

16

Suggestions for text building and structuring (see also # 9)

Goal

In addition to the strategies described in "timeline" and "scheme /introduction/main body/ conclusion" in Nr. 9, the following procedures focus on the planning and practice of text building and structuring. They aim to provide students with opportunities to practice the strategies with attractive contexts.

1. Working with cut-up texts

2nd–6th grade

20 minutes



The instructor distributes texts (5–10 age-appropriate sentences), which have been cut up into strips (one sentence per strip). The selected text should be action-oriented with a clear sequence structure. Task: sort the sentences and paste the text back together correctly. Possible additional task: expand the text with extra sentences and strips, or mark the strips according to whether they are part of the introduction/main body/ending of the text.

2. Working with picture stories


2nd–9th grade

30 minutes



Materials:
cut-up picture stories

Individually or in pairs, the students receive a cut up picture story (4–8 pictures). They are tasked to order the pictures in the correct sequence, paste them onto a sheet of paper, and describe the events with 1–2 sentences per picture. Possible additional task: write an introduction and an ending. Sources for picture stories: magazines, newspapers, comics, internet, picture story cards (e. g. Schubi learning media publisher, Schaffhausen (available in many schools).



3. Parallel texts, generative writing

2nd–9th grade

30 minutes



Materials:
text template (see right)

The students receive a text template (e. g. a short story or a poem). They then write a variation of it, based on this template. The variation might consist of a changed protagonist (instead of a barking dog, a meowing cat). Other good applications include letters, apologies, applications, etc., which are changed according to a template. Working with parallel texts is particularly suitable for weaker students, as the difficulty level for language production is considerably lower. See also example 15.2 above: alternative word test, as well as M. Lüth's excellent article on generative writing under http://www.kompetenzzentrum-sprachfoerderung.de/fileadmin/user_upload/didacta-Version.pdf