

grammatical structure of the resolutive sentence. The grammatical context standard focuses resolutive interpretation on questions of which word modifies which other word in the resolutive sentence.

grand crossfire In public forum debate, there is an assigned period after the first two rebuttals during which all four contestants engage in a lively exchange. During this period there are no preassigned questioners or respondents.

grouping of arguments When a debater is called upon to answer a large number of similar arguments, the debater often says something like, “group their answers one through four; I will make the following three responses.” **harm** Harm is one of the stock issues in policy debate that must be demonstrated by the affirmative team in the first affirmative speech.

high-power match A preliminary round paired in such a way that the top competitor meets the second-place competitor, the third meets the fourth, and so on through all the competitors.

high-low power match This pairing system for preliminary rounds divides all competitors into win-loss brackets, ordered within that bracket by speaker points. The top competitor in a win-loss bracket meets the bottom competitor in that bracket, the second-from-the-top competitor in the bracket meets the second-from-the-bottom competitor in the bracket, and so on in toward the middle. Some debaters make the mistake of thinking that a high-low power match means that the top competitor meets the bottom competitor. This is not the case. Contestants meet other contestants with the same number of wins and losses.

hypothesis testing This paradigm for judging a policy debate sees debate as analogous to a social scientist who is testing a hypothesis. The hypothesis being tested in the debate is the resolution. Just as a careful scientist would never declare a hypothesis true based on a single test, so the debate judge should not expect the negative team to limit itself to a single test of the resolution; in fact, the responsibility of the negative team is to provide a rigorous test of the hypothesis by attacking it from as many different directions as would be productive. David Zarefsky of Northwestern University and J. W. Patterson of the University of Kentucky are the most widely known advocates of the hypothesis testing model; their debate textbook *Contemporary Debate* is a thorough defense of a hypothesis testing approach.

hypothetical counterplan See *conditional counterplan*.

impact The term *impact* could refer to the significance of any argument, but in policy debate usage, it usually is applied to the impact or significance of a disadvantage. Consider a negative deficit disadvantage. If the bottom line of the disadvantage is that the affirmative plan will increase the deficit, the argument is incomplete. The next question is “Why is increasing the deficit bad?” The answer to that question would be the impact of the disadvantage.