I have observed my peer, **Kazi Mahmudul Hasan (ID: 1711553643).** Below I have described my critical analysis of his speech.

It was rather difficult to distinguish the attention-getter in the speech since there weren’t many stops or clear boundaries in the introductory part of his speech. But after being identified, it was a rather good one. His listener relevance link was good; he had connected the audience to the idea of Indian food. The credibility of the speech seemed to be limited to the single word “research” and wasn’t well elaborated. The speaker’s thesis statement was somewhat unclear.

In the body of the speech, the speaker has established himself with his research on the topic. He provided information with the help of statistics (his mention of the word “survey”) that gives a sense of credibility. The historical context, as well as the methodology of the speech, was also well presented. In terms of the content, the speech seemed nicely laid out and informative, especially the mention of the ingredients and the contradictory history behind the dish.

The conclusion was a clear and concise one, but the summary statement had no clear indication. It seemed as if the presence of an ending that brought all together was missing. There wasn’t a strong clincher also.

Overall, for an informative speech, it seemed to me he had accomplished his task. The speaker, in terms of clothing, seemed well-groomed for the speech and had presented his speech with proper body language. The sudden stops created a rather false sense of partition and made it seem as if the speaker was nervous.