**Participatory Workshop 5: Performing Skills**

**Goals**

To stage and dramatize the script of each PERSEIA script.

**Previous considerations**

Some studies claim that be taught on certain performing skills reduces public speaking anxiety:

*Students were instructed on skills training and practiced individual delivery skills (i.e.,* ***using hand gestures, spanning the audience with eye contact, using vocal variation****).[[1]](#footnote-1)*

To get focused on the Oral Scientific Communication Skills[[2]](#footnote-2), i.e. the skills needed to communicate the knowledge that scientist generate at their labs. To highlight the relation between the Performing Skills needed to deliver the PERSEIA and the Oral Scientific Communication Skills needed to communicate science:

*Oral communication skills, including those for both planned presentations (journal clubs, conference presentations) and spontaneous speech (lab discussions, professional networking)*

*Oral communication skills are limited by affective barriers, such as public speaking anxiety and shyness.**[[3]](#footnote-3)*

To highlight and/or to face the barriers that specifically affect girls at the moment of speaking in public, recapturing what was learned during PW3.

[…] female, for example, expressed low self- confidence relative to male […]

[…] female expressing a startling degree of insecurity, as revealed by their body language, tone of voice, and words iii.

[DISCOURSE AND GENDER](http://static1.squarespace.com/static/5523ffe4e4b012b2c4ebd8fc/t/56fae0e82eeb817eecbc532e/1459282153444/2015+Discourse+and+Gender.pdf)[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Specific Objectives**

**1.** At this point, students should have finished the script of their “piece of PERSEIA”. But if they do not have finish yet, finish the script of each monologue (in those cases in which students could not finish it at home) and stage it.

**2.** To provide students with the performing skills needed to dramatize and perform their text, by focusing on oral scientific communication skills, non-verbal skills and stage presence.

**3.** To give students a methodology to analyse and improve their artistic creations: the method of “trial and error with constructive criticism”.

To recover and complement what was learned about “Critical Thinking” during PW2 and the “Designed Guidelines to Analyse and Create PERSEIAs” used in PW4.

**PERSEIAs guidelines from T2.1 followed:**

Gender

General Recommendations: Use of Social Networks / Make PERSEIA interactive

**Description of the Participatory Workshop:**

**Warming Activity (5’)**

Take into account in this section the loss of time due to the organization of the students into the room.

Deliver warming exercises:

Rubber chicken game warm up (3’):

Pupils, ECR’s, teachers and trainers, stand in a circle and count off (from 5 to 1) shaking each limb, 5 times, then 4 times then 3 times etc. When 1 is reached everybody leaps into the air and cries out rubber chicken as loud as they can.

Brief introduction about the goal of the PW.

**Review of work proposed in previous PW (5’)**

Check if the students have written the script of their PERSEIA. Ask to the students if they did the homework. We must be forewarned that some students do not have completely finished their script. If yes, move to the next activity. If not, try to motivate them to do it with a brief talk about the importance of the script to deliver a good PERSEIA sketch.

**Performing Skills activity (40’)**

Explain quickly to the students that to catch and maintain the attention of the audience one powerful tool is the use of their bodies to interpret the script. Summarize that four important tools that they can use are:

* Body language: non-verbal communication reinforces your message
* Voice: good use of voice volume and voice tone
* Look: maintain eye contact with your audience
* Listen: to be aware about what happens with your peers and with your audience.

Explain to students that we are going to work each tool using games:

Body language (7’):

Highlight good body language practice and reinforce this by playing a whispering game, where a message is passed around all members of the group, with the message only being able to travel in one direction. Using this as an example of how without the reinforcement of good body language messages can often miss their intended targets. The message we often use is “I did not eat chocolate with that women Victoria Becham” or similar, (print the message out on an A3 card)

Vocal modulation (5’):

Now get random members of the group to read out the whole message from the previous exercise but each will place all their emphasis on different single words in the message, and so note how emphasising words and indeed pausing can really help to make your audience want to listen. Also mentioning at this point slowing down your spoken delivery and the very real benefits this can bring to any presentation especially if you are nervous.

Eye contact (8’):

Whole group is asked to randomly wander around a defined space for 1 min engaging each other with as many good quality eye contact as they can as they move around, (“we define good quality eye contact as you are looking at them and they are looking at you and you BOTH realise that you are looking at each other!”). This exercise is then repeated but done as a competition with the highest number of interactions winning, and receiving a small prize of some description.

Listen to your peers (5’):

Split the students in groups of 4 or 5.

The N students have to count themselves, from 1 to N, each one of them has to say one number. If two students speak at the same time, they have to resume to 1.

They have to listen to the group and take their time. Try to feel and see who is going to speak at any time.

If they achieve to count to N, we can ask them to count until 2N.

General Staging Activity (15’):

Pupils, ECRs and teachers asked to each stand up and take the rest of the group on a journey through their house (1 to 2 mins each) trainer then engages the group in positive whole group reflexion on what was good in each performance and what could be altered to make it better. (The use of a journey through a familiar space promotes confidence through familiarity and often leads to a story format being adopted with something of a beginning, middle and end, when this occurs pupils to be congratulated for this and the benefits of using a story format explored with the group as a whole).

**Development of the students’ PERSEIA** **(60’)**

20’ - Students are divided in the SWG and work on finishing the script of their PERSEIA sketch (in those cases in which students could not finish it at home) and staging it (or part of it).

ECR, teacher and SciCom visits the groups to assist them and to get them focused on the activity.

40’ – Each SWG deliver their PERSEIA sketch to the rest of the group. Peers make it constructive criticism using a guideline (designed by TBVT) that combines “Critical Thinking from PW2 guidelines” and the “Designed Guidelines to Analyse and Create PERSEIAs from PW4”. The students accept the criticism and incorporate in its PERSEIA sketch what they deems useful following the next pattern:

We can divide the group into SWG, as there is 5 SWG, let us call them A, B, C, D and E. Simultaneously:

The group A shows a section of its PERSEIA sketch to B, the teacher and the ECR.

The group C shows a section of its PERSEIA sketch to D, E, and SciCom.

They have all **5 minutes (MAXIMUM)** to perform or explain it, if it is not ready.

Then, simultaneously again:

Group B (assisted by teacher and ECR) gives very quickly constructive criticism to A.

Group D and E (assisted by SciCom) do the same to group C.

This can lasts **4 minutes**.

Then the performing groups have **2 minutes** to discuss internally before performing again.

And finally:

A and C re-performs immediately their PERSEIA sketch immediately, trying to take into account what they heard.

This lasts **5 minutes again (MAXIMUM)**.

**1 minute** to make the shift to the second part.

Then the same process is repeated:

Group B show its part to group A and teacher.

Group D shows its part to group C and ECR.

The group E shows its part to SciCom, 1 student picked from group A and 1 student picked from group C.

And to finish, **2 minutes** to conclude the activity, and let them make comments about this method. We encourage them to use it to rehearse their PERSEIA sketches during the telematics phase.

**Work proposal (10’):**

Students have to finish the script of their PERSEIA sketch, and share with their teachers, ECRs and SciCom following the methodology described in PW4.

Once the students have the script of their PERSEIA sketch, they have to learn by heart and make a video of them delivering their “piece of PERSEIA”.

Students have to share the video with his/her GWG, teachers, ECR and SciCom using the private YouTube channel (or an on-line platform from the school).

Teachers, ECRs and SciCom give constructive comments to the students in order to improve their monologues’ staging.

Students incorporate the comments and suggestions that they consider to their monologues.

**RRI learning dimension topics faced:**

Feelings and emotions

Learning to learn skills (learning autonomy, reflective thinking...)

Social and civic competences

Inclusiveness of students

**Students’ transversal skills worked:**

Learning to learn, or the ability to pursue and persist in learning and effectively organise and manage time and information (i.e., self-reflection, scientific method-approach)

Social and civic competences, or the ability to participate in an effective and constructive way in social life (i.e., team work, collaboration, social responsibility of science)

Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship, or the ability to turn ideas into action (i.e., creativity, critical thinking and innovation)
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