

Anglophone Literature and Culture: Grading Grid for Language and Editing Skills

Point deduction	0,0	0,3	0,7	1,0 up to revise / fail
Vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ very good vocabulary ✓ infrequent errors of usage of very difficult words; ✓ high academic standard ✓ text is readable and understandable throughout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ good, but lack of flexibility and variety (e.g., no use of synonyms, repeated use of the same words) ✓ several cases of wrong usage ✓ use of false friends (e.g., self-conscious instead of self-confident) ✓ academic standard sometimes affected by use of colloquialisms or non-standard vocabulary ✓ some misunderstandings and ambiguities due to wrong choice of words 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ satisfactory, but weak ✓ reduced range of words, low-level vocabulary ✓ frequent vocabulary mistakes ✓ substandard academic level ✓ text partly not understandable; vocabulary mistakes affect quality and readability of text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ vocabulary is weak (low-level, substandard, repetition of same words) ✓ frequent errors of usage ✓ substandard academic level ✓ mistakes affect understanding to the point of illegibility of text ✓ content no longer discernible
Grammar and syntax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ very good ✓ infrequent mistakes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ good, with some repeated errors ✓ use of past tense instead of present tense to refer to texts ✓ use of "<i>Germanisms</i>" such as "would" as the equivalent of "würde") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ numerous frequent and repeated mistakes (e.g., third-person singular "s" often missing) ✓ some confusion of forms ✓ some confusion of tenses ✓ faulty syntax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ frequent and repeated mistakes ✓ confusion of grammatical forms ✓ confusion of tenses ✓ syntax so faulty that text becomes unreadable
Spelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ very good ✓ very few, small typos ✓ consistent use of (British, Canadian, US-American) spelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ good ✓ occasional and repeated typos and misspellings (e.g. "lose" instead of "loose" or "lead" instead of "led") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ poor ✓ frequent and repeated typos and misspellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ very poor ✓ lack of knowledge of spelling in English
Punctuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ very good ✓ infrequent errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ good ✓ some repeated errors, e.g. comma before conjunction "that"; missing apostrophes in the genitive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ faulty, with frequent and repeated errors ✓ commas, apostrophes, full stops frequently and repeatedly missing or wrongly inserted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ completely amiss ✓ absolutely no knowledge of punctuation rules
Editing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ very good final editing, singular errors ✓ style sheet of seminar observed, with slight errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ generally good, but some sloppiness (e.g. spaces missing) ✓ style sheet of division observed, with repeated errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ poor and sloppy (name missing, errors not removed, plagiarism statement missing) ✓ style sheet of division not observed (frequent and repeated errors) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ possibly missing ✓ general sloppiness ✓ all formal requirements remain unobserved