A good crystallization is based primarily in two ideas:

1) understanding and/or winning the value/value criterion clash in the round so that you are framing your arguments using the same type of evaluation to frame the arguments that the judge will use to

evaluate the round

2) selecting the most powerful issues that matter with respect to that criterion as it is used to evaluate the round.

Once you have chosen which issues to make your voting issues, you should then structure them appropriately. It is important that you don’t merely label individual arguments you are winning as voters as this weakens the impact of your arguments.

Instead, use this structure:

1. The voting issue should begin with some short label that tags the issue that the student is asking the judge to vote on.
2. Next identify the offense you are winning and have advanced (with specific signposting to some place on the flow—in other words, refer to specific places on the flow to show you are referring to arguments made in the round).
3. You should then identify why the opponent is not winning this issue. This can be done by citing places (specifically signposting) on the flow where you are beating his/her opponent’s responses about this issue or by showing how the student’s arguments are more important than the opponent’s arguments on the same topic. The latter is, as discussed previously, called weighing.
4. Finally, you should explain why this issue links to the value criterion and is sufficient for you to win the round.

\* Notice, this structure explains why you are winning the round due to this issue (offense), why the opponent can’t win the round on this issue (defense) and why this issue is relevant to winning the round.

**EXAMPLE**: “*My first voting issue is (insert shorthand name for the issue). I am winning this argument through the extension of the second sub point of my first contention that states (summarize the argument). My opponent makes this issue worse as I stated when I responded to their first contention by saying (summarize the argument). Although my opponent may believe s/he is winning the second contention, my argument outweighs because (insert a comparison of the arguments). This is sufficient to meet the criterion of (insert criterion) because (insert reason).”*