

Devoir surveillé – Interaction orale : débat et discussion

Maîtriser les stratégies de la prise de parole, du débat et de l'argumentation orale en anglais (programme de 1re LVA)

Durée : 120 min – Sans document – Sur 20 points · Anglais (LVA) 1^{re}

Nom : _____ Date : _____ Note : _____ / 20

Les réponses doivent être rédigées et justifiées. Soigne l'orthographe et la présentation.

Exercice 1 – Compréhension écrite — « The Doors »

(4 pts)

Read the text, then answer the four questions in English, in full sentences.

Maya had joined the debating club because she wanted to speak better English, not because she enjoyed arguing. On her first evening, the topic was whether phones should be banned in schools. She had prepared three arguments and learned them by heart. The problem was that nobody let her use them. Every time she opened her mouth, somebody else was already speaking.

« You see, » said Mr Okafor, the teacher who ran the club, « in a debate you cannot simply wait for a gap. There is no gap. You have to make one. »

*He wrote four sentences on the board: **Could I just come in here? / If I could finish my point... / So what you're saying is... / That may be true, but...***

« These are not arguments, » he said. « They are doors. Learn the doors and your arguments will find their way out. »

The following week Maya tried the first sentence. Her voice shook, but the room turned towards her and, to her surprise, waited. She had nothing brilliant to say, so she asked a question instead: « Could you tell me what you mean by 'distraction'? » The boy who had been speaking for two minutes stopped, thought, and admitted that he was not entirely sure.

Maya sat back. She had not won anything, and her three prepared arguments were still in her pocket. She had, for the first time, taken part.

- a) a) Why did Maya join the debating club, and what difficulty did she meet on her first evening? (1 pt)
- b) b) Explain in your own words why Mr Okafor calls the four sentences « doors ». (1 pt)
- c) c) « She had not won anything. » Why does the narrator nevertheless present the second evening as a success? (1 pt)
- d) d) Explain the sentence « you cannot simply wait for a gap. There is no gap. » in your own words. (1 pt)

Exercice 2 – Langue — relancer : tags et questions indirectes*(4 pts)*

Complete or transform the following sentences. Write the whole answer.

- a) a) Complete the tag: « You've already given your opinion, ___ you? » (1 pt)
- b) b) Complete the tag: « He rarely speaks first, ___ he? » (1 pt)
- c) c) Turn into an indirect question: « What does 'moderation' mean? » → Could you tell me ... (1 pt)
- d) d) Turn into an indirect question: « Where did you find that figure? » → I'd like to know ... (1 pt)

Exercice 3 – Langue — accord et désaccord nuancés*(4 pts)*

Rewrite each answer so that it respects the degree of agreement indicated.

- a) a) Correct the mistake: « I am agree with you on this point. » (1 pt)
- b) b) Reply to « I don't think online lessons work. » by saying that you feel the same. (1 pt)
- c) c) Rewrite « You're completely wrong. » as a polite disagreement. (1 pt)
- d) d) Answer « Exams should be abolished. » with a partial agreement, in one full sentence. (1 pt)

Exercice 4 – Langue — reformuler, gagner du temps, faux amis*(4 pts)*

Translate the following into idiomatic English.

- a) a) « En fait, j'ai changé d'avis depuis le dernier débat. » (1 pt)
- b) b) « Si je vous comprends bien, vous êtes contre cette mesure. » (1 pt)
- c) c) « C'est une bonne question — laissez-moi réfléchir une seconde. » (1 pt)
- d) d) « Comment appelle-t-on cela en anglais ? Je vais le dire autrement. » (1 pt)

Exercice 5 – Expression écrite — un extrait de débat*(4 pts)*

Write the transcript of a short exchange (120–150 words) between two students, Alex and Jo, debating this motion: « School uniforms should be compulsory. » Respect the four requirements below.

- a) a) Alex must take the floor with an interaction formula, then give one argument. (1 pt)
- b) b) Jo must express a nuanced disagreement (neither a flat « no » nor a total agreement). (1 pt)
- c) c) One of the two speakers must reformulate the other (« So what you're saying is... » type) or ask for a clarification. (1 pt)
- d) d) The exchange must end on a concession followed by a counter-argument (concede + but/still + evidence). (1 pt)

Bon courage !