**TOPIC: ENVIRONMENT 3rd year**

*INPUT - language learning*

SUBTOPICS: texts, videos, listening recordings

1. Environmental pollution – air, water, ground pollution
2. Ten most polluted places on the planet
3. Deforestation in the Himalayas and the Amazon area, the role of rainforests
4. National parks – endagered animals
5. Global warming – Tuvalu islands; Polar Bears
6. Preserving Nature: Balance in nature, Recycling, Alternative sources of energy, Green Peace

LANGUAGE:

1. Topic vocabulary
2. Nouns of Latin and Greek origin
3. Singular and plural of nouns; uncountable nouns in English but countable in Slovene

COMMUNICATION SKILLS: RHETORIC – PUBLIC SPEAKING

1. Elements of rhetoric
2. Excerpt from the play Julius Caesar: Mark antony's speech
3. Group work: students produce their own examples usin gfigures of speech

*OUTPUT – use of language for communication*

Role play: A MOCK “UNO ENVIRONMENT SUMMIT 2014”

1. Task instructions
2. Assessment criteria for a convincing speech
3. Role play execution and assessment
4. Student evaluation
5. Teachres' reflexion

**RETHORIC - PUBLIC SPEAKING**

WARMING UP – GROUP WORK:

TASK 1. What is rhetoric? What do you know about it?

**RHETORIC** – 1. a speech that is intended to influence people

 2. the skill of using language in speech or writing in a special way that influences people (dictionary definition)

“**RHETORIC** is the ART of ruling the mind of men.” It is used in public and political settings. A speaker uses rhetorical devices to inform, persuade and motivate the audience in specific situations.

TASK 2. ANSWER THE QUESTIONS:

1. List some examples of professions which require rhetorical skills.
2. Public speaking is a two-way communication. How do listeners communicate with the speaker?
3. What skills does rhetoric require?
4. List examples from history when speakers made great achievements through public speaking (the power of speech).

TASK 3. READING: READ AN EXAMPLE OF A CONVINCING SPEECH

A Brief summary of the play Julius Caesar by William Shakespeare:

In the year 44 B.C. Julius Caesar returns victorious to Rome heartily greeted by the plebeians who are glad that the war is over. On his way to the celebration of the feast of Lupercal Caesar is warned by a fortune-teller to “beware the Ides of March” (=March 15). Cassius, a republican, is jealous of Caesar and fears a dictatorship, therefore he forms a conspiracy against him. Brutus unwillingly joins the conspirators, for he loves Caesar, but he loves the Roman republic even more. The conspirators murder Caesar in the Senate. Mark Antony, Caesar’s friend, obtains permission from Brutus to have s funeral speech over Caesar’s body. First Brutus explains to the citizens the reasons for Caesar’s death, then Mark Antony delivers his speech, mentioning that he has acquired Caesar’s public and private papers. His speech so infuriates the people that the conspirators are forced to run away from Rome. Brutus and Cassius flee to Asia Minor where Brutus sees the ghost of Caesar who tells him that they will meet again at Philippi. Mark Antony, Octavius and Lipidus follow the conspirators. A battle takes place where the conspirators are defeated and finally Brutus runs upon his own sword.

EXCERPT FROM THE PLAY JULIUS CAESAR by William Shakespeare

Citizens
Peace, ho! let us hear him.

ANTONY
Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears;
I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.

The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft **interred** with their bones; (= is buried)
So let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus
**Hath** told you Caesar was ambitious: (= has)
If it were so, it was a **grievous** **fault,** (= serious mistake)
And grievously hath Caesar **answer'd it**. (= paid for it)
Here, under **leave** of Brutus and the rest— (=permission)
For Brutus is an honourable man;
So are they all, all honourable men--
Come I to speak in Caesar's funeral.

He was my friend, faithful and just to me:
But Brutus says he was ambitious;
And Brutus is an honourable man.
He hath brought many **captives** home to Rome (=people kept as prisoners)
Whose **ransoms** did the **general coffers** fill: (= odkupnina) (=public treasury)
Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?
When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath **wept**: (=cried)
Ambition should be made of **sterner stuff**: (= of stronger character)
Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
And Brutus is an honourable man.
You all did see that on the **Lupercal** (= a feast commemorating the founders
I **thrice presented** him a kingly crown, (= three times offered)
Which he did thrice refuse: was this ambition?
Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
And, sure, he is an honourable man.
I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke,
But here I am to speak what I do know.

You all did love him once, not without cause:
What cause **withholds** you then, to mourn for him? (= stops you)
**O judgment! \*thou art fled to brutish beasts,** (=sound reason /mind)And men have lost their reason. **Bear with me**; (=be patient with me)
My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar,
And I must pause till it come back to me. (\* you have run to evil beasts)

First Citizen
**Methinks** there is much reason in his sayings. (=I think)

Second Citizen
If **thou** consider rightly of the matter, (=you)
Caesar has had great wrong.

Fourth Citizen
Mark'd ye his words? He would not take the crown;
Therefore 'tis certain he was not ambitious.

TASK 4 - GROUP WORK: Summarise the text with the help of the following phrases. Match the phrases with parts of the text. Then present the main ideas of the excerpt.

- TO BE MODEST

- TO SHOW SYMPATHY AND COMPASSION FOR SOMEONE

- TO ADDRESS A PUCLIC

- TO MOURN FOR SOMEONE

- TO BE VICTORIOUS and UNSELFISH

- TO PAY TRIBUTE TO A DEAD PERSON WITH A SPEECH AT A FUNERAL)

- TO ASK FOR PERMISSION TO DO STH

- TO PRESENT SOMEONE’S MERITS

TASK 5: Read the notes about rhetoric and study the rhetorical devices. Then read the excerpt again and identify rhetorical devices in it.

RHETORICAL DEVICES

Aristotle defined the following elements of rhetoric:

***ETHOS***

It refers to the **credibility** of the speaker and how it influences the audience. If the speaker is for example an acknowledged expert in the topic area or an experienced person, he will establish a strong credibility with the audience. The audience feel confident and trust the speaker.

***PATHOS***

It refers to the use of emotional appeals which are used **to EVOKE strong emotions** of the audience (sympathy, empathy). The speaker may make you feel patriotic, afraid, guilty … This will motivate the audience to shape their opinion and **convictions.**

***LOGOS***

 It refers to the part of the speech which appeals to our **sense of logic**. When the speaker presents an argument and supports it with facts, statistical data, proofs, logical **deductions**, he presents it more objectively and convincingly.

***OTHER RHETORICAL DEVICES***

- rhetorical questions – are asked for dramatic effect and to which no answer is expected

- the use of FIGURES OF SPEECH: metaphor, hyperbole, paradox …

- the art of speaking: voice, gestures, tone, pace, stress, pauses

- organization of arguments

- a phrase which will make the speech memorable … e. g. “I had a dream …”

SKILLS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING:

* The speaker has a good knowledge of the topic,
* feels strong about the ideas,
* is well prepared (plan, edit),
* adjusts voice, body language, behaviour,
* uses proper speaking (voice, stress, rhythm, pauses),
* maintains eye contact with the audience,
* copes with stress and the jitters.
* Successful speakers attract full attention of the audience right from the start and convince them, so that they accept his/her ideas.

\*\*\*Public-speaking is a two-way communication. On the one hand a speaker delivers a speech in order to convince the audience to accept his ideas, on the other the audience follow the speaker attentively, they reflect upon the information they hear, they judge arguments and finally take a stand over the issue. Sometimes they get involved by asking questions. The audience also sympathise with the speaker.

- to have a good command of English; - to have a good rhetoric; - to be eloquent;

- to have good communicative skills

- body language / non-verbal communication: - eye-contact, posture, hand gestures

W. Tomford TU

**Delving Further into Rhetoric**

**I. Review Question**

*Answer the following questions.*

a) What are the three main Aristotelian aspects of rhetoric?

b) Can you think of any specific ways you can accomplish these in a speech?

**II. Introducing Some More Specific Techniques/Devices**

*Define the following terms.*

Alliteration:

Anaphora:

Antithesis:

Emotional Appeal:

Hyperbole:

Metaphor:

**III. Some Examples From Great Speeches**

*While watching the film clips, make note of any rhetorical techniques/devices that you hear.*

a) Barack Obama: 2004 National Democratic Convention Speech

b) MLK Jr: I Have a Dream Speech

c) PM: European Union Speech

**IV. Putting Rhetoric to Use**

*Each group will be assigned a RHETORICAL DEVICE and a speech TOPIC. Write a few sentences of a speech about your assigned topic using your assigned rhetorical device. We will then read our examples to the rest of the class.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| GROUP | TOPIC | RHETORICAL DEVICE |
| 1 | Literacy | alliteration |
| 2 | Environment | anaphora |
| 3 | Education | antithesis |
| 4 | Teenagers’ Rights | emotional appeal |
| 5 | Internet | hyperbole |
| 6 | Sports | metaphor |

**United Nations Environment Summit 2014**

**SUMMIT OBJECTIVE/GOAL**: To stabalize and prevent dangerous, human-induced interference with the environment. (Adapted from the *UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.*)

**KEY GROUPS OF THE SUMMIT**:

1) President of the General Assembly: The president governs over the entire summit and establishes order. Lobbyists/observers and country delegates must first address the president before addressing each other. The president is addressed as »Mr. President.«

2) Lobbyists/Observers: Lobbyists/observers have two roles. First, each lobbyist will give a short speech about an environmental issue (see below). Second, lobbyists will become observers of the summit. Observers are required to comment on and/or ask questions about the resolutions presented in the delegates' speeches. Observers are addressed as »Mr./Ms. Observer.«

3) Country Delegates: Each country will have one delegate. This delegate must give a speech on behalf of his/her country (see below). In addition, the delegate may have to answer questions about his/her speech from the observers. Delegates must be addressed by others as »Mr./Ms. Delegate.«

**LOBBYIST AND DELEGATE SPEECH SPECIFICS:**

Lobbyist Speeches: Lobbyist speeches should be 250 words (see »Rhetoric – Public Speaking« handout for more details). They should address an environmental issue and make the audience aware of that issue.

Delegate Speeches: Delegate speeches should address an environmental issue that your country believes is important. The speech should stress the importance of the issue, and also propose a resolution or action to work on the issue.

**SUMMIT PROGRAM:**

**1)** Introduction to the United Nations Environment Summit 2014: Goals, Ideas, Objectives

(President of the General Assembly)

**2)** Lobbyist Speeches

(Lobbyists)

**3)** List of Country Delegates at the Summit and Speaking Order

(President of the General Assembly)

**4)** Country Delegate Speeches

(Countries in the Assembly)

**5)** Summary of Delegate Proposals Made

(President of the General Assembly)

**6)** Responses to the Delegate Speeches

(Observers)

**7)** Voting on a Final Resolution for the Summit

(Countries and Observers)

CONVINCING SPEECH – RUBRIC

**OVERALL IMPRESSION: 5-exceptional, 4-very good, 3-good, 2-satisfactory**

CONTENT: focus, purpose, thesis, arguments, **solution,** view into subject

5 – F**ully focused** on the subject, with a clear **purpose**, challenging theses, strong, convincing arguments and an **effective solution**; shows an **in-depth view** into the subject

4 – F**ocused** on the subject, with a clear purpose, clear theses, a **well-developed,** with some strong arguments and a **reasonable solution**; shows a solid view into the subject.

3 – L**oosely focused** on the subject, with indicated purpose, some arguments and a **vague** **solution**; shows an adequate view into the subject **OR** rather short

2 – Loosely focused with **few arguments** **OR too short;** Shows a shallow view into the subject.

ORGANISATION: flow, clarity, structure, rhetorical devices

5 – Clear, **very smoothly flowing** speech with **highly effective**, logical structure and **several rhetorical devices** which make the speech convincing and memorable

4 – Clear, smoothly flowing speech with reasonable structure and coherence and a rhetorical device or two which make the speech **effective**

3 – The speech is fairly clear, with occasional **hesitation**, **loosely** connected and partly **descriptive** OR **rather short,** it produces **little** effect

2 – Mostly **choppy** **OR** vaguely developed and **too descriptive** **OR** the speech is **too short,** withno effect

USE OF LANGUAGE: vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, original language

5 – **Confident use** of language - range of expression and accuracy. Uses entirely his own language.

4 – **Fairly confident** use of language – range and accuracy. Mostly uses his own language.

3 – Adequate use of language – range and accuracy **OR** obvious use of **adopted** language

2 – Limited use of language **OR** **almost all language adopted** from sources **OR** the speech is too short

DELIVERY / SPEAKING STYLE: spontaneity, articulation, voice, eyes, enthusiasm

5 – **Spontaneous speaking** with involvementsof **emotions or enthusiasm** is highly effective. **Constant eye** contact with the audience; **distinct articulation**, effective volume, **intonation,** speed, **stress** and **pauses** fully support the audience’s understanding; holds strong interest of the audience

4 – **Effective speaking** with **occasional reference** to notes **OR reading**, sufficient eye contact; **clear articulation**, proper volume, intonation, speed, stress and pauses support the audience’s understanding ; with an attempt to involve emotions or enthusiasm; **arouses** **adequate interest.**

3 – **Mostly reading** with occasional eye contact; few style features are used convincingly; arouses little interest of the audience

2 – **Monotonous reading** with **no variety** in style features; fails to arouse interest of the audience / arouses sympathy

SCORE: 20 – 19 = (5) excellent, 18 – 17 = (4) v. good, 16 – 15 = (3) good, 14 – 12 = (2) satisfactory

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMIT 2014**

Observer Documentation and Comment Worksheet

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| COUNTRY | DELEGATE NAME | RESOLUTION | COMMENTS |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Pouk je bil zanimiv.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Veliko sem se naučil/a.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Pridobljeno znanje in iskušnje so koristne.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Cilj govornih nastopov je praktična uporaba jezika in besedišča na temo okolje.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Cilj govornih nastopov je razvijati spretnosti javnega nastopanja.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Izbrana tema je povezovala znanje angleščine in geografije.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Simulacija OZN conference kot vsebinski okvir je naredila pouk bolj življenski.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Igra vlog je zanimiva in zabavna.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Za pripravo govora sem raziskal/a več virov.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Sestava govora zahteva znanje in nekaj ustvarjalnosti.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Pri dejavnosti smo razvijali vse jezikovne zmožnosti: branje, pisanje, govor, poslušanje in sporazumevanje.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Ocenjevanje s pomočjo opisnih kriterijev je nazorno.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Ocenjevanje s kriteriji pomaga predočiti, katera znanja moram izkazati.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Pouk, ki ga izvajata dva učitelja skupaj, je bolj zanimiv.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Učni sklop sta dva učitelja izpeljala bolje, kot bi ga en sam.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Tuji učitelj je dodal pouku poseben pečat (poznavanje jezika, kulture).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| strongly disagree |  |  |  |  |  | strongly agree |

**Ni mi bilo všeč:**

 **Kaj bi izboljšali?**

**Analytics From “Rhetoric and Public Speaking Lesson” Student Survey**

**Explanation of Results**: Students responded to questions on a 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”) scale. In the first column, the 1-5 scale is shown; in the second column, the number of respondents for each 1-5 mark is shown; and in the third column, the corresponding percentage is shown.

**RESULTS:**

**Pouk je bil zanimiv.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **2** | 9% |
| 4 | **8** | 35% |
| 5 | **13** | 57% |

**Veliko sem se naučil/a.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **1** | 4% |
| 3 | **5** | 22% |
| 4 | **12** | 52% |
| 5 | **5** | 22% |

**Pridobljeno znanje in iskušnje so koristne.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **1** | 4% |
| 3 | **4** | 17% |
| 4 | **7** | 30% |
| 5 | **11** | 48% |

**Cilj govornih nastopov je praktična uporaba jezika in besedišča na temo okolje.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **2** | 9% |
| 4 | **7** | 30% |
| 5 | **14** | 61% |

**Cilj govornih nastopov je razvijati spretnosti javnega nastopanja.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **4** | 17% |
| 5 | **19** | 83% |

**Izbrana tema je povezovala znanje angleščine in geografije.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **3** | 13% |
| 3 | **5** | 22% |
| 4 | **10** | 43% |
| 5 | **5** | 22% |

**Simulacija OZN conference kot vsebinski okvir je naredila pouk bolj življenski.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **2** | 9% |
| 3 | **3** | 13% |
| 4 | **11** | 48% |
| 5 | **7** | 30% |

**Igra vlog je zanimiva in zabavna.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **1** | 4% |
| 2 | **2** | 9% |
| 3 | **3** | 13% |
| 4 | **6** | 26% |
| 5 | **11** | 48% |

**Za pripravo govora sem raziskal/a več virov.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **6** | 26% |
| 4 | **8** | 35% |
| 5 | **9** | 39% |

**Sestava govora zahteva znanje in nekaj ustvarjalnosti.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **1** | 4% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **9** | 39% |
| 5 | **13** | 57% |

**Pri dejavnosti smo razvijali vse jezikovne zmožnosti: branje, pisanje, govor, poslušanje in sporazumevanje.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **1** | 4% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **0** | 0% |
| 4 | **6** | 26% |
| 5 | **16** | 70% |

**Ocenjevanje s pomočjo opisnih kriterijev je nazorno.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **1** | 4% |
| 3 | **5** | 22% |
| 4 | **11** | 48% |
| 5 | **6** | 26% |

**Ocenjevanje s kriteriji pomaga predočiti, katera znanja moram izkazati.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **5** | 22% |
| 4 | **10** | 43% |
| 5 | **8** | 35% |

**Pouk, ki ga izvajata dva učitelja skupaj, je bolj zanimiv.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **0** | 0% |
| 3 | **4** | 17% |
| 4 | **7** | 30% |
| 5 | **12** | 52% |

**Učni sklop sta dva učitelja izpeljala bolje, kot bi ga en sam.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **1** | 4% |
| 3 | **4** | 17% |
| 4 | **10** | 43% |
| 5 | **8** | 35% |

**Tuji učitelj je dodal pouku poseben pečat (poznavanje jezika, kulture).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **0** | 0% |
| 2 | **1** | 4% |
| 3 | **2** | 9% |
| 4 | **3** | 13% |
| 5 | **17** | 74% |

**STUDENT WRITTEN RESPONSES AND COMMENTS:**

**Ni mi bilo všeč:**

- Because it was too early finished. I would like to have more of this kinda classes :) Tisto uro, ko sem jaz imel govor ni bilo prof. Tomforda. Škoda, saj me je res zanimalo, kako bo komentiral moj nekoliko kontroverzen govor, še posebaj za Američana. to bi lahko izpečjal le tuj učitelj saj so profesorji pri takem ocenjevanju nekorektni in predpostavljajo prednosti in slabosti posameznega dijaka kar tudi močno vpliva na oceno

**Kaj bi izboljšali?**

- Nothing, for me it was awesome! to bi lahko izpečjal le tuj učitelj saj so profesorji pri takem ocenjevanju nekorektni in predpostavljajo prednosti in slabosti posameznega dijaka kar tudi močno vpliva na oceno Yes.

**Lesson Reflection: “Rhetoric and Public Speaking” (Lesson by Tatjana Shrestha and Will Tomford; Completed in Winter 2014)**

**Overall Impression:**

This was a lesson that I think was a strong culmination of work that we had done in the past. In previous school years Prof. Shrestha and I had worked together on an activity where students used Shakespeare’s Mark Antony speech from *Julius Caesar* to teach rhetoric and public speaking. We had also conducted debates, which combine public speaking with critical thinking, organizational, team work and research skills. This year we used all of those ideas and lessons from the past to create an extended project, which I think successfully synthesized everything into a coherent, dynamic, and pedagogically beneficial lesson. This time, by using the Mark Antony activity as a jumping-off point to explore rhetoric on a broader level (learning about rhetorical devices; identifying rhetoric in modern political speeches; and practicing using rhetorical devices in small groups) we were able to make that lead into a more comprehensive activity of a UN summit where students could put all of that work and study into a practical (and interesting and stimulating) realm.

**Best Practices/Success:**

1) Using class activities to lead to broader projects

 We introduced the topic on a smaller level, requiring students to think critically by themselves while studying a text; we then moved onto a group level where students worked in small groups; lastly, we moved onto the largest platform, which was the UN conference. This made for a good progression of activities and lessons. As students improved their skills they moved onto the more difficult tasks.

2) Joint assessment with FT and SU

 The SU concentrated on the linguistic aspects of the students’ speaking skills, while the FT gave more holistic grades and concentrated on the rhetoric. Students benefited from the comments of both teachers.

**Areas for Improvement:**

Because this was the first time we had completed such a project, there were a few areas that needed improvement. This time we divided students into UN observers and countries, but I think in the future, I would ask that all students participate in the conference, perhaps even in teams of two. As it stood, I think some students felt that the conference was unfairly divided. As I wrote above, I think the progression of lessons was good, but I think we could create more activities between the group work and the actual UN conference that we held, as there was an unnecessary gap between these two.

Will Tomford

**Ocena simulacije OZN konference – prepričljivi govori**

V četrtek, 23.1. 2014, in v ponedeljek, 3.2. 2014, sem kot gostja v razredu (3.letnik) Tatjane Shrestha v gimnaziji Kranj poslušala del simulacije OZN konference – govore trinajstih dijakov. Gospa Shrestha me je povabila na mojo željo: ker pišem doktorat na temo poučevanja in ocenjevanja govorne sporazumevalne zmožnosti v angleščini kot tujem jeziku, raziskujem, kaj se v zvezi s tem dogaja v naših gimnazijah.

Obakrat sem bila priča delu kompleksnega dogodka, ki so ga, med drugim, odlikovali elementi avtentičnosti, sodelovalnosti in kritičnega mišljenja. Dijaki so nastopili kot predstavniki svojih držav, in predstavili enega od perečih okoljskih problemov: radioaktivni odpadki, lov na kite, ogrožene živalske vrste, intenzivna živinoreja, ravnanje z odpadki, uničevanje biotske raznovrstnosti in ekosistemov, ipd. Will Tomford, ameriški lektor, je otvoril konferenco, in govorce posamično pozival, da prevzamejo govorniško mesto za podijem. V razrednem vzdušju sem zaznavala nadvse prijetno mešanico resnosti in sproščenosti. Vsi so začeli svoj govor z »Mr President, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen« in nadaljevali v dokaj uradnem registru, ki so ga bolj ali manj uspešno »blažili« s pogovornim tonom in zavzeto govorico telesa. V veliki meri so uporabljali strokovno terminologijo in izbrani temi ustrezne besedne zveze, upoštevali so pravila primerne strukture govora, zvečine so govorili prosto (z zapiski pred sabo), na splošno so pazili na očesni stik, in vpletali retorične figure. Skratka, bilo je očitno, da so se predhodno posvečali teoriji govornega nastopanja.

Po dveh ali treh prispevkih je gospa Shrestha v odprti izmenjavi mnenj izpeljala dajanje povratnih informacij z oceno. Najprej so svoje vrednotenje podali dijaki, nato učiteljica, za njo ameriški lektor. Merila/Kriteriji, po katerih so se ravnali v odzivih, je izdelala učiteljica sama, dijaki pa so bili z njimi predhodno seznanjeni. Njena merila so pregledna in dovolj kratka, da so lahko obvladljiva. Elementi govorne prezentacije, ki naj bi jih ocenjevali, so primerno izbrani: niso nesorazmerno obremenjeni z jezikovnimi zmožnostmi, temveč predpostavljajo tudi izkazovanje tako sociolingvističnih kot pragmatičnih zmožnosti. Med zbiranjem povratnih informacij je dijake vzpodbujala, da svoje ocene utemeljijo v skladu z merili, nato je, držeč se opisnikov v teh merilih, pojasnila še svojo oceno. Ko je s svojimi opažanji, priporočili in komentarji zaključil še ameriški lektor, so oblikovali končno oceno nastopa – odraz dobrodošlih razlik in podobnosti v njihovem opazovanju, pozornosti in kritičnosti.

Tako izvedena simulacija OZN konference lahko, skratka, kljub časovni omejenosti (45 minut) in številčnosti dijakov v razredu (bilo jih je več kot 20) naslovi zelo raznolike izobraževalne cilje: jezikovne, pragmatične, kognitivne, interakcijske, vedenjske. Za ključne so se v tem smislu izkazali tako prispevki in motivacijska vloga maternega govorca angleščine med dijaki kot organizacijske in pedagoške sposobnosti gospe Shrestha.

Hkrati se mi je ob zasledovanju omenjenih didaktičnih ciljev razkrila tudi določena frustracija: dijaki imajo možnost, da predstavijo zahtevne in/ali kontroverzne teme, in da to počnejo ob so-mentorstvu učitelja-maternega govorca angleščine, kar jim pomaga sprejemati drugačne razmisleke in nove vidike, in vodi v razvoj različnih (jezikovnih) zmožnosti. Vendar se zdi, da ni na voljo dovolj časa za razvijanje bistvenih elementov teh zmožnosti, kot sta, denimo, argumentirano razpravljanje in kritično analiziranje prispevkov, na katerih temeljijo predstavitve; zmanjka tudi časa, da bi na področju (samo)evalvacije v dialogu z drugimi opazovalci/poslušalci kultivirali bolj podkrepljeno in vešče artikulirano mnenje. Povedano nekoliko drugače: gospa Shrestha ambiciozno in nadvse ustrezno zastavlja didaktične cilje pri pouku angleščine – z ozirom na znanja in veščine, ki jih zahteva odrasli svet, v katerega dijaki počasi vstopajo. Pri tem pa se, nič presenetljivo, izkaže, da bi razvoj *sporazumevalnih* (govornih)zmožnosti za razliko od *sporočilnih* (govornih) zmožnosti terjal še več pozornosti in časa. In tandem Shrestha-Tomford se zdi za to nalogo izvrstno usposobljen.

Mirjana Želježič, lektorica za angleški jezik na Oddelku za anglistiko in amerikanistiko Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani

V Ljubljani, 15. 3. 2014