



Text analysis grid for the evaluation of argumentative text products

Authors: Alexandra Budke, Diana Gebele, Pia Königs, Sarah Schwerdtfeger und Alexandra L. Zepter (2020)

The SpiGU project is a collaboration between the Institute of Geography Education and the Department of German Language and Literature II at the University of Cologne. The analysis of students’ argumentation aims to identify the typical challenges in content and language encountered in material-based argumentative writing. The following analysis grid was developed to systematically determine these challenges.

Code:							
1. Argumentative organization of the text through text procedures							
Argumentative text procedures (Information: patterns in supplementary sheet)	Pts.	Pts. for individual text procedure			Used text procedures (Wording that is used to execute the text procedure)		
The student uses a text procedure of positioning (<i>In my opinion...; According to my opinion; I am in favor ..., I am against</i>)	/0	no	0	0			
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.						
The student uses a text procedure of perspectivizing. (The verbal act of putting something into perspective)	/0	no	0	0			
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.						
The student uses a text procedure of conceding. (Granting, weighing up and invalidating counterclaim(s): <i>though ...; ...but; both ... and; however, ...; nevertheless ...</i>)	/0	no	0	0			
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.						
The student uses a text procedure of justifying. (Intermediate justification within the argumentation to be developed; can concern the own position, but also the position of another party: <i>...because; since; based on; due to ...</i>)	/0	no	0	0			
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.						
The student uses a text procedure of concluding. (<i>My conclusion is ...; I come to the conclusion that ...; consequently ...; as a result</i>)	/0	no	0	0			
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.		
+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.						



The student uses a text procedure of contrasting. <i>(in comparison to ...; this can be compared with ...; ... exactly like ...)</i>	/0	no	0	0	
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.
			+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.	
The student uses a text procedure of explicit text structuring <i>(... in the following ...; firstly ... secondly ...in the next paragraph ...)</i>	/0	no	0	0	
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.
			+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.	
The student uses a text procedure of inter-textual referencing <i>(Reference to intertextual sources through direct and indirect quotations)</i>	/0	no	0	0	
	/4	yes	1	0	All resp. up to 25 % of the text procedures are <u>not</u> used stringently concerning their semantic function.
				+1	26%- 50% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.
				+2	51%-75% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.
			+3	76%- 100% of the text procedures are used stringently concerning their semantic function.	
Further argumentative occurrences in the text product		Used text procedures (Wording that is used to execute the text procedure)			
In the context of the argumentation the student demonstrates a meaningful spatial reference.	0	no			
	1	yes			
In the context of the argumentation the student demonstrates a meaningful temporal reference.	0	no			
	1	yes			
2. Linguistic and structural organization of the text					
2.1 Length					
		Σ sentences			
2.2 Structure					
The student structures her/his text by using comprehensible paragraphs (i.e. introduction, main part, conclusion).	0	no			
	/2	yes	1	Text presents rudimentary paragraphs that show lack of comprehensibility.	
			2	Text is well-structured with comprehensible paragraphs.	
2.3 Lexis					
Used text procedures					
The student uses technical terms included in the material precisely, i.e. correctly concerning its semantic use.	/0	no	0	no use resp. percentage of precisely used terminology = 0%-50 %	
	/2	yes	1	percentage of precisely used terminology: 51 %-75%	
			2	percentage of precisely used terminology: 76 %-100%	
The student uses technical terms <u>not</u> included in the material precisely, i.e. correctly concerning its semantic use.	/0	no	0	no use resp. percentage of precisely used terminology = 0%-50 %	
	/2	/0	1	percentage of precisely used terminology: 51 %-75%	
			2	percentage of precisely used terminology: 76 %-100%	



2.4 Grammar						
The student writes a syntactically well-formed text.	/0	no	0	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 0% -50%		
	/3	yes	1	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 51% -75%		
			2	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 76% -99%		
			3	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 100 %		
The student uses conjunctions (complementizers) to establish cohesion and coherence.	/0	no	0	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 0% -50%		
	/3	yes	1	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 51% -75%		
			2	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 76% -99%		
			3	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 100 %		
The student uses textual references to establish cohesion and coherence.	/0	no	0	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 0% -50%		
	/3	yes	1	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 51% -75%		
			2	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 76% -99%		
			3	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 100 %		
The student writes a text with correct punctuation.	0	no	0	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures 0% -50%		
	/3	yes	1	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 51%-75%		
			2	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 76% -99%		
			3	percentage of correctly used grammatical structures: 100 %		
___ / 52 Subtotal [Linguistic part]						
3. Reference to material ¹			Used wording for presenting information			
3.1 Correctness in terms of content						
The student presents information of material M1 correctly.	0	no	not at all			
	1	yes	incorrect presentation	correct presentation		
The student presents information of material M2 correctly.	0	no	not at all			
	1	yes	incorrect presentation	correct presentation		
3.2 Use of information in terms of its linguistic presentation						
The student presents information from material M1 .	/0	0	no	Type of the linguistic presentation of information		
	/2	1	yes, implicitly (Information is presented without reference to the material .)	The information is presented with a text procedure of direct or indirect speech plus argumentative objective of the informing:	Neutral report	
					Qualifying	
					Discussing	
					Integrating (confirming)	
					Systematizing (comparing)	
				Taking position (criticizing)		
	2	yes, explicitly (Information is presented with reference to the material .)			Neutral report	
					Qualifying	
					Discussing	
					more	
The student presents information from material M2 .	/0	0	no	Type of linguistic presentation of information		
	/2	1	yes, implicitly (Information is presented without reference to material .)	The information is presented with a text procedure of direct or indirect speech plus argumentative objective of the informing:	Neutral report	
					Qualifying	
					Discussing	
					Integrating (confirming)	
					Systematizing (comparing)	
				Taking position (criticizing)		
	2	yes, explicitly (Information is presented with reference to material .)			Neutral report	
					Qualifying	
					Discussing	
					more	

¹ This category can vary in number of material. Increasing or decreasing the number of material is possible for category 3.1 and 3.2.



The student connects information from different material.	/0	no	0	The reference to the material is monotextual , i.e., the student only uses information from one resp. no material.	
				The reference to the material is polytextual , i.e., the student uses information from at least two different materials. However, the information from the different material is not connected/is not set in relation to one another (<i>dt.: Aggregation: Aggregation</i>)	
	/2	yes	1	The reference to the material is polytextual , i.e., the student uses information from at least two different materials . The text shows in parts a synthesis of the information .	
			2	The reference to the material is polytextual , i.e., the student uses information from at least two different materials . The text shows a complete synthesis of the information .	

___ /45 Subtotal [Use of material]

4. Quality of argumentation in terms of content

Σarguments			
The student describes the conflict correctly.	0	no	
	1	yes	
The student names the relevant persons involved.	0	no	
	/5	yes (One point per named person involved.)	
The student describes the position of the person involved correctly.	0	no, incorrect or not at all	
	/5	yes (One point per named position.)	
The student provides arguments against her/his own position.	0	no	
	1	yes	
The Student presents the conflict's spatial conditions correctly.	0	no	
	1	yes	

Annotation:

Internal structure of the presented arguments

Contentwise closed statement/presented aspect of the student² <i>(Has to be marked and numbered in the text)</i>	1	2	3
Analysis of completeness: <i>If not everything is present, the expression does not count as an argument.</i>	0 position 0 justification (warrant & data)	0 position 0 justification (warrant & data)	0 position 0 justification (warrant & data)
Relevance: Does the argument correspond to the problem question?	Completely (2 P.) Partially (1 P.) Not at all (0 P.) ___/2	Completely (2 P.) Partially (1 P.) Not at all (0 P.) ___/2	Completely (2 P.) Partially (1 P.) Not at all (0 P.) ___/2
Suitability of the warrant: Does the argument, evidence and opinion link logically/correctly?	No (0 P.) Yes (1P.) ___/1	No (0 P.) Yes (1P.) ___/1	No (0 P.) Yes (1P.) ___/1
Validity: Is the mentioned reference correct? <i>Yes: References correct, precise (factual) or with explicit norms (normative) (2 Points)</i> <i>In part: References partly correct, but imprecise or implicit norms are named (1 Point)</i> <i>No: References incorrect or no references to norms (0 Points)</i>	___/2	___/2	___/2
Complexity/Conditions: 1. The student integrates spatial conditions; says where the argument applies. (___/1) 2. The student integrates temporal conditions; says when the argument applies. (___/1) 3. The student names further conditions of the argument; e.g. for whom the argument applies. (___/1)	1. (___/1) 2. (___/1) 3. (___/1)	1. (___/1) 2. (___/1) 3. (___/1)	1. (___/1) 2. (___/1) 3. (___/1)
Total number of arguments: _____ Total points for each argument:	Argument 1 achieves ___/8 Points.	Argument 2 achieves ___/8 Points.	Argument 3 achieves ___/8 Points.

___ / 24 Subtotal [Quality of argumentation]

___ / 121 Total [Linguistic, material, quality]

² The analysis grid can be increased or decreased concerning the number of arguments.