



METHODOLOGICAL GUIDE



For the implementation of
debate methodology in VET

*A methodological resource for VET
teachers ready to bring structured
debate into the classroom*

Voice of vocation, Zagreb, 2025.



Erasmus+
Enriching lives, opening minds.



Imprint

Voice of Vocation — Methodological Guide for the implementation of debate methodology in VET

Publisher: Croatian Debate Society (Hrvatsko debatno društvo, HDD)

Editors: Ivona Anić and Branimira Penić

Authors: Prepared by the Voice of Vocation consortium

Place and year: Zagreb, 2025

Funding: Co-funded by the European Union through the Erasmus+ Programme (Key Action 2: General Education). Total project funding: €400,000.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Agency for Mobility and EU Programmes (AMEUP). Neither the European Union nor AMEUP can be held responsible for them.

Project partners

- Croatian Debate Society — Croatia
- Škola za cestovni promet — Croatia
- Associazione Società Nazionale Debate Italia — Italy
- IISS Pietro Sette — Italy
- Debating Society Germany e.V. — Germany
- Berufliches Schulzentrum Bietigheim-Bissingen — Germany
- Otvorena komunikacija — Serbia
- Ekonomsko-trgovinska škola — Serbia
- International Debate Education Association (IDEA) — Netherlands / international network



Contents

- **Introduction**
- **How to use the Guide and the Toolkit together**
- **Active citizenship and soft skills in VET**
- **Why debate in VET schools?**
- **What is debate?**
 - ▶ Basics of debate
 - ▶ Debate formats
 - ▶ Classroom debate
 - ▶ Competitive debate
- **Debating in VET — Curricula**
 - ▶ Classroom debate (curricular)
 - ▶ Long-term debate curriculum
 - ▶ Extracurricular debate
 - ▶ Debate methodology in everyday class
 - ▶ Assessment & evaluation
- **Conclusion**
- **Reviews**

Introduction

This Methodological Guide was developed within the Voice of Vocation project under Erasmus+ KA2 (General Education). Led by the Croatian Debate Society and implemented by a consortium of nine partners — debate organisations and VET schools — the project responds to specific Vocational Education and Training needs: building transferable soft skills, civic competence, resilience, and motivation for lifelong learning. It is fully aligned with the 2018 Council Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning and the EU's focus on employability, inclusion, and active citizenship. Voice of Vocation recognises that VET teachers often lack tailored training and pedagogical materials adapted to VET, co-created with teachers, and tested in real classrooms.

◆ How the Guide was built

- Initial draft by 9 educators (VET teachers and debate experts) from 5 countries — Croatia, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Serbia.
- Refined across three feedback cycles with input from 24 VET educators in partner schools and associated institutions.
- Tested and validated by 40+ educators outside the partnership in over 30 schools, spanning urban, rural, remote, and varied-income contexts.
- Externally reviewed by experts in debate education and VET, plus a peer review by VET teachers.

Substantively, the Guide positions debate as a springboard for active citizenship and soft skills — critical thinking, communication, collaboration, adaptability, problem-solving — within VET realities and labour-market demands. It explains the fundamentals of debate (motion analysis, research, argumentation, models, case-building, refutation), the formats (KP, WS, BP, classroom), classroom organisation (roles, large groups, topic selection, time), and assessment (rubrics, self- and peer-assessment, formative feedback). In short, the Guide answers the WHAT and the WHY of debate-based pedagogy in VET.

★ An integrated resource suite

- Methodological Guide — theoretical and methodological framework (this document).
- Implementation Toolkit — operational lesson plans and stand-alone activities ready for the classroom.
- E-learning modules — self-paced learning for teachers.

How to Use the Guide and Toolkit Together

Designed as complementary halves of a single resource, the Guide and the Toolkit work best in this sequence:

1	2	3	4
Start with the Guide	Move to the Toolkit	Add e-learning	Track impact
Grasp the goals, structures, and pedagogy — the WHAT and the WHY.	Pick a lesson plan or stand-alone activity that fits your subject, group, and time slot.	Use online modules for your professional development and short student primers.	Apply rubrics and feedback forms; run small implement → feedback → adjust cycles.

Active Citizenship and Soft Skills in VET

Active citizenship is the ability to make a positive contribution to one's own community and to society at large. It calls for a real understanding of democratic processes, critical thinking, and the capacity to engage in meaningful dialogue. Debate develops exactly those muscles: critical thinking, effective communication, and active listening.

The world is undergoing rapid socio-economic, political, and technological change — pressures that fall heavily on Vocational Education and Training. Hard skills still matter, but soft skills — critical thinking, communication, adaptability, teamwork — are increasingly what set VET graduates up for success at work and as citizens. Recent studies emphasise the importance of soft skills for an evolving job market: as workplaces grow more dynamic and technologically sophisticated, the ability to adapt, collaborate, and solve problems carries more and more weight.

Debate inside VET programmes bridges theory and practice. Students articulate their thoughts, defend their viewpoints, and weigh competing perspectives — habits that transfer across subjects, into workplaces, and into civic life. Debate also aligns with the EU's emphasis on key competences for lifelong learning. The 2018 European Framework outlines eight key competences — including personal, social, and learning-to-learn competences, citizenship competence, and cultural awareness — and debate touches almost all of them.

■ Employability — what the EU means by it

- Young people enter the world of work with the knowledge and skills guaranteed by a quality training system.
- Workers can move from one role to another inside the same organisation, meeting whatever the new role requires.

These employability skills are a mix of technical and soft skills: communication, collaboration, problem-solving, creativity, leadership, emotional intelligence, adaptability, and a commitment to lifelong learning. Debate is unusually good at growing all of them at once. Through structured practice students learn to analyse issues, evaluate perspectives, and present coherent arguments. They develop leadership and emotional intelligence by managing stress, listening across difference, and constructively engaging peers. They build adaptability and a habit of continuous learning — qualities that translate directly into modern workplaces.

Debate skills mapped to EU Key Competences for Lifelong Learning (2018)

Debate skill	Linked EU key competence	Debate's contribution
Critical thinking & problem-solving	Personal, social and learning-to-learn · Citizenship	Students analyse complex issues, challenge assumptions, and evaluate

		arguments — strengthening reflective judgment and democratic participation.
Communication (verbal, non-verbal, paraverbal)	Literacy · Multilingual	Debaters practise clear structure, adapt language to context, and use body language and tone deliberately.
Collaboration & teamwork	Personal, social and learning-to-learn	Debate requires coordinated team prep, role distribution, and consensus-building — workplace cooperation in miniature.
Argumentation & persuasion	Citizenship · Literacy	Students learn to defend positions with evidence and reason — essential for civic engagement and public discourse.
Research & information literacy	Digital · Literacy	Debaters evaluate sources, verify credibility, and integrate evidence — building real media and information literacy.
Adaptability & creativity	Personal, social and learning-to-learn · Cultural awareness and expression	Impromptu debates train adaptability, creative framing, and openness to alternative perspectives.
Leadership & initiative	Entrepreneurship	Debate creates leadership roles — speakers, chairs, judges — and demands strategic decisions under pressure.
Ethical reasoning & respect for diversity	Citizenship · Cultural awareness and expression	Debaters engage opposing views respectfully, build empathy, and surface intercultural and ethical issues.
Confidence & resilience	Personal, social and learning-to-learn	Practice grows self-esteem, resilience to criticism, and the capacity to perform under stress.

Debating global and vocational issues for stronger employability

Once students have a foundation in soft skills, they can sharpen them on real-world issues. Events in one part of the world ripple across continents, shaping local markets and daily lives. Inflation, climate change, social justice, geopolitics, public health — debating these topics forces students to research thoroughly, hold competing viewpoints in mind at once, and build well-reasoned arguments.

A climate-change debate, for example, demands scientific data, policy analysis, and a socio-economic lens all at once. Social-justice debates send students into history, law, and current affairs. International-relations motions push them into geopolitics, culture, and diplomacy — quietly building global citizenship. Public-health motions weave together evidence, policy, and ethics. None of these are abstract exercises: each one shapes the way students approach complexity for the rest of their lives.

Vocational topics matter just as much. Debates such as “the impact of automation on skilled trades” or “the role of renewable energy in future vocational jobs” pull students into industry-specific knowledge and force them to forecast where their field is heading. Along the way they grow technical fluency and the soft skills — adaptability, communication, strategic thinking — that make them genuinely employable.

Debate skills in business settings

In business, the ability to persuade and to communicate clearly often decides whether an enterprise succeeds. Debate skills show up everywhere — negotiation, sales, leadership.

Steve Jobs, Richard Branson, Sara Blakely — none of them built what they built without an exceptional ability to argue a vision into existence. Jobs’s presentations rallied teams and customers around Apple. Branson’s talent for persuading stakeholders turned Virgin into a diversified international brand. Blakely talked manufacturers and retailers into believing in Spanx when nothing like it existed.

For VET students, debate skills are tools for the world they’re heading into: negotiating with clients, persuading investors, leading teams, making sound decisions under uncertainty. Persuasive argumentation, active listening, strategic thinking — these are the muscles that win negotiations, drive sales, and steer organisations through crises.

Why Debate in a VET School?

VET schools exist to fuse knowledge with skill — “know-how” that students can use the moment they walk into a workplace. Debate strengthens precisely the soft skills that anchor that know-how: communication, collaboration, and critical thinking.

Dialogical strategies — and debate in particular — start as early as primary school and are considered essential for soft-skill development, citizenship education, and the rapidly shifting world of work. Debate training maps neatly onto the skills the World Economic Forum’s Future of Jobs Report 2023 highlights:

◆ Skills the labour market is demanding

- Problem-solving.
- Creativity, originality, and reasoning.
- Self-management, stress tolerance, and active learning.
- Working with people — collaboration and leadership.

These are exactly the skills AI cannot easily replicate. Companies keep pointing to communication, collaboration, and team-building as strategic. Building them takes time and intentional practice — which is exactly what a school curriculum can deliver. Debate, treated as a methodology of “knowing how to think,” deserves a place in VET curricula as a vehicle for active citizenship, career orientation, and social inclusion.

What debate can do inside a VET school

★ Five concrete impacts

- Counters communicative poverty — especially for students whose family or social context offers limited linguistic tools — through education in dialogue, empathy, and creative thinking.
- Motivates students by anchoring lessons in current, interesting topics tied to their future careers.
- Creates a positive learning environment in mixed socio-cultural classrooms by giving everyone a role with shared goals.
- Reduces failure and dropout by adding dynamic, active workshops to the curriculum.
- Encourages ethical and moral development.

The evidence backs the claim. Mezuk and colleagues (2021) studied ten years of school data from 116 high schools and found that debaters were 19% more likely to graduate than non-debaters, with a grade-point average about a full point higher. Other studies show improvements in literacy, reading comprehension, school engagement, and university enrolment, alongside reductions in absenteeism.

Bringing debate into VET classrooms transforms passive lectures into active conversations. Students don't just receive information — they own positions, defend them, and adjust under challenge. That ownership is the difference.

How debate shows up across VET subjects

BUSINESS Business & entrepreneurship Ethical use of social-media data in marketing. Pros and cons of management styles. Globalisation and local businesses.	HEALTH Healthcare & medical Allocating limited medical resources. Ethics of emerging medical technologies. Cost-benefit of specific interventions.
TECH Technology & IT AI and the job market. Ethics of cybersecurity hacking. Open-source vs. proprietary software.	HOSPITAL Hospitality & tourism Tourism's impact on local economies vs. environmental and cultural costs. Sustainable tourism practices.

What Is Debate?

Debate is a formal, structured discussion where participants argue opposing viewpoints on a specific topic. The goal is to persuade an audience or judges through well-organised arguments, clear communication, and strategic refutation. Effective debating rests on five habits: communication, analysis, research, argumentation, and refutation.

Debate is not a chaotic argument or a contest of who can be the loudest. It is not about winning at any cost. It is about presenting and defending well-reasoned viewpoints while engaging respectfully with opposing perspectives.

Every debate revolves around a controversial topic stated as a motion — a clear proposition that defines the issue to be debated and what is at stake. Different motion types call for different ways of analysing, preparing, and arguing.

Several common components structure every debate. It opens with introductions, where teams frame their positions and the topic. The main arguments phase is where each team lays out its case with evidence. In rebuttals, teams engage directly with the opposing arguments. Cross-examination lets participants probe weaknesses in the other side’s case. The conclusion lets each team summarise and make a final appeal. Format details vary, but the underlying scaffolding is always recognisable.

Basics of debate — the six core moves

At the core of every debate is a team’s ability to engage thoroughly with the topic — analysing the issue, deciding what must be proven, weighing arguments, and preparing evidence. The process moves through six steps:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Motion analysis	Research	Argument	Model	Case	Refutation
Read the motion. Pin down the conflict.	Find credible evidence.	Build claim, explanation, evidence, link.	For policy motions: agent, mechanism, cost.	Combine arguments into a coherent line.	Engage and dismantle the opposition.

1 • Motion analysis

Every good debate starts with a balanced, debatable motion — one that gives both teams real arguments. Different motions can be drawn from a single topic depending on which aspect of the problem you want to tackle.

The motion is the central proposition the team must prove or disprove. It frames the discussion and steers every argument that follows. A strong motion is clear, concise, and debatable — specific enough to focus the debate but broad enough to host real disagreement. “School uniforms should be mandatory in all public schools” is a clear, specific motion that supports substantial arguments on both sides.

Knowing the motion type matters: each type shifts the burden of proof and the line of reasoning teams should follow.

MOTION Fact “Something is or isn’t.” Built on evidence and examples; the team must prove the claim beyond reasonable doubt. Example: “Advertising does more harm than good.”	MOTION Value “Something has inherent worth — or doesn’t.” Built on comparison against defined criteria. Example: “Shakespeare is the world’s greatest writer.”	MOTION Policy “Something should be done — or shouldn’t.” Usually opens with This House would. Built on a model that proposes change to the status quo.
---	---	---

Once the type is identified, dig deeper into framing, impact, and stakeholders. Two prep modes are common: impromptu (the motion drops shortly before the debate, e.g. an hour out — logical-argumentative skill carries the day) and prepared (the motion is announced well in advance, e.g. a month out, allowing thorough research).

▣ Toolkit cross-reference

- Lesson: Motion Analysis.
- Lesson: Understanding Types of Motions in the WSD format.

2 • Research

Debate performance occupies a relatively short slice of the whole debate process. Most of the time is spent going deeper — finding evidence that strengthens arguments. Thorough research is the backbone of every successful debate.

■ What good research looks like

- Source selection — academic journals, reputable news outlets, expert opinion.
- Evidence gathering — relevant data, statistics, case studies, examples.
- The researcher’s job — collect general information, identify the research hypothesis, organise and evaluate evidence that supports your arguments and enables refutation.

▣ Toolkit cross-reference

- Lesson: Debate Research — Fast facts for strong arguments.

3 • Making an argument

An argument is a set of statements or reasons used to support or oppose the thesis. A compelling argument always has four parts: claim, explanation, evidence, link.

PART 1 Claim The central assertion you're trying to prove — clear and specific. e.g. "Mandatory uniforms improve student behaviour."	PART 2 Explanation Why is the claim valid or important? Spell out the reasoning — the logic, principle, or mechanism behind it.	PART 3 Evidence Facts, statistics, expert opinion, case studies, real-life examples. Credible, relevant, and robust enough to back the claim.	PART 4 Link to thesis Connects the argument back to the motion. Answers: how does this argument prove the thesis?
---	---	--	--

Persuasiveness is built on logical consistency and relevance. Anticipate counter-arguments and address weaknesses in your own case before the opposition can. To make sure each argument earns its place, weigh its impact — does it actually move the debate?

▣ Toolkit cross-reference

- Lesson: Argumentation.
- Lesson: Logic in Debate.
- Lesson: Build Your Argument.

4 • Model

When the motion is a policy motion, you need a model — a concrete plan for what should be done about the problem. A good model spells out three things:

MODEL Agent Who carries out the action? Government, schools, the police, the EU, an industry body — name the actor.	MODEL Mechanism How does it work? The actual policy or steps — ban, tax, regulate, subsidise, educate, mandate.	MODEL Cost What does it cost — financially, politically, socially? The realistic trade-offs you accept by choosing this plan.
--	---	---

A model isn't needed when the debate centres on whether a problem exists or what its implications are. It is essential when the motion proposes a solution. Take "Government intervention is necessary to combat climate change": a model might propose carbon taxes (mechanism), the government or a designated agency (agent), and quantified financial and economic impacts (cost). A well-designed model demonstrates that your solution is feasible, practical, and ready to deal with the problem in front of it.

▣ Toolkit cross-reference

- Lesson: Model.
- Lesson: Building a Plan — How to Create a Model in Policy Debate.

5 • Building a case

A case is a cohesive set of arguments that justify the team's stance on the topic. Building a case means assembling the team's arguments and making sure they're solid and consistent. It lets debaters prioritise the arguments they think matter most and decide how to interpret the topic to defend them. Within a case, debaters define a team line — a strategic ordering of arguments. For a policy motion, the case ties tightly to the problem being solved and the reasoning behind the proposed solution.

▣ Toolkit cross-reference

- Lesson: Case Building.

6 • Rebuttal & refutation

Refutation is challenging and dismantling the opposition's arguments. It's the move that makes a debate a debate. Effective refutation rests on four strategies:

◆ Four strategies for refutation

Identify flaws

Logical inconsistencies, missing evidence, unsupported assumptions in the opponent's case.

Counter-evidence

Present evidence that directly contradicts or undermines their claims.

Reframe

Offer a different perspective that shrinks the importance or relevance of their argument.

Minimise

Concede minor points but show that even if true they don't move the resolution.

Refutation should be clear, concise, and direct, targeting the core weaknesses in your opponent's argument. Strong refutation can shift the momentum of a debate — it shows critical thinking and the ability to respond under pressure. Debaters can rebut during their own speech or by offering a Point of Information (POI) during the opponent's speech. POIs must be short — no more than 15 seconds.

Toolkit cross-reference

- Lesson: Refutation.

Debate Formats

Several formats are used around the world. This chapter covers the four most common in European classrooms.

The four formats at a glance

KP Karl Popper 2 teams · 3 speakers each 6+6+5+5 + 5/5 summary Cross-examination periods	WS World Schools 2 teams · 3 speakers each 8 min main speeches + 4 min reply POIs minutes 1–7	BP British Parliamentary 4 teams · 2 speakers each 7 min per speaker 2 governments + 2 oppositions	CR Classroom Flexible roles Adjust speakers, judges, time Ideal for everyday VET classrooms
--	---	--	---

Karl Popper Debate (KP)

Two teams of three speakers debate a pre-set motion.

Order of speeches

6 min	OPEN 1st Proposition	Presents the team's case.
3 min	CX Cross-examination	1st Opposition questions 1st Proposition.
6 min	OPP 1st Opposition	Presents counter-arguments.
3 min	CX Cross-examination	1st Proposition questions 1st Opposition.

5 min	PROP 2nd Proposition	Develops the case; responds to opposition.
3 min	CX Cross-examination	Round of CX between 2nd speakers.
5 min	OPP 2nd Opposition	Builds on rebuttal; presents fresh challenges.
5 min	SUM Proposition Summary	Final summation and appeal to judges.
5 min	SUM Opposition Summary	Final summation and appeal to judges.

World Schools Debate (WS)

WS blends prepared and impromptu debating. Each team has three speakers; speeches are eight minutes; reply speeches at the end are four minutes. Between minutes one and seven of each speech, opposing speakers can offer Points of Information (POIs) — short questions or remarks. Accepting one or two demonstrates engagement.

Order of speeches

8 min	PROP Prime Minister	Frames the motion and opens the case.
-------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------------

8 min	OPP Leader of the Opposition	Counters the case; opens the opposition line.
8 min	PROP Deputy Prime Minister	Builds the case; engages opposition.
8 min	OPP Deputy Leader of the Opposition	Builds the opposition line; rebuts.
8 min	PROP Member of Government	Adds further substantive argument and rebuttal.
8 min	OPP Member of Opposition	Adds further substantive argument and rebuttal.
4 min	REPLY Opposition Reply	Closing summary — opposition speaks first.
4 min	REPLY Government Reply	Closing summary — government has the last word.

British Parliamentary Debate (BP)

BP is dynamic and engaging — four teams of two speakers each. Two sides (Government and Opposition) each split into Opening and Closing teams.

Order of speeches

7 min	OPEN GOV Prime Minister	Opens with the team's case.
7 min	OPEN OPP Leader of the Opposition	Frames the opposition response.
7 min	OPEN GOV Deputy Prime Minister	Builds case; rebuts.
7 min	OPEN OPP Deputy Leader of Opposition	Builds the opposition; rebuts.
7 min	CLOSE GOV Member of Government	Brings new analysis; widens the case.
7 min	CLOSE OPP Member of Opposition	Brings new analysis; widens the opposition.
5 min	SUMMARY Government Whip	Closes — summarises and reinforces.
5 min	SUMMARY Opposition Whip	Closes — summarises and reinforces.

Classroom Debate

The classroom is an ideal environment for debate. It's a familiar, low-stakes setting where students can practise under a teacher's eye. Used well, debate sharpens critical thinking, improves argumentation, and builds confidence.

Instead of a traditional lecture on, say, the ethics of genetic engineering, run a debate where some students argue for genetic modification to prevent disease and others argue against it on safety and ethical grounds. Variants like fishbowl debates (a small group debates in the centre while the rest observes and feeds back) and debate carousels (students rotate through stations on different aspects of a topic) keep discussion lively.

This chapter covers how to organise debate inside the constraints every teacher faces — curriculum, time, group size.

1 • Role assignments

Imagine teaching the causes and effects of the 1929 financial crisis. In a traditional lecture, you explain — students take notes (or yawn). Instead, group them, give them different sources and perspectives, and let them debate. Active participation, critical thinking, and engagement follow.

■ WSDC roles — the standard 11

- Three speakers — Proposition.
- Three speakers — Opposition.
- One timekeeper.
- One chairperson.
- Three judges.

Eleven participants is the standard, but class sizes vary. The art is making sure every student has something meaningful to do.

2 • Tweaking the debate to your group size

Be flexible with the number of participants. Adjusting the WSDC standard doesn't weaken the debate — even major tournaments adapt formats based on available people.

◆ Common adjustments for smaller groups

- One judge — winner takes all.
- Two judges — the more experienced gets two votes.
- Skip timekeepers and chairs; team members cover those roles.

- Iron-manning — one speaker delivers two speeches to fill a missing teammate.

These work when participant count is limited. The harder problem is the opposite: managing thirty-plus students.

3 • Managing large groups

With 20–30+ students, every student needs a role. Debates often run beyond a single session; leaving students idle is fatal — especially when the activity contributes to grades.

★ Debate roles by involvement

- Speakers — heavy involvement, both prep and debate.
- Judges — light prep, active during the debate and feedback.
- Chair / Timekeeper — light prep, active during the debate.
- Researchers — extra roles for prep-heavy or promotional work.

Match roles to abilities and interests. Some students want the spotlight; others thrive in supporting roles. Encourage everyone to try something new — confidence builds when students discover talents they didn't know they had.

4 • Allocating time

Prep and debate timing is up to you. More prep time means deeper exploration; impromptu debates with minimal prep can also be effective. Adjust speaking times to fit the schedule you actually have.

5 • Choosing the right topic

Topic choice can be a double-edged sword. Pick motions that are fair, balanced, and tied to your students' interests and curriculum. In history class, "THBT the Industrial Revolution did more harm than good" opens up social, economic, and environmental analysis. In science, "THW make vaccinations mandatory" teaches students about public-health policy and the evidence behind it.

6 • Evaluation and feedback

Effective judging is constructive judging. Stay positive. Highlight areas to improve without discouraging participants. Recognise the bravery of standing up to argue — and frame every debate as a chance to learn.

Using debate games in the classroom

Debate games turn ordinary lessons into something students remember. Continuum Line, Four Corners, Hot Seat, Think-Pair-Share, Fishbowl, Role-Play Debate, Devil's Advocate — each offers a different way to build critical thinking, communication, and collaboration.

★ Why use debate games

Engagement and motivation

Lively, dynamic classrooms; learning becomes interactive instead of received.

Skill development

Critical thinking, public speaking, active listening, logical argument — plus emotional intelligence in handling disagreement.

Real-world application

These skills transfer directly: business meetings, civic debate, everyday decisions.

GAME

The Continuum Line

History: causes of an event.
Science: ethical implications of a new technology.

GAME

Four Corners

Literature: interpretations of a text. Social studies: current events or policy positions.

GAME

Hot Seat

One student answers in character — historical figure, politician, expert. Others probe.

GAME

Think–Pair–Share

Think alone → discuss in pairs → share with the class. Encourages clarity and listening.

GAME

Fishbowl

A small inner circle debates; the outer circle observes and rotates in.

GAME

Role-Play Debate

Small groups defend an assigned role or perspective.

▣ Toolkit cross-reference

- Lesson: Debate Exercises for Negotiation, Communication & Presentation Skills.

Competitive Debate

Competitive debate means tournaments. There are plenty of opportunities at local and international level. The single most important factor in a team's success is the coach.

Coaching is more than teaching the basics. It is about building skills, strategies, and confidence — and shaping a team that can think critically, work well together, and construct or dismantle arguments under pressure.

1 • Forming a balanced team

Different speaker positions need different strengths. A balanced team plays each speaker to what they're best at:

POSITION	POSITION	POSITION
1st Speaker	2nd Speaker	3rd Speaker
Strong on research; structured, well-supported arguments. Confident enough to lay down the team's foundational case.	Quick-thinking; effective at responding to the opposition. Adaptable; sharp at rebuttal while still building the case.	Strong analytical synthesis. In WS, also rebuts. Combines summary with counter-argumentation.

2 • Developing debate and strategy skills

◆ Four pillars of competitive skill

Research

Credible evidence from diverse sources — academic journals, reputable news, expert opinion. Stay current; familiarise the team with multiple perspectives on common motions.

Argumentation

Claim, explanation, evidence, link — and impact. Push for logical consistency, relevance, and persuasion in every argument.

Refutation

Critically analyse counter-arguments and prepare rebuttals. Run drills targeting common weaknesses in case construction.

Public speaking

Verbal and non-verbal delivery. Practise tone, pacing, body language, and eye contact until they're instinctive.

3 • Building team cohesion and confidence

★ How to coach a team

Encourage collaboration

Open communication and teamwork. Sharing ideas, constructive criticism, mutual support across prep.

Build confidence

Highlight strengths and work on weaknesses. Positive reinforcement; every debate is a chance to learn.

Manage stress

Teach focus, calm, composure under pressure. Breathing exercises, mental prep, dealing with nerves.

Strategic, supportive, skill-focused coaching is what prepares students for tournament success — and, more importantly, turns them into confident critical thinkers and effective communicators.

Debating in VET — Curricula

★ The heart of the Guide

How to actually fold debate into a VET school week — without disrupting subject learning, blowing up timetables, or asking teachers to become debate coaches overnight.

Debate activities can be added to the curriculum to make their impact on learning more effective and to integrate them into general teaching methodology. We propose three debate curricula. Pick whichever fits your school context and your level of comfort with debate.

Three debate curricula at a glance

OPTION 1

Classroom debate

Curricular use, woven into individual subjects. Best starting point for students with no previous debate experience.

OPTION 2

Long-term curriculum

A multi-year programme building specific soft skills across subjects.

OPTION 3

Extracurricular debate

Voluntary clubs aiming at competitive tournaments — for students who want to go further.

We recommend starting with classroom debate when students are new to debating, then planning a multi-year curriculum, then — if there's real student and teacher appetite — adding extracurricular activities aimed at competitive tournaments.

1 • Classroom debate (curricular)

“Classroom debate” is an educational methodology that engages students in a structured discussion on a specific topic — usually tied to an individual subject. It works best when practised regularly throughout the school year (for example, once a week), so it becomes systematic and embedded.

The structured path below is designed for beginners, in 45-minute sessions. Sessions can be repeated as your class needs. Each alternates theory with interactive practice. For deeper examples and full lessons, see the Toolkit's Basic Track.

MODULE

Introduction to debate (1 session)

Show students why debate matters.

◆ Objectives

- Introduce the skills debate develops.
- Highlight the ethical values of debating.

■ Content

- What debate is and why it matters.
- Ethical responsibilities of debaters.
- Debate format and rules — speaking time, number of speakers, roles.

★ Warm-up / guided practice

Why-game; tongue-twisters.

✦ Activities

- Body-language activities.
- Short debate on a simple topic — e.g. cats vs. dogs, or “all zoos should close” — to familiarise students with technique and procedure.

✓ Self-assessment

Encourage students to reflect on what they learned and how they felt about it.

MODULE

Constructing arguments (multiple sessions)

Sound arguments are the foundation. Use the AREL structure — Assertion, Reasoning, Evidence, Link-back — like the framework of a well-built house.

◆ Objectives

- Recognise and construct logically sound arguments using AREL.

■ Content

- Recognising argument structure; completing the AREL skeleton.
- Constructing persuasive arguments with AREL.

★ Warm-up / guided practice

Balloon debate; “may I have a minute to talk about...”; the for/against game.

✦ Activities

- Build pro and con arguments on simple motions.
- Develop arguments on vocational topics — workplace safety, regulation, technology, ethics.
- Launch a motion.

✓ Self-assessment

Encourage students to reflect on what they learned and how they felt about it.

MODULE

Research skills (1 session)

Documentary research is essential. Modern information sources are limitless — and not always reliable. Students need to find, recognise, and select what they can trust.

◆ Objectives

- Develop research skills, evaluate sources, manage information.

■ Content

- Basics of documentary research and bibliographic resources.
- Assessing source quality and reliability.

★ Warm-up / guided practice

Guided use of libraries, databases, web sources, digital tools.

✦ Activities

- Topic selection tied to the curriculum.
- Research using online and bibliographic sources.
- Source evaluation against the criteria taught.
- Compile a research report with a properly formatted bibliography.
- Hands-on activities focused on vocational topics relevant to students' future careers.

✓ Self-assessment

Encourage students to reflect on what they learned and how they felt about it.

MODULE

Rebuttal (multiple sessions)

After argument construction, debaters need to rebut — a counter-argument or response to an opponent's claim, supported by evidence, logic, or contradicting examples.

◆ Objectives

- Recognise the opponent's logical weaknesses and construct effective rebuttals.

■ Content

- Structure of rebuttal — restate, counter, support with evidence, explain impact.
- Types: direct, indirect (comparison), pre-emptive.
- Strategies: negation, overcoming, overturning.
- Logical fallacies.
- Rebuttal via Point of Information (POI).

★ Warm-up / guided practice

Present a statement (e.g. “Homework should be banned”). Students have one minute to draft a rebuttal; share back.

✦ Activities

- Write a rebuttal that restates, counters, supports, and explains impact.
- Apply different types of rebuttal to the same argument.
- Pair drills — 1-minute arguments answered with 1-minute rebuttals.

✓ Self-assessment

Encourage students to reflect on what they learned and how they felt about it.

MODULE

Communication skills (multiple sessions)

Debate is an oral exercise. Verbal, paraverbal (intonation, pace, pitch), and non-verbal communication — together they form a powerful, persuasive tool.

◆ Objectives

- Successfully manage verbal, paraverbal, and non-verbal communication with rhetorical awareness.

■ Content

- Public speaking, active listening, non-verbal communication.
- Audience engagement, conveying ideas clearly, responding to questions and challenges.

★ Warm-up / guided practice

Pantomime — communicate a concept without words. Paraverbal exercise — deliver fictional words with different emotions.

✦ Activities

- Active listening in pairs.
- Scenario simulations: handling conflict, negotiating an agreement.
- Analysing famous speeches.

✓ Self-assessment

Encourage students to reflect on what they learned and how they felt about it.

MODULE

Judging a debate

Debate doesn't end in a draw — judges award the win. Students should know the criteria they'll be judged on; letting students judge each other reinforces those criteria.

◆ Objectives

- Recognise judging criteria and evaluate a debate.

■ Content

- Examples of feedback.
- Skill assessment across the debate curriculum to drive improvement.

★ Warm-up / guided practice

Mini-judging exercise: short clip of a debate speech. Students rate it on content, style, strategy with thumbs up/down or 1–3 scale.

✦ Activities

- Use an evaluation sheet while watching a debate.
- Discuss evaluations and decide a winning team.

✓ Self-assessment

Encourage students to reflect on what they learned and how they felt about it.

MODULE

Practice debate (multiple sessions)

Run a full debate. Choose a motion students care about, split into two (or more) teams, mentor through arguments and rebuttals, then have them debate.

◆ Objectives

- Practise debating end-to-end.

■ Content

- Refine technique; adapt to format and opponent.
- Mock debates on complex vocational topics for advanced practice.

★ Warm-up / guided practice

Lightning round on a simple motion (e.g. “THP summer to winter”). 5 minutes prep, 2–3 minutes per speaker.

✦ Activities

- Team prep simulation: outline case structure on flipcharts before writing speeches.
- Rotating roles: swap proposition/opposition or speaker/judge mid-debate.
- Vocational mock debate: e.g. “THW make financial literacy compulsory in vocational schools.”

✓ Self-assessment

Encourage students to reflect on what they learned and how they felt about it.

Cross-curricular integration

After the basic debate course — or after the introductory theoretical sessions — start running debates on subject-specific topics. This way you achieve disciplinary and interdisciplinary objectives in one move.

► Two ways to integrate

- Use the curriculum across all VET subjects — history, biology, ethics, economics, social studies — to build interdisciplinary learning.
- Introduce debating as a project on relevant topics in any subject to push research and speaking skills.

2 · Long-term debate curriculum

A long-term curriculum unlocks the educational potential of debate at multiple levels. After the classroom-debate phase introduces beginners to fundamentals, you can use debate as a focused tool to reinforce specific skills across two years of teaching.

We've picked three soft skills tied to different subject areas — but you can swap in others based on your school's focus:

◆ Three soft skills, three subject areas

- Critical thinking — humanistic and social subjects.
- Communication skills — humanistic and social subjects.
- Teamwork — vocational/professional subjects.

Year 1 — critical thinking and communication

After the basic debate course, embed debate methodology across subjects with a focus on critical and communication skills. These underpin not just debating but learning in general — which is exactly why they should sit at the centre of transdisciplinary teaching.

★ Year 1 objectives

- Analyse and evaluate arguments; spot logical fallacies; build evidence-based reasoning.
- Refine public speaking; communicate complex ideas clearly; engage in persuasive discourse.

✦ Year 1 activities

- Structured debates on simple topics to drill argument and rebuttal.
- Analyse debate videos and case studies for persuasive technique.
- Individual research projects on social issues to grow information literacy.
- Impromptu speaking to build spontaneity and clarity under pressure.
- Guest speakers from different professions on real-world communication.

Year 2 — team dynamics and leadership

Year two shifts toward professionalising and transversal skills the labour market demands, and toward debates that engage students' social and professional context.

★ Year 2 objectives

- Collaborate effectively in teams, delegate, resolve conflict, demonstrate leadership.

✦ Year 2 activities

- Workshops on conflict resolution and consensus-building.
- Peer mentoring and coaching to grow leadership.
- Regional or national debate competitions to test skills under pressure.
- Personal reflection and self-assessment to track growth.
- Self-orientation assessment and personal debater curriculum.

3 • Extracurricular debate

Extracurricular debate is mostly about competitive opportunities — local, national, and occasionally in a foreign language. Students opt in voluntarily after school. Coaches plan advanced activities that refine the skills already built in class — argumentation, documentary research, case construction. The goal of the debate club is participation in tournaments such as World Schools Debate.

 Toolkit cross-reference

- Implementation Toolkit: Advanced Track.

4 • Debate methodology in everyday class

Beyond units and clubs entirely focused on debate, the project also developed topical lessons that fold debate methodology directly into regular VET classes. The idea is simple: teachers carry on with their subject — transport safety, hospitality management, IT security, entrepreneurship, healthcare ethics — while integrating debate elements into the lesson. Students stay actively engaged and develop soft skills along the way.

Debate doesn't need to be confined to extracurricular clubs or full-scale formats. This flexible approach lets teachers use debate as a one-off activity, an opener or closer, or a recurring feature of their teaching. A short debate on road rage can complement a transport-safety class. A 20-minute exchange on gender equality at work can sit inside a business class.

One of the project's key innovations is the topical lessons themselves — they connect debate methodology to everyday subject teaching. VET teachers continue delivering subject content while building the transversal skills described elsewhere in this Guide. Even when lesson time is limited, debate can take the form of a structured discussion, a 20–30-minute mini-debate, or a reflective exercise that surfaces multiple perspectives.

Topical lessons cover ten thematic areas

THEME Civic literacy	THEME Media & information literacy	THEME Human rights	THEME Interculturalism	THEME EU political & economic processes
THEME Labour-market readiness	THEME Gender equality	THEME Communication & social skills	THEME Combating violence & aggression	THEME EU values & institutions

By working inside these areas, debate becomes more than a method — it becomes a tool for addressing core educational priorities and EU Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. The value here is adaptability: subject learning stays at the centre while transversal competences — communication, reasoning, teamwork, problem-solving — grow alongside. By rotating roles and encouraging reflection, every student stays involved, building exactly the competences that mirror real workplace situations: negotiation, justification, ethical decision-making.

Toolkit cross-reference

- Implementation Toolkit: Topical Lessons section — debate-infused lessons across vocational fields.

5 • Assessment and evaluation in debate curricula

Assessment and evaluation matter — for teachers and students. Done well, they help teachers spot where students need reinforcement, give students tools for self-assessment and growth, and measure transversal skills alongside disciplinary knowledge.

Three complementary phases of evaluation

PHASE 1 Self-assessment Students reflect on their own performance.	PHASE 2 Peer assessment Students give each other constructive feedback.	PHASE 3 Teacher assessment The teacher evaluates content and debate skills together.
--	---	--

All three phases use criteria tied to your chosen format and your specific objectives. Phases 1 and 2 don’t just sharpen debate skills — they grow self- and peer-assessment as transversal soft skills, building empathy, critical sense, and awareness. The student “judging” feedback is a real input for the teacher’s final evaluation.

After phases 1 and 2, the teacher steps in. Bring in observation notes from preparation — research, analysis, in-class argument construction. Build observation grids for each prep phase, scoring observable skills from minimally to fully acquired. Then evaluate against criteria you communicated to the students up front.

Debate scoring isn’t standard school grading. You’ll need to decide how to translate the format’s scores into a school grade by weighting criteria. For mostly disciplinary objectives — how well the student commands the subject content — prioritise “content” and logical structuring of arguments and refutations, with less weight to strategy or style. Account for learning styles too: for sensitive students or those with communication difficulties, treat “style” as secondary to argumentation, refutation, summarising, or listening.

Unlike competitive debate, classroom evaluation should be formative — feedback that helps students grow and feel positive about performing in front of a class, which can be tiring and stressful.

Sample debate evaluation rubric — classroom use

Criterion	What to look for	Points (1–5)
Content (arguments and evidence)	Clarity of arguments, relevant examples, quality of evidence	1 = weak / unclear · 5 = strong, well-supported
Organisation and structure	Logical flow, clear case-building, effective use of time	1 = disorganised · 5 = clear and structured

Delivery and style	Voice, body language, eye contact, audience engagement	1 = very weak · 5 = confident and persuasive
Refutation and responsiveness	Addresses opposing arguments; effective rebuttals	1 = ignores or misrepresents · 5 = strong and precise
Teamwork and collaboration	Balanced roles, smooth transitions, mutual support	1 = unbalanced · 5 = excellent collaboration

Three dimensions: assessment, evaluation, feedback

◆ Assessment

Develop a clear rubric covering content, delivery, organisation, and rebuttals. Keep criteria objective, specific, measurable. Pair teacher assessment with peer evaluation and self-assessment so students take ownership. Use ongoing formative assessment to monitor progress and adapt activities.

■ Evaluation

Active observation of debates — arguments, plus non-verbal and paraverbal communication. Recording debates allows deeper later analysis. Individual feedback is the highest-value move: schedule one-on-one sessions to review performance and set realistic development goals.

★ Feedback

Specific and timely. Pair positive reinforcement with constructive critique to build confidence. Reference concrete moments from the debate. Help students set achievable goals — improvement is a process, not an event.

Conclusion

Voice of Vocation establishes a research-informed, scalable model for integrating debate into VET schools. The Methodological Guide is the pedagogical compass — goals, principles, structures, and alignment with EU key competences. The Implementation Toolkit turns it into ready-to-use classroom materials. E-learning ensures continuous professional development for teachers.

What this changes — for teachers, students, and schools

TEACHERS Diversify methods Lower pedagogical risk, less prep time, clear rubrics, and a phased approach — from micro-activities to full units.	STUDENTS Build the skills that matter Critical thinking, communication, teamwork, self-confidence, active citizenship — and, in turn, employability and resilience.	SCHOOLS Sustain quality practice Open resources and networks (IDEA and beyond), aligned with European policy and recommendations.
--	---	---

This is not just another manual. It’s a mechanism for shifting classroom practice — turning VET classrooms into spaces of discussion, cooperation, and reflection, and making VET more relevant for everyday life, working life, and democratic participation.

The Methodological Guide answers the WHAT and the WHY. The Implementation Toolkit shows the HOW. E-learning ensures we keep learning and improving.

Reviews

On top of the development process, the Methodological Guide went through comprehensive expert and peer review to ensure both academic quality and practical applicability. Four reviews were conducted: one by a debate-education expert, two by VET teachers (one directly involved in the project, one independent), and one by an education expert. The reviews brought distinct perspectives — debate methodology, vocational education, broader pedagogy — and helped sharpen the Guide into something methodologically accurate, pedagogically sound, and immediately useful in the classroom.

“The methodological guide Voice of Vocation is an exceptionally valuable resource for teachers in vocational schools. It clearly demonstrates how debate methodology can foster active learning and develop communication, critical thinking, and teamwork — key skills for students’ employability and civic engagement. The text is clear, professionally grounded, and pedagogically applicable. As a VET teacher, I believe the Guide makes a significant contribution to modernising teaching and enhancing both student and teacher competencies. It encourages teachers to apply debate methodology through simple, concrete examples, and shows them how to do it.

— Mirna Dovhanj, teacher of English and German, Vocational Secondary School Vinkovci

“The Guide enables teachers without prior debate experience to gradually, thoroughly, and effectively prepare students for debate. It supports the use of active learning methods, applies debate methodology as a teaching tool, and points readers to other sources of knowledge. Teachers can use it within the vocational curriculum leading to relevant qualifications — particularly because of its tight connection with key competences for lifelong learning and cross-curricular themes.

— Ivanka Jareb, dipl. iur., teacher of Legal Subjects, School of Economics and Office Technology Bjelovar / Commercial and Trade School Bjelovar

“The Voice of Vocation Methodological Guide is a well-structured, highly practical, and innovative educational resource. It successfully links the theoretical foundations of debate methodology with the specific needs of VET, fostering the development of key competences in line with current EU standards. The text is clear, coherent, and engaging, and the integration of the Guide, Toolkit, and e-

learning modules will give teachers a comprehensive support system directly applicable to everyday practice. Its particular strength lies in promoting active citizenship and enhancing communication skills that are especially relevant for VET students, including those from vulnerable groups. The Guide is an excellent example of pedagogical practice and a valuable contribution to improving teaching methodology and the development of much-needed soft skills among VET students.

— Eli Pijaca Plavšić, independent educational expert

“The Voice of Vocation Methodological Guide stands out as both a pedagogical tool and a transformative vision for modern teaching practice. It shows how critical thinking, communication, and civic engagement can become an organic part of vocational education. By providing a structured yet flexible approach, the Guide helps teachers enrich their lessons with meaningful dialogue and foster a more engaged, reflective, collaborative learning environment. The Guide convincingly argues that the modern labour market demands far more than technical proficiency. What sets Voice of Vocation apart from other methodological publications is its commitment to accessibility and practical implementation. The structure is clear, detailed, and user-oriented: it begins with theoretical grounding and progressively translates these concepts into adaptable lesson plans, classroom models, and evaluation rubrics. Teachers are guided step by step — from motion analysis and argument construction to assessment and feedback — showing how debate can be introduced even by educators without prior experience. By integrating debate into the heart of vocational pedagogy, it positions learning as an active, reflective, and democratic process.

— Gabrijela Martić, debate expert and trainer, Croatian Debate Society

Notes & Sources

1. Executive Perceptions of the Top 10 Soft Skills Needed in Today's Workplace.
2. Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018 on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning.
3. European Skills Agenda — Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion (European Commission).
4. European Commission communication COM(2010) 352 final — Europe, the world's No. 1 tourist destination.
5. World Economic Forum, The Future of Jobs Report 2023.
6. Mezuk et al. (2021): Debate Participation and Academic Achievement among High School Students in the Houston Independent School District, 2012–2015.