|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Genre Move** | **Suggestions concerning content and structure** | **Suggestions concerning the tone and style** | **Suggestions concerning the use of language** | **Language examples and useful phrases** | **Possible Cognitive Discourse Functions and Operative Verbs of the Pluriliteracies Wheel:** |
| **Introduction:**  In this part the you introduce the topic and the guiding question.  You can also already put forward your answer to the guiding question as a theory. | You might analyse a quotation of a historical person or historian on a historical matter which you call into question  **and/ or**  you formulate a historical question which you will answer in the course of the argumentation.  **and/ or**  you put forward your own ideas about a historical matter | Make sure you formulate as neutral as possible and with scientific distance to the topic.  Your personal opinion can show but try to indicate that there may be different perspectives and views which you are willing to take into consideration.  Use an academic register and appropriate technical terms.  Nominalizations can help you to say more with less words. | Reported Speech:  With this you can express that you are referring to the viewpoint of somebody else and indicate your personal distance to it.  References:  By referring explicitely to a historical person or historian you can express personal distance to his/her point of view and compare views.  Passive Voice:  You can also use the passive voice in order to make your text sound more neutral.  Historical questions: .  You should use historical categories to formulate meaningful questions e.g. historical significance, legitimacy and efficiency, continuity and change, power and interest, etc.  Putting forward a theory:  A theory should be formulated as briefly as possible and in a straight forward manner as to indicate that you are convinced of its correctness. | Example:  “Robespierre puts forward that the terror was justified. If the other nations had intervened, the revolution would have been in danger. „  In the X’s opinion ....  According to Robesspierre …  Other historians think that ....  In contrast to/ Like X, I thinks that...  The French Revolution is often seen as ....  Examples:  „What was the historical significance of the terror during the French revolution?“  „Was the terror justified?“  Example:  “The French revolution was the date of founding of European democracy and the terror was a necessary evil to defend the French revolution. „ | **REPORT**   * present a historical question * summarize a historical situation * narrate a historical event * recount a historian’s view   **DESCRIBE**   * -relate cause and effect   **CLASSIFY**   * match or contrast past and present/ views/ power positions etc. * compare historian’s views/ historical protagonist’s views * subsume aspects to a historical concept * categorize a historical question/ analysis   **DEFINE**   * define a historical concept * identify elements of a historical concept   **EXPLAIN**   * explain a historical theory * deduce a historical question   **EXPLORE**   * hypothesize about the significance/ legitimacy/ efficiency etc. of a historical event * take other historian’s /historical protagonists perspectives |
| **Discussion**  In this part of your text you discuss the guiding question or topic by presenting, structuring and weighing the relevant arguments. | You can itemize the categories in a separate paragraph by listing criteria or indicators for them before you start the argumentation. With this you can provide transparency for your line of reasooning.  Examine the categories and criteria addressed in the guiding question  or in the theory  e.g. historical significance, legitimacy and efficiency, continuity and chance, power and interest etc. and use them to strukture your argumentation.  For the structuring of an argumentation there are different strategies:  linear:  You present all Arguments which speak in favour of the theory and then the counter-arguments  dialectic:  You present arguments in favour and against that can be related to eachother  Don’t forget to prove your arguments with references to the historical context. | It is important to relate the arguments with each other and also with the guiding question or topic.  Try not to write long passages in which you only recount histrical matter without relating it to the guiding question or topic. | Itemizing categories:  Historical categories are general principles, which state the relationship between historical concepts, which have to be defined with respect to the specific historical situation.  If you formulate Yes/No-questions you can use the criteria like a checklist.  Linking Arguments:  Use enummerations and phrases that link your arguments by indicating similarity or contrast.  Increasing density and complexity:  Nominalisations especially technical terms can help you to say more with less words. | Example:  “In the following the legitimacy of the terror during the French Revolution will be examined by looking at criteria that could have legitimized the terror:   * Criterion „Values“: Was the terror in accordance with the values of the French revolution? * Criterion „Success“:Was it legitimized by the successful rise of democracy in Europe? * Criterion „Legal norms“: Can the terror be regared as some kind of collective self-defense taking the other European nations reaction into consideration?"   The first argument in favour of the legitimacy is...  Second.., third ...Finally,...  Furthermore one could argue that ....  On the other hand one could come to the conclusion that ....  Against this argument another aspect has to be taken into consideration...  Example:  “A victory of the counter-revolution could have meant the reerrection of the old social order.“ **instead of:**  “If the enemies of the revolution had won, this would have meant that the they would have reerrected the old social order. | **REPORT**   * summarize a historical situation   **DESCRIBE**   * - relate cause and effect   **CLASSIFY**   * Itzemize categories into criteria * subsume arguments to criteria * match or contras arguments to crit * categorize a historical question or analysis * structure a discussion * compare arguments   **DEFINE**   * identify the link between arguments and criteria * identify perspectives of historical protagonists * define obervation levels (politics, economy ect.)   **EXPLAIN**   * explain historical protagonist’s predicaments * explain link between different observation levels (psychological, economic and political factors) * iexplain the link between argument, criterion and category * draw conclusions * explain conclusions   **EXPLORE**   * estimate/simulate contingeous development   **EVALUATE**   * argue in favour or against a historical theory * reflect historical perspectives * evaluate legitimacy /efficiency/ significance etc. of a historical event or process |
| **Assessment**  In this part you give an answer to the guiding question or a summary of the results of your discussion on the topic. | Make sure that you use the categories and criteria addressed in the guiding question or topic und use them to structure your assessment.  You should also be aware of the different time levels: What could the historical actors have known? | Summarize the morst important results of your discussion relating them to the catgories and criteria of the guiding question or topic. | Use of Tenses:  Change between Past Tense for refernce to the historical context and Present Tense for your own statements.  Increasing density and complexity:  Nominalisations especially technical terms can help you to say more with less words. | Finally one can say that,….  It is highly probable that…  For the historical protagonists the situation seemed…  Assessing the situation...we can conclude that …  In conclusion one can assume that the values of….at the time were different to … | **CLASSIFY**   * subsume arguments to criteria * match or contras arguments to criteria * compare arguments   **DEFINE**   * identify the link between arguments and criteria * identify perspectives of historical protagonists * define obervation levels (politics, economy ect.)   **EXPLAIN**   * explain historical protagonist’s predicaments * explain link between different observation levels (psychological, economic and political factors) * iexplain the link between argument, criterion and category * draw conclusions * explain conclusions   **EXPLORE**   * estimate/simulate/predict contingeous development   **EVALUATE**   * argue in favour or against a historical theory * reflect historical perspectives * evaluate legitimacy /efficiency/ significance etc. of a historical event or process |
| **Value Judgement**  In this final part you can express your own opinion on the matter based on current values and norms. | From today’s point of you you can judge taking further developments inro considerationm which the historica lprotagonistst were not aware of. Today’s norms and values might also cast a different light on the historical matter. | Make sure that you indicate the shift in time levels by using the accurate tenses. | Use of Tenses:  Change between Past Tense for refernce to the historical context and Present Tense for your own statements.  Expressing contingency:  If you want to express that a historical process would have developed differently under certain changed conditions. Use conditional sentences and Future in the Past.  . | From today’s point of view ...  Arguing on the basis of today’s norms and values....we have to judge...  Had the revolutionaries allowed to ....the French Revolution would have....  In hindsight the situation developed...because ...  Robespierre could have decided ... and then the situation would have turned out as... | **CLASSIFY**   * match or contrast past and present/ views/ power positions etc. * compare historian’s views/ historical protagonist’s views * subsume aspects to a historical concept   **EVALUATE**   * argue in favour or against a historical theory * reflecting historical contingency * reflect historical perspectives * evaluate legitimacy /efficiency/ significance etc. of a historical event or process |