Opinion Content Reliability Rubric

This rubric assesses the quality and trustworthiness of opinion-based content. The goal is not to evaluate the validity of the opinion itself, but to measure the logical soundness, intellectual honesty, and clarity with which the argument is presented.

I. Provenance & Perspective (Weight: High)

This category assesses the author and platform to understand the perspective from which the opinion is offered.

Criterion	5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Fair	2 - Poor	1 - Very Poor	0 - Unacceptable
Author's Expertise & Standing	Author is a recognized expert or thought leader on the subject, with a clear history of thoughtful, public engagement on the topic.	Author has relevant professional or academic credentials that provide a strong foundation for their opinion.	Author is an established journalist or commentator with a reputation for reasoned analysis, but not a specific subject matter expert.	Author's credentials are not directly relevant to the topic, or their public record is limited.	Author is anonymous, uses a pseudonym with no established reputation, or has clear, unmanaged conflicts of interest.	Author has a known history of bad-faith arguments, trolling, or promoting baseless claims.
Publisher's Stance & Reputation	Published by an outlet with a strong, publicly stated commitment to hosting a diversity of high-quality, reasoned opinions and clear labeling of opinion vs. news.	Published by a reputable outlet that clearly distinguishes opinion content and has a history of thoughtful commentary.	Published on a platform with a clear ideological leaning but maintains standards for logical argumentation (e.g., a reputable think tank, established political magazine).	Published on a platform known for highly partisan or one-sided commentary with little to no editorial oversight.	Published by a source known primarily for propaganda, outrage-bait, or conspiratorial thinking.	The source deliberately misrepresents itself as a neutral news source while exclusively publishing opinion.

| Transparency of Position | The author's worldview, potential biases, and purpose are explicitly and clearly stated. The line between fact and interpretation is rigorously maintained. | The author's general position is clear from the context and their affiliations. An effort is made to distinguish analysis from factual claims. | The author's position is not explicitly stated but is easily inferred. The distinction between fact and interpretation can become blurred. | The author's underlying biases significantly color the presentation of facts without acknowledgment. | The author presents their opinion as objective fact, without any supporting evidence or logical structure. | The author falsely claims objectivity while selectively using or misrepresenting evidence to support a hidden agenda. |

II. Argument & Rhetoric (Weight: High)

This category analyzes the internal logic, the use of evidence to support the opinion, and the rhetorical style.

Criterion	5 - Excellent	4 - Good	3 - Fair	2 - Poor	1 - Very Poor	0 - Unacceptable
Logical Coherence	The argument is well-reasoned, internally consistent, and free of logical fallacies. The conclusion follows logically from the premises.	The core argument is sound, but may contain 1-2 minor informal fallacies that do not undermine the central thesis.	The argument has a clear structure, but contains at least one significant logical fallacy that weakens its persuasiveness.	The argument relies on multiple significant logical fallacies (e.g., Straw Man, Ad Hominem, False Dichotomy).	The argument is fundamentally illogical, circular, or internally contradictory.	The content lacks a discernible argument and consists primarily of assertions, insults, or incoherent claims.
Support for Opinion	The opinion is thoroughly supported by high-quality evidence, sound reasoning,	The opinion is supported by a solid mix of evidence and logical reasoning. Factual	The opinion is supported more by anecdotes, personal reasoning, or secondary evidence	The opinion is supported by weak evidence (e.g., cherry-picked data, irrelevant	The opinion is presented with no supporting evidence or reasoning whatsoever. Factual	The opinion is supported by fabricated evidence, deliberate misinterpretations, or known

	and/or well-chosen examples. Factual claims are accurate.	claims are generally accurate.	than by primary factual evidence.	anecdotes) or relies heavily on appeals to emotion.	claims are demonstrably false.	disinformation.
Intellectual Honesty	Accurately and fairly represents alternative or opposing viewpoints, engaging with their strongest points before offering a rebuttal.	Acknowledges the existence of opposing views and addresses them, even if not in their strongest form.	Acknowledges other views but misrepresents them or dismisses them without substantive engagement (e.g., constructs a straw man).	Ignores or omits obvious counterarguments, creating a false impression of consensus or simplicity.	Presents a caricature of the opposing view designed to ridicule rather than engage.	Falsely claims that no legitimate opposing viewpoints exist.
Rhetorical Style	The tone is reasoned, persuasive, and respectful. It seeks to convince through logic and evidence.	The tone is firm and persuasive but avoids inflammatory or overly emotional language.	The tone is generally reasoned but contains instances of sarcasm, loaded language, or biased framing.	The language is frequently emotionally charged, judgmental, or manipulative, appealing more to prejudice than to reason.	The language is overwhelmingly inflammatory, ad hominem, and designed to provoke outrage rather than thought.	The language is dehumanizing, constitutes hate speech, or incites violence.