

Written Argumentation

Rubric to Score the Quality of Argumentation Elements

Table 2

Effectiveness of Argumentation Elements

| Argumentation Elements | Effectiveness | Descriptions | Examples |
|------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Lead | Effective | The lead grabs the reader's attention and strongly points toward the position. | Prompt: "Should we admire heroes but not celebrities?" Lead: Too often in today's society people appreciate only the circumstances which immediately profit themselves and they follow the pack, never stopping to wonder, "Is this really the person who deserves my attention?" |
| | Adequate | The lead attempts to grab the reader's attention and points toward the position. | Prompt: "Can people ever be truly original?" Lead: Originality: being able to do something that few or none have done before. |
| | Ineffective | The lead may not grab the readers' attention and may not point to the position. | Prompt: "Can people ever be truly original?" Lead: Originality is hard to in this time and era. |
| Position | Effective | The position states a clear stance closely related to the topic. | Prompt: "Should learners choose online education?" Position: "Online education is a good choice for those who strive to learn something new." |
| | Adequate | The position addresses the topic but generally repeats the prompt's stance. | Prompt: "Does every individual have an obligation to think seriously about important matters, even when doing so may be difficult?" Position: "Every individual has an obligation to think seriously about important things, even when doing so may be difficult!" |
| | Ineffective | The position is not relevant to the topic, and/or it shows no clear stance. | Prompt: "Does every individual have an obligation to think seriously about important matters, even when doing so may be difficult?" Position: "The important matters that may disturb people in the short term, its all about people how do they think." |
| Claim | Effective | The claim is closely relevant to the position and backs up the position with specific points or perspectives. The claim is valid and acceptable. | Position: "I definitely agree with the statement that every individual has an obligation to think seriously about important matters." Claim: "The next reason why I agree that every individual has an obligation to think seriously about important matters is because this simple task can help each person get ahead in life and be successful." |
| | Adequate | The claim relates to the position but may simply repeat part of the position or state a claim without support. The claim is moderately valid and acceptable. | Position: "Every individual owes it to themselves to think seriously about important matters, no matter the difficulty". Claim: " It is important to think seriously about important matters although some people do not do this". |

Written Argumentation

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|---|---|
| | Ineffective | The claim is irrelevant to the position. It may also be weak and/or not acceptable. | Position: "Everyone have an obligation to think about seriously about important matters!" Claim: "I can not see the reason why would not. I feel like it is pretty much part of the human rights." |
| Counterclaim | Effective | The counterclaim is reasonable and relevant. It represents a valid objection to the position. | Position: "Being a twin has many benefits". Counterclaim: "The disadvantage of being a twin may be evident during the teenage years. Privacy and sexuality become more important, and rivalry for the attention of the opposite sex and from parents come into play." |
| | Adequate | The counterclaim is not quite a reasonable opposing opinion, or it is not closely relevant to the position. | Position: "In the United States of America, no one person has an obligation to live thier life in any certain way." Counterclaim: "Many may argue that obligating a person to make a decision one way or another would make the country better." |
| | Ineffective | The counterclaim is neither reasonable nor relevant. | Position: "People should have an obligation to think seriously." Counterclaim: "Some may argue that humor is what enlivens our life." |
| Rebuttal | Effective | The rebuttal directly answers and refutes the counterclaim. | Position: "Being a twin has many benefits". Counterclaim: "The disadvantage of being a twin may be evident during the teenage years. Privacy and sexuality become more important, and rivalry for the attention of the opposite sex and from parents come into play." Rebuttal: "However, the process of growing together is what makes the twins bond and understand each other at a level other relationship most often do not get to." |
| | Adequate | The rebuttal does not answer the counterclaim directly and it is not strong and/or valid. | Position: "People should have an obligation to think seriously." Counterclaim: "Yes, it can be difficult to sit down and think about these things and some could bring about many unpleasant feelings or emotions." Rebuttal: "However, in doing so you are able to more clearly see the big picture of what you are about to do." |
| | Ineffective | The rebuttal misses the target. It does not refute the counterclaim. | Position: "In the United States of America, no one person has an obligation to live their life in any certain way." Counterclaim + Rebuttal: "Many may argue that obligating a person to make a decision one way or another would make the country better, but those individuals are those who are intolerant of others opinions and lifestyles." |
| Evidence | Effective | The evidence is closely relevant to the claim they support and back up the claim objectively with concrete facts, examples, research, statistics, or studies. The reasons in the evidence support the claim and are sound and well substantiated. | Claim: "There are a number of instances, in either our everyday lives or special occurrences, in which one must confront an issue they do not want to face." Evidence: "For instance, the presidential debate is currently going on and in order to choose the right candidate, they must research all sides of both candidates. The voter must learn all about the morals and how each one plans to better America. This might disturb some people, given that some people may either feel too strongly about a certain candidate or that they may not feel strongly enough. However, by not researching and gaining all the possible knowledge that they can, they are hurting themselves by passing up a valuable opportunity to possibly better the country for themselves and the people surrounding them." |

Written Argumentation

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | Adequate | The evidence is not closely relevant to the claim it supports. The evidence contains some detailed examples but they may not be relevant to each other and only loosely bound together. The evidence uses some unsubstantiated or unsound claims or assumptions. | Claim: "Individuals do not have an obligation to others to think seriously about important matters." Evidence: "It is never fair for an individual to place their beliefs or state of mind onto someone else. An individual never knows where someone else might be in their life, and in result the individual cannot and should not force anything onto them." |
| | Ineffective | The evidence is irrelevant to the claim it backs up and provide few valid examples. The evidence uses unsubstantiated assumptions that sound quite unacceptable. | Claim: "I feel like it is pretty much part of the human rights." Evidence: "We cannot, not allow someone just to think, even if we know that doing is maybe difficult. Imagine that, what if somebody came up a brilliant idea in a really difficult case, but that person doesn't have enough power to make it happen, but another person has. So if he tells it to the other one, he can make it happen. This way they can help each other out, and that is how society can take a step ahead." |
| Concluding summary | Effective | The concluding summary effectively restates the claims using different wording. It may readdress the claims in light of the evidence provided. | Position: "I definitely agree with the statement that every individual has an obligation to think seriously about important matters." Claim One: "The first reason why I believe it is very important to think seriously is because decisions completely affect your life." Claim Two: "The next reason why I agree that every individual has an obligation to think seriously about important matters is because this simple task can help each person get ahead in life and be successful." Claim Three: "Finally, even though it may be difficult, thinking hard about important matters is actually important." Conclusion: "To sum up, thinking seriously is important in making decisions because each decision has an outcome that affects lives. It is also important because if you think seriously it can help you succeed. Finally, it is important because issues are relevant and people need to stay involved." |
| | Adequate | The concluding summary merely copies the claims or may restates only part of the claims. It may partially misrepresent the claims. | Position: "To me, individuals have an obligation to themselves to think seriously about important matters, even when doing so may be difficult." Conclusion: "To me, thinking about important matters, even when difficult, is a big part of that obligation." |
| | Ineffective | The concluding summary is irrelevant to the claims. The conclusion may also misrepresent the claims. | Position: "Every individual owes it to themselves to think seriously about important matters, no matter the difficulty." Conclusion: "'It is immoral to let a sucker keep his money' explains Edward Norton in the movie Rounders. While stealing i never looked upon with a smile, it is often not that bad when a thoughtless person gives away their money for nothing in return." |

Written Argumentation