

# 「113 年全國高級中等學校英語辯論比賽—區域賽與全國賽」實施計畫

## 一、目的

- (一) 透過英語辯論比賽，深化學生英語表達及邏輯思辨能力，培養國際溝通長才。
- (二) 辦理全國賽事活動，提供各地師生跨區校際交流與觀摩英語辯論機會。

## 二、辦理單位

- (一) 指導單位：教育部國民及學前教育署。
- (二) 主辦單位：國立臺灣師範大學英語學系。
- (三) 承辦學校：臺中市立西苑高級中學（全國）、桃園市立武陵高級中學（北區）、臺中市立西苑高級中學（中區）、國立臺南女子高級中學（南區）、國立羅東高級中學（東區）。

## 三、辯論型式

- (一) 政策性英語辯論（原有辯論型式）
- (二) 本辯論以政策研究為導向，辯士須具有較進階的思辨技巧及運用策略，因此較適合已具備相關培訓或參賽經驗、英文程度介於中高級至高級的學生，且對法學、公共政策、政治學等領域有興趣者。
- (三) 公共論壇英語辯論（111 年修正之辯論型式）
- (四) 本辯論為修正版公共論壇英語辯論，須提出理由及資料以支持己方主張，但無須著墨政策本身，同時也准予較彈性的模式，讓辯士在比賽進行時進行團隊合作，因此較適合對英語辯論較不熟悉或較無經驗或英文程度介於中級至中高級的學生。

## 四、參加對象

### (一) 區域賽事

#### 1. 本賽事北中南東四區域劃分為下：

北區區域賽僅限北部地區（新北市、台北市、桃園市）學校參與。

中區區域賽僅限中部地區（新竹縣、新竹市<sup>1</sup>、苗栗縣、台中市、彰化縣、南投縣、雲林縣）學校參與。

南區區域賽僅限南部地區（嘉義縣、嘉義市、台南市、高雄市、屏東縣）學校參與。

東區區域賽僅限東部地區（基隆市、宜蘭縣、花蓮縣、台東縣）參與。

離島地區學校不在此限，得因交通便利性或住宿方便性，自行選擇區域參加。

#### 2. 各區公私立高級中等學校為主（國際學校九年級至十二年級視為高中生），參加政策性及公共論壇辯論比賽之隊伍。

#### 3. 各區域各賽制皆分別以十六隊為限。超過十六隊，以抽籤方式決定參賽隊伍。

#### 4. 各校在評估校內學生能力及需求後，報名該校所屬區域賽事。每校每一賽制最多可報名一隊。

#### 5. 主辦單位將優先錄取報名所屬區域賽事之學校隊伍；如該區域賽任一賽制報名隊數未達 8 隊<sup>2</sup>或為奇數時，處理方式依序如下：

(1) 承辦學校可多報名一隊。

(2) 若承辦學校不報第二隊，開放該區域賽已報名任一賽制之學校報名第二隊。若欲報名第二隊之校數超過該區所需之最低隊伍數，主辦單位將抽籤決定。

(3) 若該區域賽已報名之學校未能報名第二隊，此時若有其他區域賽相同賽制之報名隊數為奇數或其他區域賽任一賽制之報名隊伍可出第二隊時，主辦單位得以協調兩區區域參賽隊伍，使其皆為 8 隊以上的偶數隊。

#### 6. 參加政策性及公共論壇辯論比賽之隊伍，須由兩小隊（即小隊一和小隊二）組成，每一小隊分包含兩位辯士，並至多可備取兩位辯士，即每校可報名四至六

<sup>1</sup> 為均衡各區參賽學校數量，本賽事將新竹縣/市劃分至中區。

<sup>2</sup> 為避免參賽學校指派評審評及自己學校隊伍，區域賽各賽制之參賽隊伍數須達八隊以上。

- 人，含四位參賽辯士及至多兩位備取辯士。不符合本規定之隊伍無法報名參賽。
7. 已於歷年「全國賽」同一賽制中獲得「最佳辯士」獎項者，仍可再次報名參賽，爭取團體獎，但不具角逐個人獎之資格。
  8. 參加政策性及公共論壇辯論比賽之隊伍，每校參賽指導教師至少一位，並須針對每支報名隊伍指派一位英文教師全程擔任比賽當天評審（有評審經驗者為佳）。指導教師、評審教師及參賽隊伍隊長請務必準時並全程參加賽前會議。

## (二) 全國賽事

1. 獲選本賽事北、中、南、東區域賽之優勝隊伍，將具有全國賽參賽資格。
2. 若某賽制三區優勝隊伍總和未達 12 隊，將由主辦單位依照該賽制三區獲得評審團獎隊伍之參賽表現決定剩餘晉級全國賽之隊伍（決選方式見比賽規則-評分及晉級方式）。
3. 參賽選手須同區域賽正取與備取辯士，若因特殊正當理由（「原參加辯士能力不足而更換辯士」非正當理由）需更換辯士，請於報名表上註明理由並出示相關證明。
4. 已於歷年「全國賽」同一賽制中獲得「最佳辯士」獎項者，仍可再次報名參賽，爭取團體獎，但不具角逐個人獎之資格。
5. 參加政策性及公共論壇辯論比賽之隊伍，每校參賽指導教師至少一位，並須針對每支報名隊伍指派一位英文教師全程擔任比賽當天評審（有評審經驗者為佳）。

## 五、 辯題

### 政策性辯論

RESOLVED: The Taiwanese government should institute the mental health leave for secondary school students.

### 公共論壇辯論

RESOLVED: Media outlets bear a greater responsibility than viewers in combating sensationalism.

## 六、 報名時間及方式

- (一) 北區賽事資訊：113 年 4 月 27 日（六），假武陵高中（330 桃園市桃園區中山路 889 號）舉行，報名期限即日起至 113 年 3 月 12 日（二）下午五時，請於線上填妥報名資料（網址），任何報名訊息異動，自行請在 113 年 4 月 16 日（二）下午五時報名系統關閉前完成。
- (二) 中區賽事資訊：113 年 4 月 20 日（六），假西苑高中（407 臺中市西屯區西苑路 268 號）舉行，報名期限即日起至 113 年 3 月 12 日（二）下午五時，請於線上填妥報名資料（網址），任何報名訊息異動，自行請在 113 年 4 月 9 日（二）下午五時報名系統關閉前完成。
- (三) 南區賽事資訊：113 年 5 月 4 日（六），假臺南女中（700011 臺南市中西區大埔街 97 號）舉行，報名期限即日起至 113 年 3 月 12 日（二）下午五時，請於線上填妥報名資料（網址），任何報名訊息異動，自行請在 113 年 4 月 30 日（二）下午五時報名系統關閉前完成。
- (四) 東區賽事資訊：113 年 4 月 13 日（六），假羅東高中（265 宜蘭縣羅東鎮公正路 324 號）舉行，報名期限即日起至 113 年 3 月 12 日（二）下午五時，請於線上填妥報名資料（網址），任何報名訊息異動，自行請在 113 年 4 月 2 日（二）下午五時報名系統關閉前完成。
- (五) 全國賽事資訊：待區域賽後另行通知各區獲選代表隊伍。

## 七、 比賽時間及地點

- (一) 北區 113 年 4 月 27 日（六）—武陵高中（330 桃園市桃園區中山路 889 號）。
- (二) 中區 113 年 4 月 20 日（六）—西苑高中（407 臺中市西屯區西苑路 268 號）。
- (三) 南區 113 年 5 月 4 日（六）—臺南女中（700011 臺南市中西區大埔街 97 號）。

(四) 東區 113 年 4 月 13 日 (六) — 羅東高中 (265 宜蘭縣羅東鎮公正路 324 號)。

(五) 全國 113 年 6 月 1 日 (六) — 西苑高中 (407 臺中市西屯區西苑路 268 號)。

#### 八、 賽事承辦學校聯絡人

與報名以外其他賽事相關問題，請洽：

(一) 北區：武陵高中學務處國際教育組羅宥理教師

(聯絡資料：wlshb26@email.wlsh.tyc.edu.tw，03-3698170#264)

(二) 中區：西苑高中教務處課程發展組王雅駿教師

(聯絡資料：terrencex@sysh.tc.edu.tw，04-27016473#716)

(三) 南區：臺南女中英文科林于婷教師

(聯絡資料：bonnielinyuting@tns.tn.edu.tw，06-2131928#122)

(四) 東區：羅東高中英文科王青怡教師

(聯絡資料：lanslot1031@gmail.com，03-9567645#703)

(五) 全國：西苑高中教務處課程發展組王雅駿教師

(聯絡資料：terrencex@sysh.tc.edu.tw，04-27016473#716)

#### 九、 報名表及證明相關注意事項

(一) 參賽者如需更動調整報名資料 (如誤植辯士中英文姓名之更正、調整辯士所屬小隊、正備取辯士調換)，請自行在報名修正期限截止前完成。報名截止後至報名修改期限截止前，如有特殊理由需替換辯士，請指導老師主動以電子郵件

(ctndebate@gmail.com) 聯絡主辦單位更改細節，並詳述替換辯士之理由。填寫報名表者若非隊伍指導老師，請務必在系統關閉前與指導老師進行確認，以免損及辯士權益。

(二) 除非有無法掌控之特殊狀況，系統關閉後即不得更動報名表資料。

(三) 主辦單位亦視系統關閉時之報名資料 (含指導老師、參賽學生及派出之評審) 為參賽隊伍已確認後之最後報名資訊。任何賽事證明及獎狀上之姓名誤植，如出自報名表而非主辦單位疏失，將由指導老師及參賽學生自行負責，主辦單位將不予更正及補發。

(四) 報名表單上之正、備取辯士皆可獲得參賽證明；但僅有比賽當天實際上場之辯士可獲得團體獎項獎狀。獲獎隊伍未上場之備取辯士在符合以下所有條件時，可由指導老師於賽後三天內主動向主辦單位提出授予團體獎獎狀申請：

1. 完成四分之三以上之訓練總時數。

2. 實際上場參與校內練習賽。

3. 協助辯題資料收集及辯稿撰寫。

4. 除有正當理由以致無法出席，於比賽當天準時報到並全程參與。

(五) 區域賽獎狀證明由師大製發，全國賽獎狀證明由國教署製作、師大寄發。

(六) 因個人因素而遺失之證明或獎狀，將不予以補發。

## 2024 National High School English Debate Tournament Implementing Plan

- I. Purposes
  - A. To encourage research and active learning, thereby sharpening students' English speaking and logical thinking skills.
  - B. To promote interscholastic debating events throughout Taiwan.
- II. Organizers & Hosting Schools
  - A. Supervised & sponsored by: K-12 Education Administration, Ministry of Education
  - B. Organized by: English Department of National Taiwan Normal University
  - C. Hosted by:
    - 1. Taoyuan Wu-Ling Senior High School (Northern Regional)
    - 2. Taichung Shi Yuan Senior High School (Central Regional)
    - 3. National Tainan Girls' Senior High School (Southern Regional)
    - 4. National Lo-Tung Senior High School (Eastern Regional)
    - 5. Taichung Shi Yuan Senior High School (National Tournament)
- III. Types of Debate
  - A. **Policy Debate:** Policy debate is heavily research-oriented and entails more advanced debate knowledge and strategies, and therefore it is more suitable to students who (1) have had some training and experience in debate, (2) have high intermediate to advanced level of English proficiency, and/or (3) are greatly interested in fields like law, public policy, political science.
  - B. **Public Forum Debate:** Public Forum Debate, while sticking to its original format for the most part and requiring reasons and data to support one's claims, allows more room for collaboration between teammates anytime during debate. PFD also does not require research into the policy aspect of the controversy. For those reasons, it is more suitable to students who (1) do not have much knowledge or experience in debate, and/or (2) have intermediate to high intermediate level of English proficiency.
- IV. Participating Teams
  - A. Regional Tournaments:
    - 1. There are a total of four regional tournaments as part of this debate tournament: the Northern, Central, Southern, and Eastern regional tournaments. The Northern regional tournament exclusively accepts registration from schools in the northern areas of Taiwan (i.e., New Taipei City, Taipei City, and Taoyuan City). The Central regional tournament exclusively accepts registration from schools in the central areas of Taiwan (i.e., Hsinchu County, Hsinchu City<sup>3</sup>, Miaoli County, Taichung City, Changhua County, Nantou County, and Yunlin County). The Southern regional tournament exclusively accepts registration from schools in the southern areas of Taiwan (i.e., Chiayi County, Chiayi City, Tainan City, Kaohsiung City, and Pingtung County). The Eastern regional tournament exclusively accept registration from schools in the eastern areas of Taiwan (i.e., Keelung City, Yilan County, Hualien County, and Taitung County). Schools from the outlying islands of Taiwan are not subject to these restrictions and may choose to participate in any of the regional tournaments based on transportation or accommodation concerns.
    - 2. The tournaments are mainly for high school students (for international schools that means grade 9 to 12).
    - 3. For both **policy debate** and **public forum debate**, the maximum number of school teams in each regional tournament is 16. When more than 16 schools register, the tournament organizer will resort to lot-drawing to decide which 16 schools get to compete.
    - 4. Each school, after gauging students' abilities and needs, can register one team for

---

<sup>3</sup> To balance the number of participating schools from each region, Hsinchu County and Hsinchu City are included in the central region.

each type of debate in the regional tournament that corresponds to the area where your school is located.

5. Priority will be given to high schools within their respective regions. In the event that the number of registered teams for either debate type in any given regional tournament does not reach 8<sup>4</sup> or is an odd number, the measures below shall be followed sequentially:
  - (1) The hosting school of that regional tournament may send in one more team to participate.
  - (2) When (1) fails, any school that has registered for either debate type in the given regional tournament will be informed of the chance to send in a second team. When the schools that can send in a second team exceed the number needed, the tournament organizer will resort to lot-drawing to decide which school gets to register a second team.
  - (3) When both (1) and (2) fail, if any of the other regional tournaments has an odd number of registered teams for the same debate type, or if any school that has registered for either debate type in those regional tournaments can send in a second team, the organizer may coordinate between the two regional tournaments to ensure that both types of debate in both regional tournaments have an even number of teams that reaches a minimum of 8 teams each.
6. For both **policy debate** and **public forum debate**, each school team consists of two sub-teams (i.e., sub-team 1 and sub-team 2), with each sub-team comprising two speakers, and up to two backup debaters. In other words, for each debate type each school team can register up to 6 debaters, 4 official debaters(required) and 2 backup debaters (optional). **Teams that fail to meet this requirement are not eligible to compete.**
7. Debaters who have won The Best Debater Awards in the same type of debate in past National tournaments, though can enter the contest to compete for the team award, are not eligible to run for individual awards.
8. Regardless of the type of debate the team enters, for each registered team, a teacher needs to serve as the coach, and a coach or teacher needs to be dispatched to adjudicate the debate (priority should be given to those with adjudication experiences) for the whole duration of the registered tournament. All coaches, adjudicators and team captains are required to attend the pre-tournament meeting (dates to be announced later).

B. National Tournament:

1. Winning teams in the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern regional tournaments will compete in the National tournament.
2. **Debaters who participate in the National tournament should be the same as those taking part in the regional tournaments, be it official or back-up debaters.** Only under special circumstances can there be a change to the debaters (replacing one or several original debaters with those equipped with better qualities is not a legitimate reason). If a replacement has to be made, please note it down on the registration form with needed proof attached.
3. If the total number of Winning Teams in any debate type from all the regional tournaments is less than 12, the remaining teams to advance to the National tournament will be selected from the teams that have received Judges' Choice Award in the given debate type from all the regional tournaments based on their performance. The selection process is detailed in Scoring & Advancement of Rules & Regulations.
4. Debaters who have won The Best Debater Awards in the same type of debate in past National tournaments, though can enter the contest to compete for the team award, are

---

<sup>4</sup> In order to prevent judges assigned by participating schools from evaluating their own teams, each debate type in all the regional tournaments requires a minimum of 8 participating teams.

not eligible to run for individual awards.

5. Regardless of the type of debate the team enters, for each registered team, a teacher needs to serve as the coach, and a coach or teacher needs to be dispatched to adjudicate the debate (priority should be given to those with adjudication experiences) for the whole duration of the registered tournament.

V. Debate Propositions

**Policy Debate**

RESOLVED: The Taiwanese government should institute the mental health leave for secondary school students.

**Public Forum Debate**

RESOLVED: Media outlets bear a greater responsibility than viewers in combating sensationalism.

VI. Registration

- A. Northern Regional: Registration has to be completed on the website (TBD) by 17:00, March 12<sup>th</sup>. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed on TBD.
- B. Central Regional: Registration has to be completed on the website (TBD) by 17:00, March 12<sup>th</sup>. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed on TBD.
- C. Southern Regional: Registration has to be completed on the website (TBD) by 17:00, March 12<sup>th</sup>. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed on TBD.
- D. Eastern Regional: Registration has to be completed on the website (TBD) by 17:00, March 12<sup>th</sup>. Any revision to the registration has to be completed on the above website before the registration system is closed on TBD.
- E. National Tournament: Registration is required. The deadline for registration will be announced after the regional tournaments.

VII. Dates and Venues:

- A. Northern Regional: April 27, Taoyuan Municipal Wu-Ling Senior High School
- B. Central Regional: April 20, Taichung Municipal Shi Yuan Senior High School
- C. Southern Regional: May 4, National Tainan Girls' Senior High School
- D. Eastern Regional: April 13, National Lo-Tung Senior High School
- E. National Tournament: June 1, Taichung Municipal Shi Yuan Senior High School

VIII. Contact

For any further question (excluding registration-related matters), please contact

- A. Northern Regional: Mr. Derrick Lo of Wuling Senior High School at 03-3698170#264; [wshb26@email.wlsh.tyc.edu.tw](mailto:wshb26@email.wlsh.tyc.edu.tw)
- B. Central Regional: Mr. Terrence Wang of Shi Yuan Senior High School at 04-27016473#716; [terrencex@sysh.tc.edu.tw](mailto:terrencex@sysh.tc.edu.tw)
- C. Southern Regional: Ms. Bonnie Lin of Tainan Girls' Senior High School at 06-2131928#122; [bonnielinyuting@tngs.tn.edu.tw](mailto:bonnielinyuting@tngs.tn.edu.tw)
- D. Eastern Regional: Ms. Linda Wang at of Lo-Tung Senior High School at 03-9567645#703; [lanslot1031@gmail.com](mailto:lanslot1031@gmail.com)
- E. National Tournament: Mr. Terrence Wang of Shi Yuan Senior High School at 04-27016473#716; [terrencex@sysh.tc.edu.tw](mailto:terrencex@sysh.tc.edu.tw)

IX. Important Clauses

- A. Revisions/Corrections to the registration information (e.g., correcting misspelled names in Mandarin or English, changing the composition of sub-teams, or swapping official and back-up debaters) must be made on the on-line registration system by the personnel responsible for filling out the form from each team before the revision deadline. During the period between the registration and revision deadlines, if there are special and justified circumstances that call for debater replacement, the coach must contact the organizer via email at [ctndebate@gmail.com](mailto:ctndebate@gmail.com), providing comprehensive explanations for

the replacement and detailing the necessary adjustments. For any individual who has filled out the registration form but is not a team coach, please make sure to confirm relevant information with the coach(es) before the system closes to avoid miscommunication and guard the rights of the debaters.

- B. Other than some uncontrollable factors, no changes can be made to the registration once the on-line registration system is closed.
- C. All the participation proofs and award certificates issued after the tournament will be based on the information on the registration form at the time when the on-line system is closed. That information will be taken as finalized by all participating schools. For errors appearing on the proofs or award certificates that concern the participant's names, when proven not a result of a mistake made by the organizer, no proofs or certificates will be reissued.
- D. Certificates of participation will be issued to all members on the registration form (i.e., official and backup debaters). Team award certificates (i.e., certificates of excellence) will be issued to the debaters who have debated on the day of the tournament. However, coaches may request, **within 3 days after the tournament**, the issue of team award certificate for backup debater(s) who did not debate on the day of the tournament but have fulfilled all of the following criteria:
  - 1. Completed at least three-fourths of the total training hours.
  - 2. Participated in practice matches.
  - 3. Contributed to the research of resolution and drafting of arguments.
  - 4. Signed in to the tournament punctually and attended the tournament for the whole duration unless there are valid reasons for absence.
- E. Certificates for regional tournaments will be issued and mailed by National Taiwan Normal University. Certificates for the National tournament will be issued by K-12 Education Administration and mailed by National Taiwan Normal University.
- F. Proofs or certificates, when lost due to personal negligence, will not be reissued.

# 「113 年全國高級中等學校英語辯論比賽—區域賽與全國賽」比賽規則

## 一、賽制

### (一) 政策性辯論

本賽制採以下方式：每場比賽由正方一隊，反方一隊參加，每隊僅有二人，所有辯士皆可能擔任正反方。此外，整場比賽共有兩次「申論」、兩次「結辯」、四次「交叉質詢」，即每位辯士皆須進行一次申論、一次結辯，以及兩次交叉質詢（一次提問、一次回答問題）。

### (二) 公共論壇辯論

本賽制採以下方式：每場比賽由正方一隊，反方一隊參加，每隊僅有二人，所有辯士皆可能擔任正反方。以下為本賽制與原有公共論壇辯論之差異：

1. 不同於原有「公共論壇辯論」（原「公共論壇辯論」各部分每隊僅限一人論述或問答），本賽制允許辯士於辯論進行之各階段進行團隊合作，因此同一小隊之兩位辯士，在每次論述或交叉質詢（共三次交叉質詢）時，皆能依照既有安排或臨時狀況需要，由一位或兩位辯士共合作完成各部份的論述與交叉質詢；每次交叉質詢時，來自兩隊的四位辯士亦皆能參與提問與回答。
2. 不同於原有「公共論壇辯論」（原「公共論壇辯論」中只有「自由交叉質詢」可由四位辯士自由提問與回應），本賽制因在所有交叉質詢環節皆能由四位辯士自由參與，因此並無區分「雙方一辯交叉質詢」「雙方二辯交叉質詢」與「自由交叉質詢」。整場總計有三次交叉質詢。
3. 本賽制雖允許各個論述與交叉質詢以團隊合作方式進行，但同屬一隊之兩位辯士在發言時間分配上仍應力求平均分配，不應相差懸殊。
4. 不同於原有「公共論壇辯論」（原「公共論壇辯論」由投擲硬幣決定各小隊正反方及發言順序），本賽制統一規定一律由正方論點陳述開始。

## 二、辯題

### 政策性辯論

RESOLVED: The Taiwanese government should institute the mental health leave for secondary school students.

### 公共論壇辯論

RESOLVED: Media outlets bear a greater responsibility than viewers in combating sensationalism.

## 三、比賽規則說明

### (一) 比賽時間：

1. 區域賽：上午 8:30 開始報到、9:00 賽前說明、9:30 開始比賽，遲到之隊伍視為棄權。
2. 全國賽：上午 8:30 開始報到、9:10 開始比賽，遲到之隊伍視為棄權。

### (二) 比賽方式：

1. 區域賽：政策性及公共論壇辯論皆有三輪，每輪皆為正、反兩方辯護。
  - (1) 三輪之各隊伍配對（即哪一校的哪一個小隊會在哪一輪對上哪一校的哪一個小隊）及各小隊正反方組合由主辦單位抽籤決定；前兩輪之隊伍配對及正反方組合將於賽事前一日中午 12 點公布；第三輪之隊伍配對及正反方組合於比賽當日中午公布。比賽當天前兩輪賽事，請各參賽隊伍之各小隊務必遵照報名表上之小隊名單並根據抽籤所決定之一方進行比賽，自行更動小隊名單者，該輪賽事團體分數及辯士個人排序分數將皆以零分計算，且該評審團於三輪賽事結束後亦將給予該小隊零分之排序分數。
  - (2) 前兩輪由各隊伍的兩小隊各進行一輪賽事，且前兩輪須分別為不同方辯護；各校可針對賽事當天中午公告之第三輪立場，由四位正取辯士中安排兩位辯士組

合成為第三輪小隊的辯士，**辯士出賽名單決定後請於比賽開始半小時前繳交給主辦單位**；若逾時未繳交第三輪名單，主辦單位將安排該校稍早為該方辯護之兩位辯士出場第三輪辯論。

- (3) 因賽事前一日才會公告每支隊伍第一、二輪之出賽小隊及前兩輪所持立場為正方或反方，故參加兩賽制的各小隊辯士在準備過程中須同時練習為正、反兩方辯護。
2. 全國賽：政策性及公共論壇辯論皆有**四**輪，每輪皆為正、反兩方辯護。
  - (1) 前兩輪各隊伍配對（即哪一校的哪一個小隊會在哪一輪對上哪一校的哪一個小隊）及各小隊正反方組合，將於賽事前一日公告；第三輪、第四輪各隊伍配對由主辦單位抽籤決定，而正反方則與各小隊早上場次相反（如該小隊早上場次打正方/反方、下午場次則打反方/正方），後兩輪之配對與正反方於比賽當日中午公告。比賽當天，請各參賽隊伍之各小隊務必遵照報名表上之小隊名單並根據抽籤所決定之一方進行比賽，自行更動小隊名單者，該輪賽事團體分數及辯士個人排序分數將皆以零分計算，且該評審團於四輪賽事結束後亦將給予該小隊零分之排序分數。
  - (2) 前兩輪由各隊伍的兩小隊各進行一輪賽事，且前兩輪須分別為不同方辯護（假設抽籤結果為第一輪由小隊一打正方，則第二輪將由小隊二打反方；若抽籤結果為第一輪小隊二打反方，則第二輪交由小隊一打正方）；第三與第四輪也由各隊伍的兩小隊各進行一輪賽事，而各小隊在後兩輪所辯護之立場將正好與其於前兩輪所辯護之立場相反（延續前述假設，若小隊一在第一輪中打正方，則該小隊在第三或第四輪中將打反方；若小隊二在第二輪中打反方，則該小隊在第三或第四輪中將打正方）與。
  - (3) 因全國賽當天所有小隊皆會為正方及反方各辯護一次，故參加兩賽制的各小隊辯士在準備過程中須同時練習為正、反兩方辯護。

### （三）比賽流程

#### **政策性辯論**

每場比賽由正方一隊，反方一隊參加，每隊由每校隊伍中小隊一或小隊二的兩位辯士組成。賽制採交叉質詢制，即正反方各兩次的申論中間皆穿插交叉質詢，最後由正反方各自進行兩次結辯。四位辯士上臺順序與辯論時間如下：

1. 正方一辯申論五分鐘
2. 正方一辯接受反方二辯交叉質詢三分鐘
3. 準備時間一分鐘
4. 反方一辯申論五分鐘
5. 反方一辯接受正方一辯交叉質詢三分鐘
6. 準備時間一分鐘
7. 正方二辯申論五分鐘
8. 正方二辯接受反方一辯交叉質詢三分鐘
9. 準備時間一分鐘
10. 反方二辯申論五分鐘
11. 反方二辯接受正方二辯交叉質詢三分鐘
12. 準備時間一分鐘
13. 反方一辯結辯三分鐘
14. 準備時間一分鐘
15. 正方一辯結辯三分鐘
16. 準備時間一分鐘
17. 反方二辯結辯三分鐘
18. 準備時間一分鐘

#### 19. 正方二辯結辯三分鐘

上述時間共計 51 分鐘。

※若參賽隊伍未依照以上辯論順序進行，該部分將不予以計分。

※若該時段辯士時間未到即結束時，直接接續下一順序辯士進行。

#### **公共論壇辯論**

本辯論賽制強調團隊合作，每場比賽由正方一隊、反方一隊參加，每隊二人。正反方各一次「論點陳述」("Pro Case Speech"及"Con Case Speech")、「反駁」("Rebuttal")、「摘要陳述」與「最後重點陳述」("Summary"與"Final Focus")，中間皆穿插「交叉質詢」("Crossfire")。每隊可自行指派每位辯士之任務，各次「論述」(含「論點陳述」、「反駁」、「摘要陳述」、「最後重點陳述」)與「交叉質詢」，可由一位或兩位辯士共同負責完成，亦可視臨場狀況機動調整，唯每位辯士皆須上場發言，且發言時間長短不可差別過大。四位辯士上臺順序與辯論時間如下：

1. 正方論點陳述四分鐘 (正方兩辯士皆可發言)
2. 反方論點陳述四分鐘 (反方兩辯士皆可發言)
3. 準備時間兩分鐘
4. 第一次交叉質詢三分鐘 (正反兩方辯士輪流提問及回答)
5. 準備時間兩分鐘
6. 正方反駁四分鐘 (正方兩辯士皆可發言)
7. 反方反駁四分鐘 (反方兩辯士皆可發言)
8. 準備時間兩分鐘
9. 第二次交叉質詢三分鐘 (正反兩方辯士輪流提問及回答)
10. 準備時間兩分鐘
11. 正方摘要陳述三分鐘 (正方兩辯士皆可發言)
12. 反方摘要陳述三分鐘 (反方兩辯士皆可發言)
13. 準備時間兩分鐘
14. 第三次交叉質詢三分鐘 (正反兩方辯士輪流提問及回答)
15. 準備時間兩分鐘
16. 正方最後重點陳述兩分鐘 (正方兩辯士皆可發言)
17. 反方最後重點陳述兩分鐘 (反方兩辯士皆可發言)

上述時間共計 47 分鐘。

※若該時段辯士時間未到即結束時，直接接續下一順序辯士進行。

#### (四) 賽事裁判

政策性辯論與公共論壇辯論每場各有三位裁判，首席評審由主辦單位聘請有英語辯論專業背景之學者專家擔任，另兩位同儕評審則由參賽學校指派教師擔任。參賽學校指派評審不會評判自家隊伍辯士。

#### (五) 評分及晉級方式

##### 1. 區域賽

- (1) **政策性及公共論壇辯論**每場比賽，各隊最多可獲三分、最少零分。三場賽事得分累積為該隊在本賽事之總分；依照參賽隊伍數量，將取賽事總分最高前三至四名為優勝隊伍，排名緊接其後之一至四名者獲選評審團獎。若遇賽事各輪積分總分相同時，則以評審決議之排序積分 (由同賽場三位評審依當日所評判過隊伍之表現給予排序) 之總和決定先後順序；若遇排序積分總和相同時，以三輪對打小隊之排序積分總和作為判定標準，對打小隊排序積分總和較高者勝出；若仍同分時，則該等級同分隊伍皆能獲選該獎項。
- (2) **政策性及公共論壇辯論**每場比賽，評審將就各場比賽四位辯士之表現，分別給

予個人排序分數，表現最佳者4分、次佳者3分、依序排列至得分1分。依照參賽隊伍數量，三輪賽事結束後，積分總和最高前三至四名者為最佳辯士，排名緊接其後之一至四名者為優良辯士。若遇同分時，依序以「各輪與之競爭小隊排序積分總和」（與之競爭小隊積分總和較高者勝出）、「所屬小隊排序積分總和」（所屬小隊積分較高者勝出）為判定標準；若仍同分時，則該等級同分辯士皆能獲選該獎項。

- (3) **政策性及公共論壇辯論**將各取12隊晉級全國賽，區域賽之優勝隊伍將直接晉級，若某賽制三區優勝隊伍總和未達12隊，則比較該賽制三區所有獲得評團獎隊伍之分數，比序方式如下：比較各隊排序積分總和，排序積分較高者勝出；若遇排序積分總和相同，則比較各隊三輪對打小隊之排序積分總和，三輪對打小隊之排序積分總和較高者勝出；若遇三輪對打小隊排序積分總和同分，則比較各隊四名辯士個人積分總和，各隊四名辯士個人積分總和較高者勝出；若遇各隊四名辯士個人積分總和同分，則請三區皆有評分之評審，提出晉級全國賽隊伍的建議。如上述決選方式仍無法決定晉級隊伍，主辦單位將保留裁量空間。

## 2. 全國賽

- (1) **政策性及公共論壇辯論**每場比賽，各隊最多可獲三分、最少零分。四場賽事得分累積為該隊在本賽事之總分；依照參賽隊伍數量，將取賽事總分最高前三名為優勝隊伍，排名緊接其後之三名者獲選評審團獎。若遇賽事各輪積分總和相同時，則以評審決議之排序積分（由同賽場三位評審依當日所評判過隊伍之表現給予排序）決定先後順序；若遇排序積分相同時，以四輪對打小隊之排序積分總和作為判定標準，對打小隊排序積分總和較高者勝出；若仍同分時，則該等級同分隊伍皆能獲選該獎項。
- (2) **政策性及公共論壇辯論**每場比賽，評審將就各場比賽四位辯士之表現，分別給予個人排序分數，表現最佳者4分、次佳者3分、依序排列至得分1分。依照參賽隊伍數量，四輪賽事結束後，兩場個人積分總和最高前三名者為最佳辯士，排名緊接其後三名者為優良辯士。若遇同分時，依序以「各輪與之競爭小隊排序積分總和」（與之競爭小隊積分總和較高者勝出）、「所屬小隊排序積分總和」（所屬小隊積分總和較高者勝出）、「所屬小隊輸贏場次」（贏較多場者勝出）為判定標準；若仍同分時，則該等級同分辯士皆能獲選該獎項。

## (六) 計時方式

1. 在政策性辯論「申論」與「結辯」、公共論壇辯論「陳述」與「反駁」時，評審會於規定發言時間結束時提醒：「時間到」，並於超時三十秒時告知：「很抱歉，請停止發言」，辯士必須立即下臺或坐下，並停止發言；每超過規定時間十秒鐘，扣總分一分。
2. 在「交叉質詢」時，評審會於規定發言時間結束時提醒：「時間到」。當時間到時，若正值辯士在問問題，該辯士須立即停止提問；當時間到時，若正值辯士在回答問題，則該辯士須在10秒內回答完畢。
3. 在「準備時間」到時，評審會告知：「時間到」。
4. 在「準備時間」到時，政策性辯論辯士必須立即上臺開始進行申論、結辯或質詢，公共論壇辯論辯士則從座位中起立進行陳述、反駁或質詢，並開始計時。當評審告知：「時間到」並宣布上場隊伍後，該隊應立即上場，若不按時間出場，每晚十秒鐘扣總分一分。

## (七) 攜帶物品

1. 學生請務必攜帶身份證或學生證以查驗身分。
2. 辯論時可攜帶字典及紙本資料，但禁止使用任何電子儀器查閱論點或辯論資料，陳述論點時亦禁止使用視覺輔助道具。
3. 參加政策性辯論與公共論壇辯論各隊應就比賽中所可能引述之證據準備證據卡，做為對方辯士於辯論進行中審查佐證資料之用，評審於整場辯論後、勝負判決前亦可要求審查佐證資料。在證據卡的準備與使用上請注意下列幾點：
  - (1) 一張證據卡僅列一則證據，勿多則並列，以方便評審或對方辯士閱讀。
  - (2) 證據卡內容需包含該則證據之「主旨標題」、「詳細出處（如書籍刊物名稱、冊號、頁碼或網址）」、「發表或取得時間」、「作者人名身分」及「原始引文」等項目。證據卡格式請參見計畫官網 (<https://shorturl.at/bjLTY>)。若辯士或評審發現某一方之證據卡格式因不符本賽事要求而導致難以閱讀與理解，評審得以在隊伍總分上酌情扣分。
  - (3) 若證據為中文資料，要將出處、日期、作者姓名、頭銜及資料內容的重點摘要翻成英文放在括號中，並置於中文後面。若為中、英文以外之文字，則需逐字翻譯為英文。
  - (4) 對方辯士可於交叉質詢時提出要求審查某一證據卡或所有申論中所用之證據卡，被要求方須即時出示相關證據卡，若有嚴重拖延，導致不利對方辯士審查，評審得於該隊之交叉質詢團體分數上酌情扣分，並將出示證據卡之表現列入負責辯士之個人排序分數考量。
  - (5) 辯士拿到證據卡後可自行或交由隊友檢視，唯須在該「交叉質詢」後的「準備時間」結束前交還對方（建議各隊準備兩套證據卡以因應此規定）。

## (八) 棄權處理與參賽規範

1. 辯士個人棄權處理：
  - (1) 區域賽：每一隊皆須有至少四位辯士，若該隊伍未能滿足本賽事一隊至少四人之規定，仍可進行比賽，但將只具角逐個人獎項之資格，而無法競爭團體獎項。該隊替代上場辯士，若三輪全都上場，其個人總分將取三場賽事中個人成績最高分之兩場採計。
  - (2) 全國賽：每一隊皆須有至少四位辯士，若該隊伍未能滿足本賽事一隊至少四人之規定，仍可進行比賽，但將只具角逐個人獎項之資格，而無法競爭團體獎項。該隊替代上場辯士，不論上場三輪或四輪，其個人總分將取其所打正、反方各一場（即共兩場）表現最佳場次採計。
2. 隊伍棄權處理：
  - (1) 參加政策性及公共論壇辯論區域賽隊伍，報名後無充分理由退賽者，主辦單位將衡量情事之嚴重性決定往後一至三年是否錄取該校參賽，並予以行文至退賽學校。
  - (2) 因區域賽與全國賽實為同一賽事之不同階段，凡晉級政策性及公共論壇辯論全國賽隊伍，無論於全國賽報名前或報名後，若無故棄賽，將視為不尊重本賽事及嚴重違反參賽者精神，主辦單位除將拔除其區域賽所獲之獎項外，亦將衡量棄賽情事之嚴重性決定往後一至三年是否錄取該校參賽，並予以行文至棄賽學校。
3. 比賽當天各隊辯士須依照賽事配對表與報名表上的小隊名單出賽，比賽開始前，實體賽事或線上賽事皆由評審核對辯士身分。

政策性辯論：各隊辯士於該方之辯士角色（即 A1/A2/N1/N2）由辯士自行決定並於比賽開始前將辯士姓名與辯士角色標註於賽事結果表上。若任一辯士未依照賽事規則上該辯士角色之發言順序發言，則該辯士於該環節之表現不予計分。

公共論壇辯論：各隊辯士無一定之發言順序，惟賽前仍須將辯士姓名及辯士座位（即 P-左/P-右/C-左/C-右）標示於賽事結果表上。

未依配對表或報名表之小隊辯士組合出賽，該隊伍在該場次之團體與個人表現皆不予計分；冒名頂替者，則該隊伍喪失所有團體及個人獎項之獲獎資格。

4. 參加**政策性辯論**，辯士需出列至指定位置進行論述與交叉質詢；參加**公共論壇辯論**，辯士無須出列，只須自座椅上起立進行論述與交叉質詢。**政策性辯論**賽事進行中，講臺上的辯士禁止與臺下隊友及觀眾交談互動，唯在「交叉質詢」環節，被質詢者要求相關資料以回答質詢者問題時，隊友可傳遞相關資料（但不可與被質詢者有言語討論），以利質詢順利進行，但隊友不能代為問答，否則將予以扣分。進行交叉質詢時，請正反方辯士皆面向評審（而非對方辯士）進行問答。
5. **政策性及公共論壇辯論**賽事中，辯士語速不宜過快。若經評審警告後仍無法改善語速，評審得介入賽事或斟酌扣分。比賽進行中，若有辯士態度傲慢無理，評審可暫停比賽，適時提出糾正，如糾正後未見改善，評審可酌情扣分。
6. 參賽隊伍或個人若有失辯士風範之情事，一旦有具體事證，且經評審團會議通過，將取消其獲獎資格，由積分排名緊接在後之隊伍或個人依序遞補。

#### 四、敘獎

獲獎隊伍及獲獎學生之指導老師（依線上報名填報之指導老師每隊最多兩人），由服務學校依以下標準予以敘獎。

##### （一）全國賽：

優勝隊伍、最佳辯士：計功一次。

評審團獎、優秀辯士：嘉獎兩次。

##### （二）區域賽：

優勝隊伍、最佳辯士：嘉獎兩次。

評審團獎、優秀辯士：嘉獎一次。

#### 五、比賽場地注意事項

- （一）請辯士務必依照自己在報名表上之所屬小隊及賽事配對表上註記之參賽小隊，參加各輪比賽。
- （二）辯士須備妥相關證件，方便工作人員於比賽開始前核對身分。
- （三）請辯士務必依照自己所決定之辯士順序（即「辯士一」、「辯士二」）及各賽場座位標示牌（即「A1」、「A2」、「N1」、「N2」、「P-左」、「P-右」、「C-左」、「C-右」）入座。
- （四）場地內沒有麥克風。
- （五）賽事進行中，辯士不得使用手機、平板等智慧型電子產品計時、查閱資料或撰寫論點。計時器具部分，一般電子手錶或傳統計時器不在此限。
- （六）教室內不得飲食，請勿攜帶食物入內。
- （七）比賽開始後將關閉後門，除承辦單位的工作人員外，禁止任何人出入。
- （八）為避免影響辯士表現，比賽開始後請勿走動或交談，並請確實關手機。
- （九）比賽進行中請勿鼓掌喧鬧。
- （十）觀眾席師生與家長嚴禁與場上辯士有任何交談、傳遞書面訊息或展示電子產品上所呈現資訊之行為。
- （十一）若欲錄影請於賽前架設完畢，欲照相者切勿使用閃光燈，以免打擾比賽進行。
- （十二）競賽場地待安排確認後，再行通知各參賽學校。

#### 六、服儀規定及身分確認

為避免任何可能先設印象，所有比賽隊伍皆以主辦單位事先選定之英文隊名（而非校名）呈現。學生請穿著整齊服裝（勿穿著制服），於報到時請學生出示身份證或學生證。各場次活動前也請出示證件以利身分核對。

七、主辦單位免責聲明

請參賽者務必於賽前詳閱比賽實施計畫與比賽規則。針對比賽當天任何與本賽事規則不符之情事，若主辦或承辦單位口頭告知或回應之訊息與比賽書面資訊有異，一律以書面資訊為主。

八、如本計畫有未盡事宜，將依國教署辦理或指導之其他賽事相關規定或主辦單位會議討論結果辦理。

## 2024 High School English Debate Tournament Rules & Regulations

### I. Types of Debate

- A. For **policy debate**, each debate consists of an Affirmative team and a Negative team, and each team consists of two speakers only. All the speakers **MUST** prepare for the Affirmative and Negative cases for there is a chance for them to defend both sides at the tournament. Furthermore, each match contains two constructive speeches, two rebuttal speeches, and four cross-examination sessions. As a result, during each match, each speaker has to give one constructive speech and one rebuttal speech, and asking and answering questions during cross-examinations.
- B. For (Modified) **public forum debate (PFD)**, each debate consists of a Pro (advocating a position) and a Con (rejecting a position). All the speakers **MUST** prepare for the Pro and Con cases for there is a chance for them to debate on both sides at the tournament. The reasons it is called a modified PFD are as follows:
1. Unlike the original PDR in which each speech is done by one and only one speaker, teamwork is allowed in each part of the debate; the two speakers on the same team can collaborate in giving the same speech and asking/answering questions in the same crossfire session. Such collaboration can be an advanced arrangement or a spontaneous move.
  2. Unlike the original PFD in which there is a grand crossfire where all four speakers will engage in asking/answering questions, in our modified PFD, as all speakers can get involved in the questioning and responding, there is no difference between a crossfire and a grand crossfire, and there will be three crossfire sessions in total.
  3. Though this modified public forum debate allows the two debaters on the same team to collaborate on one speech/crossfire, the speaking time should still be evenly distributed between those two debaters.
  4. Unlike the original PFD in which the sides the two teams are to defend and their speaking orders are decided by a coin toss, in our modified PFD, the debate will always start with the Pro giving their constructive speech.

### II. Debate Propositions

#### **Policy Debate**

RESOLVED: The Taiwanese government should institute the mental health leave for secondary school students.

#### **Public Forum Debate**

RESOLVED: Media outlets bear a greater responsibility than viewers in combating sensationalism.

### III. Debate Rules

#### A. Time:

1. Regional: Sign-in at 8:30 AM, briefing on rules at 9:00 AM, and first debate round starting at 9:30 AM. Late-coming teams are automatically disqualified.
2. National: Sign-in at 8:30 AM, and first debate round starting at 9:10 AM. Late-coming teams are automatically disqualified.

#### B. Format:

1. Regional Tournament: For both **policy debate and public forum debate**, there will be **three** debate rounds.  
(1) For both **policy debate and public forum debate**, the school matchups (i.e., which sub-team of one school will debate against which sub-team of another school) and sides to defend for all three rounds will be decided by the organizer through lot-drawing. The matchups and sides to defend for the first two rounds will be announced at 12:00 PM one day before the tournament. The matchups and sides to defend for the third round will be revealed at noon on the day of the tournament. **For the first two rounds, debaters on each team should follow the names on the registration form for the sub-teams and debate for the side based on the matchups announced the**

**day before the tournaments. The sub-team that violates this rule will lose the round automatically (i.e., getting no points for the team score and debater's ranking scores for that match), and will score zero point from the judging panel for its ranking score.**

- (2) For both **policy debate and public forum debate**, one sub-team will compete in Round 1, and the other sub-team will compete in Round 2. If one sub-team debates as the Affirmative/Pro in Round 1, the other sub-team will debate as the Negative/Con in Round 2, and vice versa. For Round 3, upon knowing the side to defend, the coach should decide which two debaters from the four official debaters will compete one more time, and submit the names of the two debaters half an hour before the third round starts. For any team that fails to submit the Round-3 debaters by the deadline, the organizer will assign the two debaters who have defended the same side in the morning to compete in Round 3.
  - (3) For both **policy and public forum debates**, debaters on both sub-teams should prepare to debate **both** as the Affirmative/Pro and as the Negative/Con, as the matchups and the sides to defend in the first two rounds will not be announced until the day right before the tournament.
2. National Tournament: For both **policy debate and public forum debate**, there will be **four** debate rounds.
- (1) For both **policy debate and public forum debate**, the school matchups (i.e., which sub-team of one school will debate against which sub-team of another school) and sides to defend for the first and second rounds will be decided by the organizer through lot-drawing and announced one day before the tournament. The matchups for the third and fourth rounds will be decided by the organizer through lot-drawing and revealed at noon on the day of the tournament. If the sub-team debates as the Affirmative/Pro in the morning, they will debate as the Negative/Con in the afternoon, and vice versa. **Debaters on each team should follow the names on the registration form for the sub-teams and debate for the side based on the matchups announced the day before the tournament. The sub-team that violates this rule will lose the round automatically (i.e., getting no points for the team score and debater's ranking scores for that match), and will score zero point from the judging panel for its ranking score.**
  - (2) For both **policy debate and public forum debate**, one sub-team will compete in round 1, and the other sub-team will compete in round 2. If one sub-team debates as the Affirmative/Pro in round 1, the other sub-team will debate as the Negative/Con in round 2, and vice versa. Likewise, in the afternoon, for both **policy debate and public forum debate**, one sub-team will compete in round 3, and the other sub-team will compete in round 4. The side to defend in the afternoon matches will be reversed for each sub-team.
  - (3) For both **policy and public forum debates**, debaters on both sub-teams should prepare to debate **both** as the Affirmative/Pro and as the Negative/Con, as both sub-teams will defend each side for once in the National tournament.

#### C. Procedure

##### **Policy Debate**

Policy debate unfolds throughout a series of speeches and prep time sessions as outlined below:

First Affirmative Constructive Speech 5 minutes (Affirmative Debater #1)
Second Negative cross examines First Affirmative 3 minutes
Preparation Time 1 minute
First Negative Constructive Speech 5 minutes (Negative Debater #1)
First Affirmative cross examines First Negative 3 minutes
Preparation Time 1 minute

Second Affirmative Constructive Speech 5 minutes (Affirmative Debater #2)

First Negative cross examines Second Affirmative 3 minutes

Preparation Time 1 minute

Second Negative Constructive Speech 5 minutes (Negative Debater #2)

Second Affirmative cross examines Second Negative 3 minutes

Preparation Time 1 minutes

First Negative Rebuttal Speech 3 minutes (Negative Debater #1)

Preparation Time 1 minute

First Affirmative Rebuttal Speech 3 minutes (Affirmative Debater #1)

Preparation Time 1 minute

Second Negative Rebuttal Speech 3 minutes (Negative Debater #2)

Preparation Time 1 minute

Second Affirmative Rebuttal Speech 3 minutes (Affirmative Debater #2)

Total Time for one round: 51 minutes

\* The team that violates the order of speaking will lose all the points for the session where the violation occurs.

\* If the debater finishes his/her speech or questions before time is up, the unused time is simply lost, and the debate will directly move on to the next segment.

### **Public Forum Debate**

Public forum debate unfolds throughout a series of speeches and prep time sessions as outlined below:

Pro Constructive Speech 4 minutes (One or Both Speaker/s on Pro Side)

Con Constructive Speech 4 minutes (One or Both Speaker/s on Con Side)

Prep Time 2 minutes

1st Crossfire 3 minutes (Between the Two Speakers on Pro Side and the Two Speakers on Con Side, Taking Turns Asking/Answering Questions)

Prep Time 2 minutes

Pro Rebuttal Speech 4 minutes (One or Both Speakers on Pro Side)

Con Rebuttal Speech 4 minutes (One or Both Speakers on Con Side)

Prep Time 2 minutes

2nd Crossfire 3 minutes ((Between the Two Speakers on Pro Side and the Two Speakers on Con Side, Taking Turns Asking/Answering Questions)

Prep Time 2 minutes

Pro Summary Speech 3 minutes (One or Both Speakers on Pro Side)

Con Summary Speech 3 minutes (One or Both Speakers on Con Side)

Prep Time 2 minutes

3rd Crossfire 3 minutes (Between the Two Speakers on Pro Side and the Two Speakers on Con Side, Taking Turns Asking/Answering Questions)

Prep Time 2 minutes

Pro Final Focus Speech 2 minutes (One or Both Speakers on Pro Side)

Con Final Focus Speech 2 minutes (One or Both Speakers on Con Side)

Total Time for one round: 47 minutes

\* If the debater finishes his/her speech or questions before time is up, the unused time is simply lost, and the debate will directly move on to the next segment.

D. For both **policy and public forum debates**, there will have a panel of 3 judges in each match. The head adjudicator will be invited by the organizer and the two peer adjudicators will be coaches or teachers from the schools of two participating teams. No adjudicators will be judging their own teams.

E. Scoring & Advancement

1. Regional Tournament:

- (1) The tournaments will operate on a points-accrual system. For each round in **policy and public forum debates**, each team may accrue a score from 0 to 3. The top three to four teams, pending the number of participating schools, ranked by their total points across three rounds, will be the Winning Teams; the one to four teams ranked after that will be given “Judges’ Choice Award.” If any competing teams have the same team score total, the total of their “ranking scores” (i.e., the scores given by different judging panels that have judged those teams in the three debate rounds) will be used to break the tie. If the tie remains, the add-up of the “ranking scores” of their respective opponent sub-teams in all three rounds will be used to break the tie. If the tie remains, competing teams with the same highest add-up of the ranking scores of their respective opponent sub-teams will all be eligible for the team award to which they are entitled.
- (2) For each round in **policy and public forum debates**, each debater will be given a ranking score from 1 to 4 based on his/her performance by the adjudicators. The top three to four debaters, pending the number of participating schools, ranked by their total points across three rounds, will receive the honor of “Best Debater”; one to four debaters ranked after that will win the honor of “Honorable Mention Debater.” When any competing debaters score the same points, the decision of who claims an individual award title will rest on their respective rankings, which will be determined based on the following criteria (in order of priority): 1) the add-up of the “ranking scores” of their opponent sub-teams, and 2) the add-up of their own sub-team’s “ranking scores.” If the tie remains, competing debaters with the same highest add-ups of their own sub-team’s ranking scores will all be eligible for the individual award to which they are entitled.
- (3) For each type of debate (i.e., policy and public forum debates), 12 teams will be selected to advance to the National tournament. The Winning Teams from each regional tournament will directly qualify to advance. If the total number of Winning Teams in any debate type from all three regional tournaments is less than 12, the remaining teams to advance to the National tournament will be selected from the teams that have received Judges’ Choice Award in the given debate type from all three regional tournaments in the following selection order:
  1. Each team’s ranking score total will be compared. Teams with higher ranking score totals will be eligible to enter the National tournament.
  2. If 1. fails to break the tie, the ranking score totals of their respective opponent sub-teams will be compared. Teams with higher ranking score totals of opponent sub-teams will be eligible to enter the National tournament.
  3. If both 1. and 2. fail to break the tie, the individual score totals of the four debaters from each team will be compared. Teams with higher individual score totals will be eligible to enter the National tournament.
  4. If the tie remains, the organizer will seek suggestions from judges who have adjudicated in all three regional tournaments.
  5. If none of the criteria above can resolve the tie, the organizer reserves the right to make the final decision.

2. National Tournament:

- (1) The tournament will operate on a points-accrual system. For each round in **policy and public forum debates**, each team may accrue a score from 0 to 3. The top three teams, ranked by their total points across four rounds, will be the Winning Teams; the three teams ranked after that will be given “Judges’ Choice Award.” If any competing teams have the same team score total, the total of their “ranking scores” (i.e., the scores given by different judging panels that have judged those teams in the three debate rounds) will be used to break the tie. If the tie remains, the add-up of the “ranking scores” of their respective opponent sub-teams in all four rounds will be

used to break the tie. If the tie remains, competing teams with the same highest add-up of the ranking scores of their respective opponent sub-teams will all be eligible for the team award to which they are entitled.

- (2) For each round in **policy and public forum debates**, each debater will be given a ranking score from 1 to 4 based on his/her performance by the adjudicators. The top three debaters, ranked by their total points across four rounds, will receive the honor of “Best Debater”; three debaters ranked after that will win the honor of “Honorable Mention Debater.” When any competing debaters score the same points, the decision of who claims an individual award title will rest on their respective rankings, which will be determined based on the following criteria (in order of priority): 1) the add-up of the “ranking scores” of their opponent sub-teams, 2) the add-up of their own sub-team’s “ranking scores,” and 3) the winning record of their own sub-team (more wins prevail). If the tie remains, competing debaters with the same highest winning record of their own sub-team will all be eligible for the individual award to which they are entitled.

#### F. Timing

1. For all the speeches in policy and public forum debates, the judge will remind the debaters, “Time’s up” at the designated time limit. If the debaters go over the time limit by 30 seconds, they will be informed, “I’m sorry, you have to stop.” The debaters must stop speaking and get off the stage or sit down immediately. A point will be deducted for every 10 seconds overtime.
2. For cross-examinations in policy debates and crossfires in public forum debates, the judge will remind the debaters, “Time’s up” at the designated time limit. When time is up, if the debater is asking a question, he or she has to stop immediately, but if the debater is answering a question, he or she has to finish the answer in 10 seconds.
3. For prep time, the judge will inform, “Time’s up” at the designated time limit.
4. When it is time for a speech or questions, debaters for policy debate will be called to the lectern and thus must proceed to the lectern immediately, but debaters for public forum debate only need to rise up from the seat and do not need to proceed to the lectern. For both policy debate and public forum debate, a point will be deducted for every 10 seconds of delay.

#### G. Required Items

1. Debaters must bring their Student ID cards or ID cards.
2. Dictionaries and references are allowed, but all electronic devices are prohibited during the debate.
3. Each team should prepare evidence cards for cross-examination (policy debate) or crossfire (public forum debate). Any evidence cited during the debate should have a corresponding evidence card, which may be reviewed upon request by the cross-examiner/questioner and their teammates during the debate or by the judges at the end of the debate. For that reason, teams are advised to bring two sets of cards. Regulations regarding the content and viewing procedure of the evidence cards are as follows:
  - (1) Each card should contain only one piece of evidence.
  - (2) Each card should contain the following information: tag, publication or website, date of publication or retrieval, name and qualification of the author, and the actual quote. Please refer to the project’s official website (<https://shorturl.at/bjLTY>) for the evidence card format. If a debater or judge discovers that the format of a team’s evidence card does not meet the clipping requirements of this tournament, resulting in difficulty in reading comprehension, the judge may at their discretion deduct points from the team total.
  - (3) If the evidence is in Chinese, its source, date of publication or retrieval, name and qualification of the author, and the key parts of the quoted passage need to be translated into English and put in parentheses following the original Chinese words/sentences. If the evidence is in a language other than English or Chinese, it

needs to be translated verbatim into English.

- (4) During cross-examination/crossfire session, the cross-examiner is entitled to request to read all the evidence cited during the opponent team's speeches. Upon request, the cross-examinee should present the evident cards in a timely fashion. In the event of significant delay that hinders the opponents' review of the evidence cards, judges may at their discretion deduct team points for the cross-examination/crossfire sessions and factor the delay in presenting the evidence cards into the individual ranking of the responsible debater.
- (5) The evidence cards can be reviewed by the cross-examiner/questioner and/or their teammate, but should be returned at the end of the preparation time following the cross-examination (policy debate) or the crossfire session (public forum debate).

#### H. Prohibitions & Penalties

##### 1. Individual Drop-out:

- (1) Regional: There should be 4 debaters on each school team. If, for some reason, a school team has less than 4 debaters showing up at the tournament, it may still proceed with the available speakers, but will not qualify to compete for team awards. For the debater who competed in all three rounds, only the top two scores he/she obtained as an individual debater will be counted.
- (2) National: There should be 4 debaters on each school team. If, for some reason, a school team has less than 4 debaters showing up at the tournament, it may still proceed with the available speakers, but will not qualify to compete for team awards. For the debater who competed in either three or four rounds, only two best scores (one from the round where he/she debated as an affirmative and one from the round where he/she debated as a negative) will be counted.

##### 2. Team Drop-out:

- (1) A team (school) that after having successfully registered for the regional tournaments decided to withdraw with no legitimate reason will incur the penalty of being banned by the organizer from participating in the tournament for one to three years. The organizer will also send an official missive to inform the school that is banned of its final decision.
  - (2) As the regional and the National tournaments are two separate stages of the same tournament, team (school) that advances to the National tournament but decides to withdraw either before or after registration with no legitimate reason is regarded as a serious breach of sportsmanship and disrespect for the tournament. For those reasons, such a withdrawal will lead to not only the revocation of its title won at the regional tournaments but also a ban by the organizer from participating in the tournament for one to three years. An official missive will also be sent from the organizer to the school regarding its withdrawal and the incurred penalty.
3. All the debaters should compete in accordance with the sub-team information indicated on the match pair-up sheet and the registration form. Before the debate (either in-person or online) begins, the identity of debaters will be verified by judges.

In policy debate, the debaters on each sub-team have the autonomy to decide their own debate roles (i.e., who is Affirmative/Negative 1 or 2) and must indicate their debate roles along with their names on the result sheet before the debate begins and comply with the order of speaking associated with the chosen debate role. Debaters who violate the order of speaking will lose all the points for the session(s) where the violation occurs.

In public forum debate, there is no predetermined order of speaking associated with each debater. However, to facilitate identification and score assignment, public forum debaters should indicate their seating (i.e., "P-left," "P-right," "C-left," "C-right") along with their names on the result sheet before the debate begins.

If any team fails to compete in accordance with the sub-team information specified on the matchup sheet or on the registration form, both their individual and team scores for that particular round shall be voided. Should any "unregistered" substitute debaters be found,

that team shall be disqualified to compete for any team or individual awards.

4. In policy debate, debaters should step forward to designated positions for their speeches and cross-examinations. In public forum debate, debaters should rise from their seats to deliver speeches and engage in crossfires. For policy debate, the debater on stage is not allowed to discuss with his/her teammates at any time; but during cross-examination periods, cross-examinees can take the needed evidence from their teammates to facilitate the cross-examination, but teammates may not answer questions. Points may be deducted from the session where the prohibited conduct takes place. When asking and answering questions, please face the judges, instead of the opponent.
5. In both policy and public forum debates, debaters are strongly discouraged to deliver their speeches in an excessively fast pace (no spreading). Judges also have the right to intervene or take off points when the warning about the excessive speed is not heeded. In the event that a debater displays an arrogant or impolite demeanor during the course of the debate, the judges have the authority to temporarily halt the debate and issue a warning. If the debater fails to show improvement in their demeanor following the warning, the judges may at their discretion deduct points as deemed appropriate.
6. All teams/debaters must not behave disrespectfully toward others, or the adjudication committee may take away their title, which will then be filled by the runner-up team/debater.

I. Granting of Merit and Commendation

Teachers who have coached award-winning teams or award-winning individuals (up to two teachers per team, as indicated in the online registration) shall be granted merits or commendations by the hosting school based on the following criteria:

1. National Tournament:  
Winning Teams & Best Debater: One merit  
Judges' Choice Award & Honorable Mention Debater: Two commendations
2. Regional Tournament:  
Winning Teams & Best Debater: Two commendations  
Judges' Choice Award & Honorable Mention Debater: One commendation

IV. Onsite Code of Conduct

- A. Debaters must compete in accordance with the sub-team information indicated on the match pair-up sheet and the registration form.
- B. Debaters should get their IDs ready for the on-site staffers to verify their identities.
- C. Debaters should be seated according to their debate roles as indicated by the labels on the tables (i.e., "A1," "A2," "N1," "N2," "P-left," "P-right," "C-left," "C-right").
- D. The rooms will not have microphones.
- E. During the debate, debaters are prohibited from using smartphones, tablets, or other smart electronic devices for timing, accessing information, or composing arguments. However, the use of conventional electronic watches or traditional timing devices is permitted and not subject to this restriction.
- F. Debaters can use their cell phone as a timing device during the debate.
- G. Eating and drinking are prohibited in the classroom.
- H. Doors will be shut right after the match begins. Any entry is forbidden except for staff members and coordinators of the organizer.
- I. In order not to disturb the speaker, chatting and walking around in the classroom are not allowed during the debate. Please make sure your cell phone is turned off as well.
- J. Clapping is not allowed during the debate.
- K. Members in the audience are not allowed to talk to debaters in the front, nor are they allowed to pass over any information or materials.
- L. If you want to record or take photos, please set up your device before the debate begins. Flash is prohibited.
- M. Participating schools will be notified of the classrooms for debate matches once the information becomes available.

V. Dress Code and Identity Check

All participating teams will be referred to with a team code assigned by the organizer. Debaters should be dressed in formal attire that is not their school uniforms and shall bring with them their student ID cards when signing in.

VI. Disclaimer

Participants are strongly advised to thoroughly review the tournament's Implementation Plan and Rules & Regulations prior to the tournament. In the event of any discrepancies between the written information of the tournament and any oral instructions or responses provided by the organizing or hosting party on the day of the tournament, the written information shall prevail without exception.

VII. Matters not addressed in the tournament's Implementation Plan or Rules & Regulations, should there be any, will be resolved in accordance with measures adopted in similar events organized or sponsored by K-12 Education Administration, Ministry of Education, or based on consensual decisions reached by the organizing committee.

## Study Guide for 2024 Policy Debate

### **Resolved: The Taiwanese government should institute the mental health leave for secondary school students.**

Research on mental health has been steadily growing during the last 45 years, especially since 2010 in the USA (Hernández-Torrano, 2020), and is now often seen as one pole on the continuum from mental health to mental illness. The World Health Organization has defined mental health as “a state of well-being in which every individual realizes his or her potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and can make a contribution to her or his community” (World Health Organization, 2004 as cited in Hernández-Torrano, 2020). Stress is also a reality of the life that students may face in Taiwan. According to a 2023 survey by the Child Welfare League Foundation, around 10% of students experience severe levels of stress with schoolwork being one of the top three sources of stress (兒童福利聯盟, 2023). Also, the Ministry of Health and Welfare's 2022 mental health survey for secondary school students revealed concerning numbers of junior and senior high students who have contemplated or attempted suicide, with a rising suicide rate ranking as the second leading cause of death among adolescents (Guo, 2022). Currently, students can receive official leave from class for a variety of reasons with proper documentation. However, if personal leaves or unexcused absences reach one-third of class hours, the student shall receive a zero in the subject, and if accumulated absences amount to half of the total school days, the student shall be suspended (Ministry of Education, 2021).

With the growth in awareness of mental well-being, there is an increasing movement to incorporate mental health leave policies into the administration or regulation of a school year. Several American states have passed legislation since 2019 allowing for children and teens to take varying numbers of “mental health days” during the school year (Nelson & England, 2023), and as of the end of the 2022-2023 academic year, 12 Taiwanese universities have also implemented their own mental health leave policies (NOWnews, May 7, 2023). Can mental health leaves truly alleviate the stress afflicting local secondary school students? Would the mental health leave be a viable and positive addition to the regulations governing the administration of high schools in Taiwan? Given the fact that the majority of research into mental health has been done in Western countries with over half of publications being produced in the United States (Hernández-Torrano, 2020), is the concept of a mental health leave appropriate and feasible for Taiwan?

As this is a policy debate, both the affirmative and the negative should address a comprehensive policy involved with or conceived for this resolution. When arguing for the benefits or costs in your case or the opposition's, consider points related to the magnitude, probability, and/or time frame, and support your viewpoint with both clear

reasoning and concrete and contextualized evidence. Here is a word of caution: This debate tournament, aligning with “traditional” policy debate, prioritizes the use of logic and evidence, as well as arguments from the pragmatic perspective (i.e., the benefit-and-cost analysis of the policy itself), instead of something purely philosophical or only based on critical theories. Thus, a case containing only arguments that challenge a certain mindset or assumption made by the opposing team, often from the perspective of a critical theory (called a *kritik*) is strongly discouraged. The negative counterplan, if the negative decides to run one, must be *non-topical* (meaning the counterplan cannot affirm the proposition, i.e. you can’t include a mental health leave in your counterplan) and *non-conditional* (meaning the negative cannot ditch their counterplan during the debate), and preferably philosophically or practically incompatible with the affirmative plan to prevent the affirmative from running a permutation argument (i.e., arguing the affirmative plan and the counterplan are not *exclusive* and can be implemented at the same time; negative needs to show that their counterplan or repair will exclude the possibility of implementing mental health leaves).

Following is a list of references meant to provide some groundwork for debaters, which means it is by no means comprehensive or flawless. Many of the references also contain information or arguments that may not be directly relevant and thus warrant closer examination. Students are highly encouraged to continue researching beyond these preliminary references to deepen their understanding of the issue and strengthen their arguments in preparation for their debate rounds.

### Works Cited

Guo, X. (2022). 立法院全球資訊網-學生心理健康輔導機制之相關問題淺析 [Legislative Yuan World Wide Web - An Analysis of Issues Related to the Mental Health Counseling Mechanism for Students].

<https://www.ly.gov.tw/Pages/Detail.aspx?nodeid=6590&pid=225118>

Hernández-Torrano, D., Ibrayeva, L., Sparks, J., Lim, N., Clementi, A., Almukhambetova, A., Nurtayev, Y. R., & Muratkyzy, A. (2020). Mental Health and Well-Being of University Students: A Bibliometric Mapping of the Literature. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01226>

Ministry of Education. (n.d.). 教育部主管法規共用系統-法規內容-高級中等學校學生學習評量辦法 [Measures for Assessment of Students' Learning in Senior High Schools]. <https://edu.law.moe.gov.tw/LawContent.aspx?id=GL001247>

Nelson, K., & England, A. (2023, May 9). These are the US states allowing student mental health days. *Verywell Mind*. <https://www.verywellmind.com/us-states-allowing-student-mental-health-days-5270047>

NOWnews (May 7, 2023). 跨世代／12 所大學設心理假！專家籲制度應保有隱私、去汙名化 [Mental health leave: Experts call for privacy and destigmatization] Retrieved from: <https://www.nownews.com/news/6132355>

兒童福利聯盟 [Child Welfare Coalition]. (2023). 2023 年臺灣國高中生心理健康調查結果 [Results of the 2023 Mental Health Survey of National High School Students in Taiwan]. Retrieved from: [https://www.children.org.tw/publication\\_research/research\\_report/2544](https://www.children.org.tw/publication_research/research_report/2544)

## References

Abrams, Z. (n.d.). Student mental health is in crisis. Campuses are rethinking their approach. <https://www.apa.org>.  
<https://www.apa.org/monitor/2022/10/mental-health-campus-care>

Buck, D. (2021, November 30). The Problem with ‘Mental-Health Days’ at Schools. *National Review*. <https://www.nationalreview.com/2021/11/the-problem-with-mental-health-days-at-schools/>

Caron, C. (2021, October 14). Why Teens Are Advocating for Mental Health Days Off School. *The New York Times*.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/23/well/mind/mental-health-day-laws-kids.html>

Cofe. (2022). 十二年國教學生心理健康假- 提點子- 公共政策網路參與平臺 [Twelve-year State Education Students Mental Health Leave - Tips - Public Policy Online Participation Platform]. <https://join.gov.tw/idea/detail/a49e78d7-1d80-4a5d-943d-f528824666f6>

Guo, X. (2022). 立法院全球資訊網-學生心理健康輔導機制之相關問題淺析 [Legislative Yuan World Wide Web - An Analysis of Issues Related to the Mental Health Counseling Mechanism for Students].  
<https://www.ly.gov.tw/Pages/Detail.aspx?nodeid=6590&pid=225118>

Holloway, C. (2023, June 12). Is taking a mental health day actually good for you? *Cleveland Clinic*. <https://health.clevelandclinic.org/is-taking-a-mental-health-day-actually-good-for-you/>

Ingalls, N. (2023). Mental Health Days Help Kids, But Systemic Barriers Prevent Widespread Use. *Verywell Mind*. <https://www.verywellmind.com/mental-health-days-and-kids-survey-6361951>

Mahnken, K. (2022, March 8). Student ‘Mental Health Days’ Catching On In More States. <http://www.the74million.org/article/more-states-are-allowing-students-to-take-mental-health-days-but-could-the-practice-backfire/>

Ministry of Education. (2021). 教育部主管法規共用系統-法規內容-高級中等學校學生學習評量辦法 [Measures for Assessment of Students' Learning in Senior High Schools]. <https://edu.law.moe.gov.tw/LawContent.aspx?id=GL001247>

Onque, R. (2022, August 26). 74% of parents think schools should allow mental health days—these 12 states already do. *CNBC*. <https://www.cnbc.com/2022/08/23/12-states-that-allow-mental-health-days-for-kids-in-schools.html>

Partners, M. S. (2019, October 10). The Futility Of Mental Health Days. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mindsharepartners/2019/10/10/the-futility-of-mental-health-days/?sh=3ac99eac2d25>

Prothero, A. (2023, February 7). More schools are offering student mental health days. Here's what you need to know. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/leadership/more-schools-are-offering-student-mental-health-days-heres-what-you-need-to-know/2023/01>

Sandmeier, M. (2020). Are mental health days for students a good idea? *www.psychotherapynetworker.org*. <https://www.psychotherapynetworker.org/article/are-mental-health-days-students-good-idea>

Styx, L. (2023, May 9). States are now accepting “Mental Health Day” as a valid reason for missing school. *Verywell Mind*. <https://www.verywellmind.com/the-growing-acceptance-of-mental-health-days-for-students-5199076>

Weir, K. (n.d.). Safeguarding student mental health. *https://www.apa.org*. <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2020/09/safeguarding-mental-health>

Yurcaba, J. (2023, January 23). Why Taking a Mental Health Day Often Isn't Enough. *Verywell Mind*. <https://www.verywellmind.com/news-why-taking-a-mental-health-day-often-isn-t-enough-5081450>

## Study Guide for 2024 Public Forum Debate

### **Resolved: Media outlets bear a greater responsibility than viewers in combating sensationalism.**

The phenomenon of sensationalism, a tactic where news stories are presented in an exaggerated or provocative manner, has become increasingly common. It raises a critical question: To what extent should media outlets versus viewers be held accountable? Supporters of media outlets bearing greater responsibility claim that these outlets hold power to shape public opinions and ought to counter the prevalence of sensationalism. However, critics assert that content reflects audience preferences, and thus, viewers should consume news more responsibly by evaluating news sources and supporting outlets that prioritize accurate reporting. This debate hinges on the comparative impact of media outlets and viewers. Which side has a more significant role to play in reducing sensationalism?

The word "sensationalism" in the resolution refers to the practice of presenting news stories in an attention-grabbing manner to generate interest in the audience. As opposed to media, which refers to methods or channels of communication used to transmit information (e.g. TV, radio, and print), "media outlets" specifically denote organizations (e.g. CNN, BBC, and Formosa News) that produce and distribute news, information, and entertainment through various channels. "Viewers" are individuals who consume media content through media platforms. Also note that the word "greater" is vague, and thus, the debaters should set up a comparative framework from the outset. This can be done by arguing that one impact is bigger (in terms of magnitude), faster (in terms of time frame), or more likely (in terms of probability) than another. Such a framework provides a set of standards that will weigh into the judges' decision.

As this is a public forum debate, the emphasis should NOT be placed on how sensationalism can be curtailed. The pro side thus need not detail a plan for media outlets to fight sensationalism, nor should the con side ask questions concerning that issue. Instead, the debaters should focus on arguing the reasons and presenting evidence for more responsibility on the part of either media outlets or viewers.

Following is a list of references meant to serve as some groundwork for debaters, which means it is by no means comprehensive or flawless. Many of the references also contain information or arguments that may not be directly relevant and thus warrant closer examination. Students are still encouraged to continue researching in order to deepen their understanding of the issue and strengthen their arguments in preparation for their debate rounds.

## References

How to Combat Fake News and Disinformation

[www.brookings.edu/articles/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation](http://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation)

Nudging News Consumers and Producers

[www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/West-Stone\\_Nudging-News-Consumers-and-Producers.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/West-Stone_Nudging-News-Consumers-and-Producers.pdf)

It's Time to Hold the Media Accountable

<https://mhschronicle.com/staff-editorial-its-time-to-hold-the-media-accountable/>

Sensationalism in Media

<https://reporter.rit.edu/news/sensationalism-media>

How Sensationalist Journalism Obscures Views of Reality

<https://news.bahai.org/story/1605/>

The Disadvantage of Sensationalism in the Media

<https://www.sjuhawknnews.com/the-disadvantage-of-sensationalism-in-the-media/>

Fighting Fake News

[www.defindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Whose-Responsibility-Is-It\\_V7.pdf](http://www.defindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Whose-Responsibility-Is-It_V7.pdf)

Educating for Democracy in a Partisan Age: Confronting the Challenges of Motivated Reasoning and Misinformation

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0002831216679817>

What's Exactly Wrong with Taiwanese Media

<https://taiwaninsight.org/2022/05/26/whats-exactly-wrong-with-taiwanese-media/>

Research Says Taiwan's Local Media Free But Not Well Trusted

<https://www.taiwannews.com.tw/en/news/4895688>