



Dialexicon Journal Rubric

1. Strength of Argument

90 - 100%	80 - 90%	70 - 80%	60 - 70%	50 - 60%
<p>The paper exemplifies a masterful command of logical argumentation, backed with relevant analysis and examples, such as effective use of thought experiments.</p> <p>Use of logic is impeccable and generally accurate, with little to no forms of fallacious reasoning</p> <p>Responds directly to the prompt, showing masterful understanding of the context in current events and philosophy</p> <p>Anticipates and rebuts counterarguments</p>	<p>The paper uses strong logical argumentation backed with persuasive examples and considerable analysis.</p> <p>Use of logic is mostly accurate, with some fallacious reasoning</p> <p>Responds to the prompt, showing an excellent understanding of the context in current events and philosophy</p> <p>Excellent anticipation and rebuttal of counterarguments</p>	<p>The paper uses adequate logical argumentation, supported by some analysis and examples</p> <p>Uses logic to some degree, but with several lines of fallacious reasoning</p> <p>Responds to the prompt, shows some understanding of the context in current events and philosophy</p> <p>Some anticipation and rebuttal of counterarguments</p>	<p>The paper attempts to make an argument, supported by weak examples and minimal analysis</p> <p>Uses logic to a minimal degree, and contains many forms of fallacious reasoning</p> <p>Responds to the prompt, but shows little understanding of the context in current events and philosophy</p> <p>Attempted to, with little effect, anticipate and rebut counterarguments</p>	<p>The paper lacks a coherent argument, or if there is one, the argument is unclear and frequently faulty</p> <p>Little to no attempt to use logical reasoning; fallacies widely prevalent throughout</p> <p>Does not respond to the prompt, often deviates from the context in current events and philosophy</p> <p>No mention of counterarguments</p>

2. Clarity and Organization

90 - 100%	80 - 90%	70 - 80%	60 - 70%	50 - 60%
<p>The paper is clear and concise with almost no repetition, and follows a well-organized structure that flows persuasively</p> <p>Masterful introduction, thesis is clearly stated and consistently supported throughout the paper</p> <p>Excellent mastery of rhetorical strategies (tone, diction, structure)</p> <p>Close to perfect grammar and spelling</p>	<p>The paper is clear and concise with some repetition, and follows a well-organized structure</p> <p>Excellent introduction with a clear thesis statement supported throughout the paper</p> <p>Frequent use of rhetorical strategies</p> <p>Minor grammar and spelling errors</p>	<p>The paper is adequately clear, but is quite repetitive in areas, and follows somewhat of a structure</p> <p>Adequate introduction with a slightly unclear thesis statement which is sometimes supported throughout the paper</p> <p>Uses some rhetorical strategies, with some success</p> <p>Some grammar and spelling errors</p>	<p>The paper attempts a structure, with little effect, is frequently repetitive, and does not flow clearly</p> <p>Introduction is weak and does not contribute much to the essay with an unclear thesis statement which is rarely supported throughout the paper</p> <p>Attempts to use rhetorical strategies, with little success</p> <p>Many grammar and spelling errors</p>	<p>The paper is hard to follow; it may be very repetitive, rambles, and/or lacks a coherent structure</p> <p>Lacks a relevant introduction and thesis statement; almost entirely unclear what the paper is arguing for</p> <p>No attempts at using rhetorical strategies</p> <p>The essay is riddled with grammar and spelling errors, making it largely unreadable</p>

3. Originality

90 - 100%	80 - 90%	70 - 80%	60 - 70%	50 - 60%
<p>The paper adopts a unique and creative approach to the prompt, one which does not frequently appear in prior literature</p>	<p>The paper mostly takes a creative approach to the prompt, with some rehashing of previous thought</p>	<p>The paper is creative in some areas, but frequently unoriginal throughout</p>	<p>The paper shows attempts at creativity, with little success, but is largely generic and repetitive</p>	<p>The paper almost entirely repeats existing literature in the field, with no additional or unique insight</p>

Note: “Originality” does not have to mean a ground-breaking idea in philosophy, but a creative or unconventional approach to the given prompt. For example, you could approach a current event with a unique philosophical lens or focus on a stakeholder that popular literature has ignored, and so forth.

***Dialexicon* is proudly sponsored by:**



The Philosophy
Foundation
THINKING CHANGES

