1. Debate performance gap across genders does not inherently imply discrimination, but could be due to any other factors such as speech style, quality, debate topic, institutional and/or personal reputation. (Chapter 2)

2. Even though evaluation patterns are similar for male and female speakers across judges and the judge panel gender compositions, committees with more female judges are significantly harsher towards female speakers. (Chapter 2)

3. As successful women at the top might have internalized the male-skewed assessment system during their career paths, quota-based policy do not necessarily guarantee gender-neutral evaluation standards. (Chapter 3)

4. The unconditional performance gap between male and female speakers is only partially explained by committees chaired by accomplished male judges in high-ranked rooms, who give male speakers relatively higher scores than female speakers. (Chapter 3)

5. More women competing for high-profile careers and positions does not necessarily reduce the thickness of the glass ceiling. (Chapter 4)

6. We all want, above all, to be heard. We want to be understood, i.e. heard for what we think we are saying, for what we know we meant.

7. Human beings only think and reason with logic if whatever topic that is being debated does not challenge or ridicule their belief system.

8. Both sides in any intellectual debates tend to be right in what they affirm, and wrong in what they deny.

9. The greatest problem with communication is we do not listen to understand. We listen to reply.

10. The belief that sitting down and talking will ensure mutual understanding and solve problems assumes that we can say what we mean, and that what we say will be understood as we mean it. This is unlikely to happen if conversational styles differ.¹

11. Economics is the painful elaboration of the obvious.

¹Adapted from Deborah Tannen’s book "That's Not What I Meant!: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships"