

Evaluation of the Renewable Energy Debate

When commenting on the process of creating the renewable energy debate, there are three main areas of focus: the research, the draft, and the recording.

The research began smoothly, and the advantages and disadvantages of wind and water energy were moderately easy to find within the documents, articles, and texts at the archive. Considering the vast majority of the sources were located on the same shelves, this made the task significantly easier. Both Katie and I worked efficiently to find the relevant points amongst the more technical information within the works, and neither of us struggled with the research section of this project. Nevertheless, one issue discovered regarding the research process was the fact that there were far less sources on water energy, making it slightly more difficult to create an argument with roughly the same amount of advantages and disadvantages for both water and wind.

In regards to the draft, this caused a considerable amount of difficulties. Creating a list of the advantages and disadvantages was relatively easy, but creating an order for these points and ensuring that the debate would flow smoothly (i.e. sound conversational) was very time consuming, largely because we wanted the points to link. The initial draft of the debate had separate sections for water and wind, where wind would be discussed first with its advantages and disadvantages, and water would follow in similar manner. However, it was soon evident that this would create repetitions, for many of the points made about wind were also relevant for water (for instance, neither require mining or extracting). Thus, the draft was changed to have the points about water and wind be integrated. This then created the difficulty of including points that were relevant to one type of energy, but not the other, as well as trying to include points from categories that did not relate to the previous topics of discussion. After a lot of trial and error, and rearranging the order of points multiple times, a final draft was produced.

Recording the debate, like the draft, also took multiple attempts. Arguably the biggest pitfall was trying to record the almost twenty-minute audio recording in one take. Naturally, this took a lot of tries. The main problem was trying to make the debate sound natural and conversational, and not like we were simply reading a list of advantages and disadvantages. Considering the previous difficulties of making the draft flow smoothly, trying to translate this into a spoken debate was challenging, and the transition between points did not always have the desired effect. With little previous experience in both debates, and recording and transcribing audio, it is likely that this process would become easier over time with more practice. It is definitely good experience in learning how to create and edit audio files, as well as good debate and speaking practice. We edited the draft again, and made it more coherent. After creating two audio recordings, a third and final attempt was produced, uploaded, and transcribed. The transcription took far less time than expected as we were able to take most of the information from the draft and then edit it to fit with the audio. Furthermore, having split the transcription work between the two of us, where I transcribed my speech and Katie transcribed hers, the whole process was very quick.

In conclusion, both Katie and I found this project challenging in the areas we had never attempted before (namely, producing and recording an audio debate). However, the project was ultimately very rewarding, having allowed us to develop new transferable skills, and access interesting and rare documents in an area of history that neither of us have covered previously.