

10 | Markiere mit System

Markiert man gar nicht, dauert es lange, bis man wichtige Informationen wiederfindet. Pinselt man alles gelb an, so verlangsamt das den Leseprozess und hebt die „Goldbrocken“ nicht heraus. Das Ziel des Anstreichens ist es aber, das Verständnis schon während des Lesens zu erleichtern und den Text „mundgerecht“ für wiederholtes Lesen aufzubereiten. Durch das aktive Anstreichen und Arbeiten mit dem Text spielen linke und rechte Gehirnhälfte besser zusammen. Der lineare Leseprozess wird aufgelockert und Textelemente gewichtet: Durch Formen, Linien, Grafiken und Zeichencodes wird der Stoff leichter verarbeitbar und besser merkbar. Passe dein Markierungssystem dem Text und Ziel an, halte aber Logik und Konsistenz!

Wichtige Inhalte kennzeichnen

Kreise

286 *College Composition and Communication 40 (October 1989)*
processes—the instructional one we design, the cognitive one we presume it will support, and the social one that goes on anyway—can be strikingly out of sync. The critical, self-monitoring cognitive process we want students to develop may be in unsteady conflict with far more pressing interpersonal needs for social affiliation, where acts of evaluation and criticism threaten solidarity. As this small example suggests, it seems naive to assume that the cognitive processes we desire will naturally follow from the social situations we engineer. If we ignore the dialectic between cognition and context or if we try to enact one image of a “good” writing process but ignore the other, we may be building instructional delusions. We can’t afford to speculate about students’ thinking from the armchair of social theory. Nor can we place the mind in a bell jar and divorce the writing process from the social and emotional side of talk on which it flows. The problem for peer response is that even if we acknowledge the significance of this dialectic, there are few studies that have, like Freedman’s, carefully tracked the path it actually takes.

Elements of A More Integrative Theory
In asking us to examine how cognition and context interact, I do not want to suggest that we need a single image of the writing process or a single “integrated theory”—writing is too complex a phenomenon, and history tells us that single visions rarely satisfy many people for very long. What I would argue for is, first, the need for more balanced, multi-perspective descriptions and more rigorously grounded theoretical explanations of various aspects of the writing process: of the process of meaning-making, of constructing knowledge, of working collaboratively, of planning and revising, of reading-to-learn, of entering academic discourse, and so on (cf. Rose, “Complexity”). We already hold implicit theories about these acts. Even if we disavow the practice of theorizing, our images of the process and our priorities in teaching constitute a tacit theory. However, the wedding of composition with rhetoric, psychology, and new reading has called on us to theorize our understanding of composing in more reflective and testable ways. The sudden growth of research, scholarship, and new ideas, as well as the sometimes precipitous rush to polemical stands based on various moral, teacherly, or political imperatives, makes this a good time to reach for more analytical and balanced visions, for a greater sense of the conditional nature of our various perspectives. It is time for the systematic and self-questioning stance that goes with theoretical explanations—whether we are explaining a historical event, an experimental or observational study, or an approach to teaching.

Second, these attempts to build integrated, theory-conscious accounts of writing need, I believe, to address the apparent dichotomy of cognition and context in a direct way and in a spirit of open inquiry. It would be simple to frame this question in terms of a conflict—as much of the current discussion

Wichtigkeit

286 *College Composition and Communication 40 (October 1989)*
processes—the instructional one we design, the cognitive one we presume it will support, and the social one that goes on anyway—can be strikingly out of sync. The critical, self-monitoring cognitive process we want students to develop may be in unsteady conflict with far more pressing interpersonal needs for social affiliation, where acts of evaluation and criticism threaten solidarity. As this small example suggests, it seems naive to assume that the cognitive processes we desire will naturally follow from the social situations we engineer. If we ignore the dialectic between cognition and context or if we try to enact one image of a “good” writing process but ignore the other, we may be building instructional delusions. We can’t afford to speculate about students’ thinking from the armchair of social theory. Nor can we place the mind in a bell jar and divorce the writing process from the social and emotional side of talk on which it flows. The problem for peer response is that even if we acknowledge the significance of this dialectic, there are few studies that have, like Freedman’s, carefully tracked the path it actually takes.

Elements of A More Integrative Theory
In asking us to examine how cognition and context interact, I do not want to suggest that we need a single image of the writing process or a single “integrated theory”—writing is too complex a phenomenon, and history tells us that single visions rarely satisfy many people for very long. What I would argue for is, first, the need for more balanced, multi-perspective descriptions and more rigorously grounded theoretical explanations of various aspects of the writing process: of the process of meaning-making, of constructing knowledge, of working collaboratively, of planning and revising, of reading-to-learn, of entering academic discourse, and so on (cf. Rose, “Complexity”). We already hold implicit theories about these acts. Even if we disavow the practice of theorizing, our images of the process and our priorities in teaching constitute a tacit theory. However, the wedding of composition with rhetoric, psychology, and new reading has called on us to theorize our understanding of composing in more reflective and testable ways. The sudden growth of research, scholarship, and new ideas, as well as the sometimes precipitous rush to polemical stands based on various moral, teacherly, or political imperatives, makes this a good time to reach for more analytical and balanced visions, for a greater sense of the conditional nature of our various perspectives. It is time for the systematic and self-questioning stance that goes with theoretical explanations—whether we are explaining a historical event, an experimental or observational study, or an approach to teaching.

Second, these attempts to build integrated, theory-conscious accounts of writing need, I believe, to address the apparent dichotomy of cognition and context in a direct way and in a spirit of open inquiry. It would be simple to frame this question in terms of a conflict—as much of the current discussion

Textmarker

286 *College Composition and Communication 40 (October 1989)*
processes—the instructional one we design, the cognitive one we presume it will support, and the social one that goes on anyway—can be strikingly out of sync. The critical, self-monitoring cognitive process we want students to develop may be in unsteady conflict with far more pressing interpersonal needs for social affiliation, where acts of evaluation and criticism threaten solidarity. As this small example suggests, it seems naive to assume that the cognitive processes we desire will naturally follow from the social situations we engineer. If we ignore the dialectic between cognition and context or if we try to enact one image of a “good” writing process but ignore the other, we may be building instructional delusions. We can’t afford to speculate about students’ thinking from the armchair of social theory. Nor can we place the mind in a bell jar and divorce the writing process from the social and emotional side of talk on which it flows. The problem for peer response is that even if we acknowledge the significance of this dialectic, there are few studies that have, like Freedman’s, carefully tracked the path it actually takes.

Elements of A More Integrative Theory
In asking us to examine how cognition and context interact, I do not want to suggest that we need a single image of the writing process or a single “integrated theory”—writing is too complex a phenomenon, and history tells us that single visions rarely satisfy many people for very long. What I would argue for is, first, the need for more balanced, multi-perspective descriptions and more rigorously grounded theoretical explanations of various aspects of the writing process: of the process of meaning-making, of constructing knowledge, of working collaboratively, of planning and revising, of reading-to-learn, of entering academic discourse, and so on (cf. Rose, “Complexity”). We already hold implicit theories about these acts. Even if we disavow the practice of theorizing, our images of the process and our priorities in teaching constitute a tacit theory. However, the wedding of composition with rhetoric, psychology, and new reading has called on us to theorize our understanding of composing in more reflective and testable ways. The sudden growth of research, scholarship, and new ideas, as well as the sometimes precipitous rush to polemical stands based on various moral, teacherly, or political imperatives, makes this a good time to reach for more analytical and balanced visions, for a greater sense of the conditional nature of our various perspectives. It is time for the systematic and self-questioning stance that goes with theoretical explanations—whether we are explaining a historical event, an experimental or observational study, or an approach to teaching.

Second, these attempts to build integrated, theory-conscious accounts of writing need, I believe, to address the apparent dichotomy of cognition and context in a direct way and in a spirit of open inquiry. It would be simple to frame this question in terms of a conflict—as much of the current discussion

Suche Schlüsselwörter und Gedankengänge. Sei zunächst vorsichtig mit dem Markieren, greife in der ersten Leserunde erst zum Bleistift, dann zum Textmarker. Oder du fängst mit einer hellen Farbe an und wirst dunkler. So machst du durchs Markieren deinen Fortschritt sichtbar.

Dem Text Struktur geben

Trennungslinien

286 *College Composition and Communication 40 (October 1989)*
processes—the instructional one we design, the cognitive one we presume it will support, and the social one that goes on anyway—can be strikingly out of sync. The critical, self-monitoring cognitive process we want students to develop may be in unsteady conflict with far more pressing interpersonal needs for social affiliation, where acts of evaluation and criticism threaten solidarity. As this small example suggests, it seems naive to assume that the cognitive processes we desire will naturally follow from the social situations we engineer. If we ignore the dialectic between cognition and context or if we try to enact one image of a “good” writing process but ignore the other, we may be building instructional delusions. We can’t afford to speculate about students’ thinking from the armchair of social theory. Nor can we place the mind in a bell jar and divorce the writing process from the social and emotional side of talk on which it flows. The problem for peer response is that even if we acknowledge the significance of this dialectic, there are few studies that have, like Freedman’s, carefully tracked the path it actually takes.

Elements of A More Integrative Theory
In asking us to examine how cognition and context interact, I do not want to suggest that we need a single image of the writing process or a single “integrated theory”—writing is too complex a phenomenon, and history tells us that single visions rarely satisfy many people for very long. What I would argue for is, first, the need for more balanced, multi-perspective descriptions and more rigorously grounded theoretical explanations of various aspects of the writing process: of the process of meaning-making, of constructing knowledge, of working collaboratively, of planning and revising, of reading-to-learn, of entering academic discourse, and so on (cf. Rose, “Complexity”). We already hold implicit theories about these acts. Even if we disavow the practice of theorizing, our images of the process and our priorities in teaching constitute a tacit theory. However, the wedding of composition with rhetoric, psychology, and new reading has called on us to theorize our understanding of composing in more reflective and testable ways. The sudden growth of research, scholarship, and new ideas, as well as the sometimes precipitous rush to polemical stands based on various moral, teacherly, or political imperatives, makes this a good time to reach for more analytical and balanced visions, for a greater sense of the conditional nature of our various perspectives. It is time for the systematic and self-questioning stance that goes with theoretical explanations—whether we are explaining a historical event, an experimental or observational study, or an approach to teaching.

Wegstreichen

286 *College Composition and Communication 40 (October 1989)*
processes—the instructional one we design, the cognitive one we presume it will support, and the social one that goes on anyway—can be strikingly out of sync. The critical, self-monitoring cognitive process we want students to develop may be in unsteady conflict with far more pressing interpersonal needs for social affiliation, where acts of evaluation and criticism threaten solidarity. As this small example suggests, it seems naive to assume that the cognitive processes we desire will naturally follow from the social situations we engineer. If we ignore the dialectic between cognition and context or if we try to enact one image of a “good” writing process but ignore the other, we may be building instructional delusions. We can’t afford to speculate about students’ thinking from the armchair of social theory. Nor can we place the mind in a bell jar and divorce the writing process from the social and emotional side of talk on which it flows. The problem for peer response is that even if we acknowledge the significance of this dialectic, there are few studies that have, like Freedman’s, carefully tracked the path it actually takes.

Elements of A More Integrative Theory
In asking us to examine how cognition and context interact, I do not want to suggest that we need a single image of the writing process or a single “integrated theory”—writing is too complex a phenomenon, and history tells us that single visions rarely satisfy many people for very long. What I would argue for is, first, the need for more balanced, multi-perspective descriptions and more rigorously grounded theoretical explanations of various aspects of the writing process: of the process of meaning-making, of constructing knowledge, of working collaboratively, of planning and revising, of reading-to-learn, of entering academic discourse, and so on (cf. Rose, “Complexity”). We already hold implicit theories about these acts. Even if we disavow the practice of theorizing, our images of the process and our priorities in teaching constitute a tacit theory. However, the wedding of composition with rhetoric, psychology, and new reading has called on us to theorize our understanding of composing in more reflective and testable ways. The sudden growth of research, scholarship, and new ideas, as well as the sometimes precipitous rush to polemical stands based on various moral, teacherly, or political imperatives, makes this a good time to reach for more analytical and balanced visions, for a greater sense of the conditional nature of our various perspectives. It is time for the systematic and self-questioning stance that goes with theoretical explanations—whether we are explaining a historical event, an experimental or observational study, or an approach to teaching.

Bereite den Text so auf, dass sich der Leseaufwand in der nächsten Runde reduziert. Strukturiere ihn in „Argumenthappen“ und blende Nebenschauplätze aus

Übungen

1 Effizienzübung: Nimm dir ein beliebiges Buch und stelle eine Stoppuhr auf eine Stunde. In dieser Zeit musst du versuchen, die wesentlichen Inhalte des Buches zu erfassen. Suche das Global Picture, durch Überfliegen von Klapptext, Einleitung und Schluss. Betrachte das Inhaltsverzeichnis genau und verdeutliche dir den Aufbau des Buches. Nun blättere durch, betrachte Illustrationen, lies Überschriften sowie die ersten zwei Zeilen eines Absatzes und evtl. das jeweilige Fazit. Achte genau auf die Uhr, dass du mit der letzten Sekunde auch die letzte Seite des Buches betrachtest. Nun stellst du dir den Timer abermals auf 10 Minuten. Notiere nun alles, an was du dich erinnern kannst – entweder als Schlagwörter, in Notizform oder als Mindmap. Und, sind das mehr Informationen als du dachtest?

2 Übersetzen: Nimm eine beliebige Seite eines sehr philosophischen Textes (Kant, Hegel) oder eines schweren Wissenschaftstext und übersetze Satz für Satz in einfachstes Deutsch. Du wirst erstaunt sein, wie kurz die Worte sind und wie oft sich Aussagen in den langen Satzhülsen wiederholen.

3 Dechiffrieren: Nimm dir einen Fachtext zur Hand. Blättere ihn durch und schreibe neben jede Kapitelüberschrift die vermutete Funktion des entsprechenden Kapitels (Stichworte genügen). Nun nimmst du ein Kapitel heraus und recodierst jeden Satz, indem du seine Funktion bestimmst: Handelt es sich um eine Kontextualisierung des Themas, um eine Aussage, Argument, Definition, Fazit oder Beispiel?

4 Dechiffrieren II: Nimm nochmals einen beliebigen Text und markiere den jeweils zentralsten Satz eines Absatzes schön fett. Ergibt sich ein Muster?

5 Gegen Subvokalisation: Lies bewusst schneller als du sprechen kannst. Behalte dieses Vorgehen über einen längeren Zeitraum bei, auch wenn es ungewohnt und irritierend ist.

6 Blickspanne: Trainiere an Tageszeitungen den „weichen Blick“. Versuche die ganze Textspalte auf einmal zu erfassen und sieh durch die Zeitung hindurch. Führe den Blick im schnellen Tempo nach unten. Mach das mit einer ganzen Zeitung und beschränke die Zeit dafür auf 15 Minuten. Wie viele Informationen hast du aufgenommen? Von wie vielen Artikeln konntest du die Kernbotschaften erfassen? Wie verhält sich das zu deinem normalen Zeitungskonsum? Wie sind die jeweiligen Zeiteinsatz-Informationsgewinn-Verhältnisse?

Handlungsbedarf

Welche Regeln und Tricks willst du sofort umsetzen?



Nutze diese Karte, um das Gesagte noch einmal ins Gedächtnis zu rufen und um deine Verbesserungspotentiale zu bestimmen. Markiere mit Filzstiften oder Textmarkern deine Schwachstellen, trage weitere Ideen und Konkretisierungen aus deinem Arbeitsumfeld mit in diese Lesekarte ein und beginne sofort mit diesen (von dir festgelegten) Schritten:

.....

.....

.....

Schneller Lesen & Mehr Verstehen

Lies in Schichten. Neues Wissen und komplexe Informationen lassen sich besser aufnehmen, indem man die Flut von neuem in beherrschbare Informations-Happen aufteilt.

Verschafe dir Überblick. Prüfe den Hintergrund des Buches und des Autors. Worum geht es? Wie ist die Struktur des Textes?

Wirf deine Anker aus. Beginne den Text hierarchisch zu lesen: Starte bei mit Übersichten, Überschriften und Kernbotschaften, dann erst kommen Details.

Übersetze den Text. Da du nun mit dem „Großen und Ganzen“ vertraut bist kannst du ins Detail gehen. Versuche den Text mit deiner eigenen Sprache zu verstehen, schreibe notfalls die Sätze für dich um.

Trenne Inhalt & Struktur. Lies zwischen und hinter den Zeilen: Welche Intention hat der Schreiber mit jedem Ab(satz)? Welche Funktion hat der Paragraph? Brauchst du diese Funktion für dein Verständnis oder kannst du die Stelle übergehen?

Fass den Text zusammen. Der Text wird damit nochmals aktiv erarbeitet und auf einer Meta-Ebene komprimiert. Das stärkt Verständnis und Erinnerung. Zudem ist das der einzige Weg zu einer langfristigen, detailgenauen und sicheren Abrufbarkeit des Textes für mehrere Jahre.

Variiere die Verarbeitung. Denke, diskutiere, zeichne, tanze, singe die Kernaussagen deines Textes. Je vielfältiger du das Wissen knetest, umformst und anwendest, desto besser.

Selektiere. Hinterfrage genau, was du wann lesen „musst“. Oft reicht eine Vorspeise oder Kostprobe vom Text. Spar dir das schwere Hauptgericht.

Befreie den Blick! Lies nicht-linear und mit einer größeren Blickspanne. Vermeide Regressionen.

Markiere Schlüsselinformationen. Unterstütze das spätere Lesen, in dem du Unwichtiges wegstreichst, Kernbotschaften hervorhebst und dir selbst Anweisungen gibst, was mit einzelnen Textstellen noch zu tun ist.