEARCH
Please answer the following questions in regard to the round you just judged.

1. What was the thesis of the Prime Minister's constructive speech?
_____

2. Was the Prime Minister's thesis phrased as a question of (circle one)
   a) fact   b) value   c) policy

3. Was the Prime Minister Constructive advocating a specific course of action?   a) yes   b) no

4. How many contentions (main points) did the Prime Minister Constructive have?
a) one   b) two   c) three d) four   e) five   f) six or more

5. Was there a criterion or weighing mechanism outlined in the Prime Minister Constructive?
a) yes   b) no

6. If there was a criterion presented, what was it?
a) Cost-Benefit Analysis b) Utilitarianism   c) well-being
d) security   e) Other (please specify) _____

7. Was there a value outlined in the Prime Minister Constructive?
a) yes   b) no

8. If there was a value presented, what was it?
a) justice   b) fairness   c) freedom   d) well-being
e) other_____

9. How did the Prime Minister Constructive define "This House"?
a) people in the room   b) United States Federal Government
c) U.S. state(s)   d) other _____

10. Who won the round?   a) government   b) opposition

11. What describes you best? (check all that apply)
a) coach   b) former coach   c) hired judge   d) former competitor
e) other_____