

Tutor feedback:

Summary

This is a very sophisticated and competent speech, analysing three chosen oral presentations. You have considered your comparative points very carefully. Along with comments throughout your file, I have identified a few areas below that you can work on, furthering the final outcome of your response.

Structure

Generally, your structure is strong, and the critical exploration is divided clearly into appropriate sections.

The introduction:

Be very specific about the focus of the speech. Identify the question for the task that you have chosen to respond to. Provide a clear and direct answer to this question in a thesis statement. Invite your audience to agree with this, your key argument.

You seem to reinforce in the linking sentences in the body paragraphs that the question chosen is relating to the challenge of the audience. In the second body paragraph, there are references to historical significances, so ensure that you pinpoint the direction of the speech in the introduction, so your own audience is well-informed.

You might like to incorporate aspects and vocabulary of the speech topic, and pose a like question to your own audience: 'What makes a great speech, my dear fellow orators? I am most certain that we all totally agree that this is how an audience, just like you and me, are challenged intellectually. So let me challenge you with this intellectual analysis of three significant presentations...'

See the introduction for further recommendations.

Language Choice

The language fits the purpose to explore and critically evaluate. The vocabulary also suits the topic, and there is a very competent use of analytical language.

Try to also incorporate persuasive language as well, ensuring that your audience agrees with your point of view.

Vary the use of the linking word "however". The use of a thesaurus is a good language tool.

This is a very good online thesaurus: <http://www.thesaurus.com/>

Development of Ideas

Your ideas are advanced, intellectual and well presented. Examples from the speech are discussed competently and specific evidence extracted and explored. The comparative element is also well incorporated into the discussion and within paragraphs. This is all great.

You address your own audience at the beginning and end of your speech. This is effective. Try to be specific with our audience in the introduction and a bit more inventive with the address. It is also

useful to keep referring to your listeners in the body section of the oral. Use inclusive words like “we, us, and you” more readily.

Persuasive speech techniques are also useful such as rhetorical and direct questions, short sentences and repetition for effect. The use of similes can also work well.

References

It is great to see that you are making good use of quotes from the speeches, and these references support your discussion.

In places, the quotes are long and hence end up as stand-alone sentences. Try to shorten these quotes, and this will help to incorporate them into your own sentences. You have in places done this successfully, so use these as a good guideline. See the file for further recommendations.

Grammar and Spelling

Some simple mistakes with spelling and grammar have crept into your writing - this is very common!

It is possible to incorporate a further use of punctuation. This is especially where extra information is added. The use of a comma is indicated in the file with [,] and full stop [.]

When we have two points in one sentence, we place a comma in front of the conjunction “and”. We also tend to place a comma in front of “which” and “who”.

This is all in all a very effective speech, and you have worked effectively with the chosen texts.

Super work.

Student writing:

What makes a great speech?

A speech that challenges an audience intellectually, or is it a speech that marks its place in history? Or is it a speech with a direct message and the necessary actions then follow? That's up to you to decide. [Three optional questions to choose from - select one of these and be very clear about this in the introduction - unless the task provides the opportunity to select a forth and your own focus]

Good morning, [be specific with your audience - teacher/students]

The three speeches ‘The Statement to the Knesset’ presented by Egyptian president Anwar Sadat in the Israeli parliament [capital letter - Parliament] on the 20th of November 1977, the ‘Redfern speech’ received by the Australian nation in Redfern park [Park] on the 10th December 1992 from prime minister Paul Keating and ‘An Australian History for us all’ delivered by Aboriginal activist Noel Pearson on the 20th November 1996 at a university club dinner. All of these well-educated, sophisticated men followed through their speeches with a standard speech opening and then slowly built their speech up to emphasise a point and make their own individual stand for reconciliation. [This is a long sentence which is due to the references, and no point is provided. Reconsider the structure] Through this construction of their own complex ideas they have raised many ideas on who does and should experience guilt for actions of their own or actions of another and as a [express point directly] counter factor how and why a nation should unify to create the equality society requires. [Long sentence - shorten or divide into two] They also created contentious speeches which hold great

significance even today. [Good short sentence with impact - more of this] [Focus on one of the possible questions stated and provide a direct response to this in a thesis statement]

A speaker has the opportunity to unify an audience through the creation of emotion, acceptance and understanding for another. [This topic sentence seems to indicate that a possible task question chosen is: "A speech that challenges an audience intellectually"] Sadat uses inclusive language, 'we' in 'We all, Muslims, Christians and Jews, worship God and no one but God.' He uses the term **God** [show the reference - 'God'] to spiritually unify the audience through appealing to every **individuals beliefs** [phrasal structure - the beliefs of every individual] early in the speech. This is excellent at drawing our attention before he raises his contentious ideas. His use of double repetition of 'really and truly', 'As we really and truly seek peace, we really and truly welcome you to live among us in peace and security,' emphasises the unity he strives to create between both the Israeli people and the Arab's. This is similar to Noel Pearson's message where he clearly says that he thinks unity is the only way to create a positive Australian environment **through** [by] quoting Dr Hewson, 'A divisive debate over issues long gone should never be preferred to a unifying search for common ground.' Through the use of formal language [,] which leads into **quite** [delete] a colloquial statement at the end, 'common ground' emphasising his quest for **indigenous** [capital letter - Indigenous] and non-indigenous Australians to be equal and united. [This is a very good comparative analysis between the two speeches] 'It seems to me that the psychological unity of this country depends upon our taking responsibility for the future by dealing with the past.' [Incorporate this quote, instead of being a stand-alone sentence] Through the high modality of his word choice he is simply saying that for this country to move forward and unite we must first accept responsibility for the past. Paul Keating also emphasises his point that without the **indigenous** and non-indigenous Australians uniting our society cannot be considered culturally diverse and we will never truly have a holistic Australian identity. 'How well we recognise the fact that complex as our identity is, it cannot be separated from Aboriginal Australia.' [Incorporate quote] This is also reiterated in the anaphora of 'how well we' into the next line. Hence, through the careful word choice of a speaker, an audience can be connected.

Speakers have the opportunity to evoke a change [,] **I quote** [phase - This is exemplified in: 'after all is said and done, more is said than done.' Sadat's speech is momentous and **historic**, [is the chosen question also this: "A speech that marks its place in history?"] due to the previous distrust and intolerance these two nations expressed to each other, this is represented by the repetition of his idealistic statement, 'establish permanent peace based on justice.' **Which** [This] continually reinforces to the audience his clear message. He is honest and decent about the whole situation. **Keating's speech however** [,] is contentious his desire and dedication to the idea of Aboriginal reconciliation is to be commended, however he himself says that actions speak louder than words but he fails to follow through. [Longer sentence - restructure and be direct about point] Hence his speech is all just talk for example, 'we will only give them meaning when we commit ourselves to achieving concrete results.' He uses inclusive language 'we' to emphasise what he desires [,] but in actual fact no really 'concrete' actions came from his speech. Noel Pearson's speech **however** [repetition of linking word - conversely] challenges the political validity of the Howard government [,] yet his argument severely lacks cohesion. **The audience is left confused about his message** [,] and he supplies no real solution to any issues he raises and instead simply assigns guilt to the non-indigenous Australians and indicates his hatred for the Howard government, for example 'John Howard implies that a history has been cultivated by the politically-correct class which urges guilt and shame upon Australians about the national past.' [Length of sentence] Another example of Noel mocking Howard's government to represent his distempt with it is in, 'Australians have been urged by the black armbands, through a delirium of political correctness to feel guilty about the past?' His powerful use of the cliché 'black armband' and his use of a rhetorical question emphasises his confusion about Howards assignment of guilt. [Good analysis and use of short and direct quotes, worked into your own sentence - more of this] The question of who is guilty is in fact continued by Sadat as he assigns guilt to both himself and his audience in the simple statement, 'Our delegates met on the first Geneva conference

without exchanging a direct word. Yes, this happened.' It again reinforces his honesty [,] but also shows that he knows that they are both guilty for not meeting face-to-face. The use of pause in 'Yes,' also allows great impact from the speaker. Keating however disagrees with the acceptance of guilt and try's [spelling] a more directly positive approach. 'Guilt is not a very constructive emotion. I think what we need to do is open our hearts a bit.' The metaphor is emotive and emphasises that society needs to take a look at the bigger picture and move forward in positive action. Speakers hence have the potential to 'change the world' however in this case some seem to have fallen short and others succeeded temporarily.

So having now presented all of this information to you, think about whether these speeches hold validity in your opinion? Or are they just unconscious thoughts delivered to your left ear and flowed out your right? [Good direct reference to your audience] Keating, Sadat ad Pearson have developed sophisticated ideals [,] and challenged their audience in a captivating endeavour to brand their hands in history as they transform the opinions and actions of others. [Good concluding sentence]

Sample feedback