Unit 11 — Issue-Framed Debate — Teacher copy

Track E · Klasse 13 · Niveau E (Basisfach / Leistungsfach) · Abitur year

Niveau E

1. Reading

Read the text and use it for the activities below.

Debate format (~30 minutes)

1. **Proposition Speaker 1 (5 min).** Frame motion + 1st argument.
2. **Opposition Speaker 1 (5 min).** Frame counter + 1st argument + 1 rebuttal.
3. **Proposition Speaker 2 (5 min).** 2nd argument + 2 rebuttals.
4. **Opposition Speaker 2 (5 min).** 2nd argument + 2 rebuttals.
5. **Proposition Speaker 3 closing (3 min).** Synthesis + final urge.
6. **Opposition Speaker 3 closing (3 min).** Synthesis + final urge.

Chair role

Chair (1 student): introduces motion, calls speakers, manages time, opens floor for 2 short questions per team, calls the close. Chair must remain neutral on the motion.

2. Practise

Niveau E — controlled

1. Match: Speaker 1 → frame + 1st argument; Speaker 2 → 2nd argument + rebuttals; Speaker 3 closing → synthesis + urge.
2. T or F: chair argues the motion; rebuttals must name the specific previous-speaker claim; closing speaker can introduce a new argument.

Niveau E — productive

3. Draft Speaker 2's bullets: 2nd argument + 2 named rebuttals.

3. Your turn

Class issue-framed debate (30 minutes). Two teams of three + chair. Audience scores each speaker on Bewertungsraster (Textgestaltung + Sprache). Class debrief at the end.

Sample

Madam Chair, I'd like to argue in favour of the motion. Firstly, the available evidence suggests that platform algorithms — like electricity grids before them — produce systematic externalities (privacy erosion, attention rents, civic-discourse distortion) that the market has consistently under-priced. Accordingly, the structural comparison to public utilities is not metaphor; it is policy. Secondly, the regulatory experience of energy and telecoms shows that mandatory transparency (capacity reporting, allocation reporting, tariff publication) is a precondition of competition rather than its enemy. Speaker 1 of the opposition will, I anticipate, claim that transparency requirements would expose trade secrets. I accept that some transparency designs would; the OFT-style compromise of the 1990s energy privatisation showed that commercial-in-confidence aggregation permits both transparency and competition. By contrast with the opposition's expected framing, the motion does not require open-source algorithms; it requires aggregate amplification reporting. In response to the anticipated *innovation* counter-argument, I would point out, more specifically, that the regulated-utility comparison has not historically killed innovation — it has redirected it toward infrastructure improvement. To summarise: the motion is moderate, the comparison is structural, and the precedent exists. I urge this house to support the motion.

4. Further reading / listening

- ESU (English-Speaking Union) — student debate footage.
- Oxford Union — selected debate recordings (with caution: register varies).

5. Teacher answer key

Controlled. 1. all true.

2. F (chair is neutral), T, F (no new arguments in closing — synthesis only).

Productive. 3. Open.