

**САМО- И ВЗАИМОПРОВЕРКА В КУРСЕ
ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЙ РИТОРИКИ**

**SELF-EDITING AND PEER-EDITING
IN PRACTICAL RHETORIC**

Е.Ю. Курейчук

E.Y Kireichuk

Минский государственный лингвистический университет
Минск, Республика Беларусь

Minsk State Linguistics University
Minsk, Republic of Belarus

e-mail: workmiracle@mail.ru

Статья обращает внимание на необходимость развития навыков само- и взаимооценивания как компонента профессиональных компетенций на продвинутой ступени обучения студентов педагогических специальностей. В статье предлагаются практические рекомендации по подготовке анализа письменных риторических аргументов в формате само- и взаимооценивания как завершающего задания в рамках курса риторики как практической языковой дисциплины в специализированном вузе, основанные на опыте преподавания практической риторики студентам 3-его курса факультета английского языка Минского государственного лингвистического университета.

The article highlights the importance of developing assessment and self-assessment skills as a component of professional competencies at the advanced stage of training of students of pedagogics. The article contains practical recommendations for the preparation and organization of self-editing and peer-editing analysis of rhetorical arguments as a final written task in a course of rhetoric as a practical language discipline at a specialized university, based on the experience of teaching practical rhetoric to third-year students of the English language faculty of Minsk State Linguistics University.

Ключевые слова: английский язык; практическая риторика; навыки оценивания; навыки самооценивания; анкета для самопроверки; анкета для взаимопроверки.

Keywords: the English language; Practical Rhetoric; assessment skills; self-assessment skills; self-editing review; peer-editing review.

The main goal of professional linguistic education is students' foreign language proficiency for interpersonal and professional communication. Achieving this goal involves solving a variety of tasks, including teaching the use of the foreign language as a means of deepening professional knowledge and improvement of professional qualifications.

Foreign language proficiency presupposes the formation of a number of linguistic, discursive, compensatory, social and personal, educational and cognitive communicative competences. In the process of training a teacher, special attention should be paid to the development of linguo-methodological and professional competencies.

Linguo-methodological competence involves language proficiency at an adaptive level depending on a specific pedagogical situation, as well as mastery of pedagogical communication and linguo-methodological activities (management of intellectual activity; stimulation, organization and control of foreign language speech activities of students; selection, systematization, adaptation of linguistic material and socio-cultural information for use in educational processes).

Professional competence requires an effective application of the acquired knowledge, abilities and skills in practical professional activities. In 1956, B. Bloom in his book “The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives” proposed one of the best-known classifications of learning goals.

Bloom’s taxonomy distinguishes three groups of learning objectives: cognitive (Cognitive Domain), emotional (Affective Domain), and kinesthetic (Psychomotor Domain) [1, p. 31]. Emotional goals involve development of trainees’ self-control and self-reflection and formation of moral values. Motor goals include development of physical activity skills. Cognitive goals are associated with the acquisition of knowledge and intellectual development. B. Bloom also proposed a hierarchical 6-level sub-classification of cognitive goals:

1. The knowledge level involves memorization and reproduction of the studied material in the form of methods, procedures, structures, patterns, etc.

2. The comprehension level refers to transformation of material from one form of expression to another (the ability to summarize or paraphrase the information offered).

3. The application level represents the ability to use the knowledge gained in specific conditions and new situations.

4. The analysis level refers to the ability to break down the study material into its components, describe its internal organization and identify relations between its elements.

5. The synthesis level involves the ability to combine elements of learned knowledge to obtain a new whole.

6. The evaluation level engenders construction of meaningful judgments about the value of materials and methods of study and of new data in the studied area [1, p. 83].

The hierarchical relationship allows the transition to the tasks of the subsequent levels only upon reaching the goals of the previous levels.

Ever since, cognitive psychologists have been rethinking Bloom's taxonomy considering modern challenges and advances in education. In 2001, "A Taxonomy for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment" by L. Anderson and collaborates stated an updated six-level pyramid of the following learning goals according to the principle of increasing complexity: 1) memorization, 2) understanding, 3) application, 4) analysis, 5) assessment and 6) creation [1, p. 94]. As can be seen, evaluation, or assessment, is at the top of the original taxonomy and comes fifth out of the six in terms of difficulty in its revised version.

The original taxonomy associates each level of cognition with specific cognitive processes. The additional taxonomy offers the following types of knowledge at the basis of the six cognitive processes:

- Factual (knowledge of terminology, specific details and elements);
- Conceptual (knowledge of classifications and categories; of principles and generalizations; of theories, models, and structures);
- Procedural (knowledge of subject-specific skills, algorithms, techniques and methods; of criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures);
- Metacognitive (strategic knowledge; knowledge about cognitive tasks, including appropriate contextual and conditional knowledge; self-knowledge) [2].

As can be inferred, assessment as a complex educational activity activates a combination of procedural and metacognitive levels of knowledge. Therefore, at the advanced stage of training, along with the skills of analysis and synthesis, it is necessary to pay special attention to the development of assessment and self-assessment skills as a component of professional competencies.

What is assessment? To assess means to make judgments based on certain criteria and standards, about the value and relevance of ideas and solutions as a product of intellectual activity. Learning objectives for this level are formulated in the following terms: evaluation, criticism, judgment, challenge, support, justification [3, p. 75].

In practical rhetoric courses, assessment can take the shape of Peer correction (mutual verification and assessment of written tasks by students) and Self-editing (self-checking and assessment of personal written tasks). The check involves 2 main stages: (self) check and (self) critique and is performed according to a number of criteria in the form of answers to the questions formulated by the teacher in Peer correction worksheets and Self-editing worksheets, respectively.

Below we suggest sample questions for self-check and cross-check of a written rhetorical argument that have proved effective in the course of studies.

General Self-Editing Worksheet

Using the Self-Editing Worksheet, analyze and score your written argument.

Contributor:	Date:	Task:
Guiding Questions		Contributor's Response
Self-score (1 to 10):		

1. What structural type does the argument take (Toulmin/ One-sided/ Rogerian)?
2. Where is the thesis statement/claim placed?
3. What kind of introduction does this argument have? What possible elements of the introduction have I used there? How many sentences does it contain? Could it capture a reader's interest?
4. How many paragraphs are there in the body? (Number:...)
5. The controlling ideas of the body paragraphs are as follows:...
6. What kind of supporting details and argumentative strategies (logos/pathos/ethos) have I used in each body paragraph?
7. Are my paragraphs coherent? Does each paragraph flow smoothly from beginning to end? What key nouns have I repeated? What transition signals have I used?
8. Is any sentence unnecessary or "off the topic"? If the answer is yes, what is wrong about it (them)?
9. Is there a review of the opposite point of view? If there is one, how many counterarguments have I given? Is there a rebuttal of the counterarguments?
10. Would the reader like more information about anything? (If the answer is yes, write down what you would add now).
11. What concluding technique(s) have I used? Have I made a final comment/restatement? What is it? May it seem an effective ending?
12. How varied is my vocabulary (Very varied / Quite varied / Not really varied)?
13. I have found (indicate the number) mistakes: Lexical:....; Spelling:....; Morphological:....; Syntactical:....
14. I believe the best feature of my argument is ... And my best writing skill is...
15. I would score my own argument as... (give a score from 1 to 10).

General Peer Review Worksheet

Using the Peer Review Worksheet, analyze and score a groupmate's written argument.

Writer:	Reviewer:	Date:	Task:
Guiding Questions		Reviewer's Response	
Writer's score (1 to 10):			

1. What is the structural type of the argument under analysis (Toulmin/ One-sided/ Rogerian)? Is it effective, or would some other structure work better?

2. What is the functional type of the argument? Are there the necessary functional elements (a criteria-match for the definition and the evaluation type; a faulty analogy for the resemblance type; a causal mechanism for the causal type; a solution-justification for the proposal type)?

3. Which organizational structure does the argument follow (with criteria and match in separate sections or interwoven – for the definition and the evaluation type; basing on an analogy or a precedent – for the resemblance type; with a focus on cause / effect or a chain development – for the causal type; as a practical or a policy proposal – for the proposal type)?

4. Does the introduction explain and show why the phenomenon under consideration is important, controversial or problematical? What would you change in the introduction to emphasize the importance of the issues and to explain the essence of the problem?

5. Is there an attention grabber? How effective, impressive, or memorable is it? Did it make you react emotionally? In what way (smile, be shocked or amused, etc.)?

6. Is the claim found in the right position according to the chosen structural type of argument?

7. Is the claim clearly formulated? How would you reformulate it to make it more effective and up-to-the-point?

8. Is it easy to grasp the connection of the claim to the supporting reasons and the warrant? How could the connection be made clearer? Are more transitional words and phrases needed?

9. Which rhetorical component (logos, ethos and pathos) seems prevailing in this argument? Are there any other means of persuasion to supplement the claim? Give your suggestions to improve logical, ethical and pathetic appeal of this argument.

10. What can you say about the evidence (examples, facts, statistics, etc.)? What is the strongest evidence, if any, chosen to support the claim?

11. What, if any, evidence needs to be strengthened? What kinds of sources might provide this evidence?

12. Does the argument consider any alternatives or hypothetical objections to the claim? Is refutation offered for these counterclaims? What support is offered for rejecting these counterclaims? Where is additional support needed?

13. Are there any qualifiers? What are they? How effective are they?

14. Which technique(s) of conclusion is used?

15. What logical fallacies, if any, do you notice? Role-playing a skeptical audience: point out and refute the logical fallacies you have spotted.

16. Comment on the language correctness, linguistic competence and style. Are there any errors that spoil the general impression and become an obstacle to understanding?

17. Account for the target audience of this argument (supportive, neutral or resistant). Explain your point of view.

18. Which parts (elements) of the argument seem particularly effective, impressive, memorable? Which ones seem weakest? Suggest how they could be improved.

19. Overall, what other comments do you have for how this argument could be improved?

20. Give the argument a score from 1 to 10.

On completion of the feedback, the instructor double-checks the written arguments and analyzes the comments presented in the forms, and then agrees with the comments made and the mark given, or comments on the reasons for their disagreement.

This format of current written control and reflection is intended both for checking students' knowledge and organizing their independent work. Thus, self-diagnosis of students' competencies makes training an interactive process and contributes to the development of linguo-pragmatic competencies and their integration with factual knowledge within the framework of a professional personality.

Библиографические ссылки

1. Anderson L. W, Krathwohl D. R. A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing. New York: Longman (2001). ISBN : 0321084055.

2. Armstrong P. Bloom's Taxonomy. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy> (дата обращения 21.12.2022).

3. Романов Е.В. Разработка системы оценки учебных достижений студентов в контексте реализации компетентного подхода //Иновации в образовании – ИнВестРегион. 2011.