

Rhetorical Constructs for Classroom Debates

Overview

Whatever the format of classroom debating being used – Table Debates, SPontaneous ARgumentation Debates, Showdown Debates, Intelligence Squared Debates – or structured argumentation activity – Shaping Arguments, Refutation Two-Chance, Argumentative Analysis, or many others – there is common language used to introduce or present argumentation. This common language is formed for use by anyone engaged in an academic or public debate into something we call **rhetorical constructs**. Rhetorical constructs can also be called sentence stems or templates, though they have a particular purpose, power, and breadth of application when thought about and taught in the context of argument.

As Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein explore in depth in *They Say, I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*, students must have the access to and facility with the language of argument – its common templates and rhetorical moves – in order to succeed academically, especially in college. The influential argument theorist Stephen Toulmin made a similar, if more allusive, point, in his 1984 book *An Introduction to Reasoning*. There he calls these standard tools of argument construction "tropes" and "linguistic strategies." Though the names may vary somewhat, there is a consensus on the importance of providing students with these commonly needed tools to successfully perform their academic work.

Here, then, are a set of useful rhetorical constructs for students engaged in a debate or structured argumentation activity. One thing to notice: all of the argumentation is referenced in the present tense. This is, in effect, a stylistic choice. It is not incorrect for a debater to reference the other side's argumentation in the past tense ("they said," "they argued that," etc.). What is (at least somewhat) important is that the debaters maintain a consistency of tenses throughout the debate, and keeping everything in the present tense ("they say," "they argue that") seems more dynamic.



Initial Arguments/Case Arguments

>	My name is, a	nd I am arguing that [insert overall
	position]. My first argument is [insert argumentative claim]. [Follow with evidence	
	and reasoning. Avoid using the phrase: "My evidence for this is"	
	Simply begin stating the evidence and reasoning.]	
>	My name is Or	the question [insert debatable issue], I/we
	take the position that [insert overall position]. One reason for this is [insert	
	argumentative claim]. [Follow with eviden	ce and reasoning.]
>	My second argument is [insert argument	ative claiml. [Follow with evidence and
	reasoning.]	
>	Another reason that I/we believe that [insert overall position] is that [insert argumentative claim.] [Follow with evidence and reasoning.]	
Count	ter-Arguments	
>	My name is, a	and I will be responding to the other side's
	case [or opening] arguments. They first argue that [insert their first argumentative claim.] I/We disagree with that. [Insert counter-argument, starting with the claim,	
	then following with the evidence and reason	ning.]
_		
>	A second reason we disagree with their claim that [repeat their argumentative claim is the content to the content their argumentative claim is the content to t	
	is that [insert second counter-argument.]	
>	Also, [insert second counter-argument.]	
	, [
>	Secondly, [insert second counter-argument	t.]
>	My name is, a	and I will be responding to the other side's
	case [or opening] arguments. They first argue that [insert their first argumentative claim,] but their evidence to support that claim is weak. The evidence says that	
	ciaim, j but their evidence to support tha	t claim is weak. The evidence says that



[insert interpretation or reasoning of the evidence that exposes a flaw or weakness.] It doesn't say that [insert their interpretation or reasoning of the evidence.] They haven't supported this claim which means that [statement of the impact that this has on support for their overall position.]

- ➤ I will be addressing the [affirmative or negative] team's arguments. First, they say [insert argumentative claim.] That isn't true. [Insert counter-argument, starting with the claim, then following with the evidence and reasoning.]
- They also argue that [insert their second argumentative claim.] But their evidence doesn't support this claim. Their evidence would need to say [insert reasoning that would apply to evidence that is aligned, credible, sufficient to support their claim.] It doesn't say that. It actually says [insert reasoning that shows that the evidence is not aligned, credible, or sufficient.] This means that this argument isn't true that therefore [statement of the impact that this has on support for their overall position.]

Rebuttal

- ➤ We are/I am arguing that [insert original argumentative claim.] They counter-argue that [insert counter-claim], but that isn't true: [insert refutation.]
- ➤ We are/I am arguing that [insert original argumentative claim.] They make the argument that [insert counter-claim]. However, our original evidence denies this [or addresses this.] [Insert reasoning to show how this is true and why the original evidence is better than the evidence for the counter-argument.]
- They also make the counter-argument that [insert second counter-claim.] This is also not really true. [Insert refutation.] What this means is that [repeat original argumentative claim,] which is very important because [connect the argumentative claim back to the overall position, emphasizing the importance of this argument to proving the position.]



➤ Then they say that [insert second counter-claim] but without much if any evidence. [Reason through how the evidence for the original argument is more convincing – more aligned, more credible, more sufficient – than the evidence for the counter-argument.] We are proving that [repeat original argumentative claim.] This means we win the debate since [connect the argumentative claim back to the overall position, emphasizing the importance of this argument to proving the position.]