
DEVELOPING A RUBRIC TO ASSESS ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING COMPETENCE IN LITERATURE AND ENGLISH FOR 10TH-GRADE STUDENTS USING THE TOULMIN MODEL

***Chi Nguyen Nguyen**

Vietnam.

Article Received: 18 May 2026, Article Revised: 6 June 2026, Published on: 26 June 2026

***Corresponding Author: Chi Nguyen Nguyen**

Vietnam.

Doi: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.1473>

ABSTRACT

Identifying the actual competence of students plays a very important role in teaching. This helps teachers accurately recognize each student's strengths and weaknesses, allowing them to use purposeful and effective teaching methods to support student learning. In Vietnam today, testing and assessing student learning in Literature and English happen quite frequently, but there are still gaps in practical quality. This shows that measuring and assessing student competence still has many gaps to fill. The purpose of argumentative writing is to understand the learners' thoughts, perspectives, feedback, and critical thinking. However, many criteria and rubrics for assessing writing products are quite rigid, and accepting the learners' personal perspectives has not received enough attention and lacks openness. This makes it difficult to measure learners' critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity. The current situation in Vietnam shows that testing and assessment have a huge impact on students' thinking and writing products. In other words, assessment is a guiding factor that controls learners' writing activities. Therefore, to create a new and open approach for assessing the argumentative writing of 10th-grade students in Vietnam, we propose developing an assessment Rubric based on the Toulmin model. With this approach, we hope that assessing students' argumentative writing competence will both meet the current 2018 General Education Curriculum in Vietnam and align with assessment practices in countries with advanced education. In these countries, measuring critical thinking and creative ideas are basic and necessary competencies that positively impact student learning.

KEYWORDS: Rubric, Toulmin, argumentative text, text creation, Literature, English, competence.

1. INTRODUCTION

Currently, student competence assessment in Vietnam has made significant advancements. First of all, evaluating learner competence aims to measure and quantify the results (in terms of qualities and competencies) that learners achieve after a period of study. Assessment is not intended to merely provide results or test pure memorization, but rather to foster the progress of learners (Ministry of Education and Training, 2018). There is a shift from assessing the reproduction of knowledge to evaluating learners' competencies and qualities, with the standard measure being defined as the expected learning outcomes specified in the Master General Education Program and the General Education Program for individual subjects.

Assessment is a crucial stage in the teaching and learning process, impacting both teachers and learners. Authentic and objective assessment results will help learners make continuous progress, as they will have the opportunity to recognize their shortcomings and negative factors affecting their learning outcomes; from there, they can propose solutions to overcome, adjust, and make better improvements (Huyen et al., 2022). With the current trend of learner competence assessment, teachers need to evaluate learners' ability to apply knowledge and perform specific learning tasks (Bao, 2014). Thus, the assessment stage provides feedback to teachers, helping them determine the actual competence achieved by students after a learning process. Based on these results, teachers will consider adjusting their teaching methods and the way they organize learning activities to suit the learners. Current publications on assessment in Vietnam are relatively diverse and comprehensive in both theoretical and practical aspects of teaching and learning, especially regarding the assessment of learners' qualities and competencies under the current 2018 General Education Program. In Literature, initial research on competence assessment appeared very early, specifically in 2014, even though testing and assessment reforms were not officially implemented in Vietnam until 2018. The research indicates that if teaching and learning aim to develop students' qualities and competencies, testing and assessment practices must also change concurrently (Bao, 2014). In English, assessing learner competence is also a major concern for teachers at all educational levels. The current state of student competence assessment in English has been surveyed on a large scale, and initial analyses have shown effectiveness across all four skills: reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Hanh et al., 2023). There are also studies highlighting the importance of learner competence assessment in integrated teaching, which

brings multiple values such as confirming students' learning outcomes, detecting deviations, and adjusting teaching activities (An et al., 2016). Although testing and assessment in Literature and English currently receive substantial attention from researchers and teachers, they have not yet realized their full potential and lack consistency. In particular, testing and assessing the competence to produce argumentative texts-a genre present in both subjects-remain highly fragmented and separate. Therefore, despite being at the same educational level and focusing on the same target production (argumentative texts), students must adapt to a different system of evaluation criteria in each subject. This confusion and overlap lead to doubts from learners regarding their text production competence, approaches, and the scientific validity and synchronization of current education.

Therefore, in this paper, we propose constructing an assessment rubric for the competence to produce argumentative texts in both subjects using the Toulmin model. We hope that this paper will provide an interdisciplinary approach to assessment in popular language subjects in Vietnam today. Through this, testing and assessment will gradually become standardized, scientific, and meet expectations, the most important of which remains the effective implementation of the goals of the current 2018 General Education Program in Vietnam.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

To carry out this paper, we consistently used a qualitative method by formulating scientific hypotheses. Based on the data survey using questionnaires, the responses serve as a reference for us to collect, analyze, and outline proposals to solve the problem posed by the paper.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Argumentative text production capacity and assessment requirements oriented toward learner capacity development

3.1.1. The concept of argumentative text production capacity

The ability to produce argumentative texts is assessed based on critical thinking, the ability to organize arguments logically, and the effectiveness of incorporating evidence into students' argumentative essays (Ananda et al., 2024). In addition, for an argumentative text to be evaluated as good, learners need to demonstrate elements such as capacity, knowledge, and creativity (Budjalemba & Listyani, 2020). Also according to Budjalemba and Listyani (2020), learners need to comply with the prescribed requirements for producing argumentative texts, which include ensuring layout, synthesis, citation, summarization, paying attention to grammar and spelling, and avoiding plagiarism. Furthermore, producing

argumentative texts is also an activity in which writers use language to express, clarify, prove, or persuade about a specific issue according to a certain structure to create a text (Dang et al., 2020). In short, argumentative text production capacity, or argumentative writing capacity, is a concept referring to the writer's ability to self-produce an essay discussing a specific topic. The produced argumentative essay needs to meet criteria such as layout and persuasiveness, alongside basic requirements like spelling and grammar.

3.1.2. Writing capacity assessment oriented toward capacity development

Assessing learners' writing skills is an important part of the learning process because it promotes the relationship between the learning process and the assessment of learning outcomes. Assessing writing skills helps identify students' weaknesses and strengths during the writing process (Huseynova, 2024). Measuring and assessing students' learning outcomes in writing classes is a compulsory activity in the English teaching process (Suastra & Menggo, 2020). Similarly, Setyowati and Sukmawan (2019) also agree that writing capacity assessment is indispensable in the English teaching process; this assessment helps teachers identify learners' strengths and weaknesses so that they can provide appropriate knowledge to enhance learners' writing skills. Teaching oriented toward capacity development requires instructors to focus on learners' learning activities so that students have the opportunity to comprehensively develop their potential, while combining the instructor's assessment of learners' learning outcomes and peer assessment among students (Ngoc, 2022). In general, assessing learners' writing skills is mandatory when teaching argumentative text production. Based on the requirements of the current 2018 General Education Program, the assessment of learners' learning outcomes is not only based on the instructor's evaluation but also needs to be conducted comprehensively and regularly through activities during the learning process, allowing students to self-assess their products as well as conduct peer assessment on each other's argumentative texts.

3.1.3. Characteristics of argumentative writing assessment in Literature and English

- Characteristics of argumentative writing assessment in Literature:

Writing is an essential skill in teaching any language, and Vietnamese is no exception to this importance. This is because proficient writing skills contribute to improving, enhancing, and developing other skills: reading, speaking, and listening. In Literature, producing argumentative texts accounts for the highest proportion, proving the importance of this genre in the curriculum. Assessing writing in Literature must, first of all, closely follow the characteristics of the argumentative genre, such as assessing argumentation skills, which includes evaluating arguments, reasoning, and evidence (Bao, 2017). Based on the orientation

of the General Education Curriculum for Literature, the approach to assessing writing in argumentative essays basically meets elements such as: Identifying the literary issue that needs argumentation; Aesthetic appreciation of the literary issue presented in the prompt; Organizing the text in accordance with the genre's characteristics; Arguing to persuade; Expressing to persuade; Creativity in ideas, emotions, and ways of expression (Bao, 2018). In terms of genre, to assess writing skills in argumentative essays, attention should be paid to points such as: arguments, reasoning, evidence, and rhetorical devices (Tram, 2021). Most generally, it can be stated that popular argumentative essay assessment in Vietnam includes content and form. In terms of form, learners need to meet components such as structure, volume, vocabulary, and syntax. In terms of content, each text type has distinct characteristics; for argumentative essays, common assessment requirements include: identifying the argumentative issue; developing the argumentative content into arguments, reasoning, and evidence; and creative thinking.

- Characteristics of argumentative writing assessment in English:

The culture of academic English writing requires linear and direct thinking. In international Cambridge English certificate exams, Cambridge Assessment English (2020) provides a set of criteria to assess students' text production competence based on a framework of 4 factors: Content, Communicative Achievement, Organisation, and Language. In addition, there is another assessment standard co-owned by the British Council, IDP IELTS, and Cambridge University Press & Assessment (2023), which is used to assess students' writing skills in the IELTS exam. This set of criteria consists of 4 factors: Task Achievement/ Task Response, Coherence & Cohesion, Lexical Resource, and Grammatical Range & Accuracy. Depending on the students' competence, the level of meeting these 4 factors varies. It can be seen that both of these criteria sets are designed specifically for international English certificate exams. In ENL countries, students' writing skills are assessed based on national educational standard systems. In the US, the writing skills of 10th-grade students are assessed based on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS, 2010), which include the following 4 main criteria: Text Types and Purposes, Production and Distribution of Writing, Research to Build and Present Knowledge, and Range of Writing. It can be seen that this set of criteria is designed specifically for students in the US, where English is the native language.

Currently, in Vietnam, the project "Making English a second language in schools in Vietnam" has been approved. Therefore, referencing the frameworks for assessing students' argumentative text production competence in ESL or EFL countries in the Asian region is necessary. In Hong Kong, English is used as a second language. Hong Kong students'

English argumentative text production competence is assessed based on the criteria of the HKDSE (Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education) exam issued by the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA, 2014). The criteria set for writing skills consists of 3 factors: Content, Language & Style, and Organization. It is noted that in Hong Kong, English is used as a second language, a point that is similar to the goal of the project “Making English a second language in schools in Vietnam”. Therefore, in section 3.3.4. Developing Assessment Rubrics in Literature and English below, the research team selected the English writing skill assessment criteria of the HKDSE exam to develop an argumentation assessment rubric based on the Toulmin model.

3.2. The Toulmin model and its applicability in evaluating argumentative essays

3.2.1. The Toulmin argument model

The Toulmin argument model is a theoretical framework used to analyze the structure and quality of arguments in practical communication contexts. This model was created to explain how people construct and defend viewpoints in social life through formal logical rules. According to this approach, the persuasiveness of an argument depends not only on the conclusion presented but also on the system of evidence, reasoning, and grounds used to defend that conclusion (Toulmin, 2003).

The Toulmin model consists of six basic components: claim, data/grounds, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal (Toulmin, 2003). These six components form an interconnected system, reflecting the process of forming, developing, and defending the writer’s viewpoint. Among them, the claim represents the conclusion or viewpoint that needs to be defended; the data/grounds provide the foundation for the claim; the warrant explains the connection between the evidence and the claim; the backing reinforces the validity of the warrant; the qualifier shows the degree of certainty of the statement; and the rebuttal demonstrates the ability to consider and address opposing viewpoints.

From the above six-component structure, it can be seen that the Toulmin model possesses several basic characteristics. First and foremost, the model approaches argumentation from the perspective of the communication context instead of relying solely on formal logical rules. Therefore, the analysis of an argument is not only directed toward the final conclusion but also depends on the communication context and the process of argument formation. Besides, the model places special emphasis on the relationship among claims, evidence, and reasoning, thereby clarifying the reasoning process from data to conclusion. This characteristic helps evaluators examine the quality of thinking expressed in the essay instead

of just assessing the final product. In addition, including rebuttals and qualifiers in the argumentative structure shows that the model aims not only at persuasiveness but also highly values the ability to view issues from multiple perspectives, contributing to reflecting the writer's critical thinking and objectivity (Toulmin, 2003).

The components of the Toulmin argument model and their significance for evaluating argumentative essays are presented in Table below.

Component	Function in argumentation	Significance for assessment
Claim	Stating the viewpoint or conclusion that needs to be defended	Assessing the ability to establish a stance and direct the argumentation
Data/Grounds	Providing grounds for the thesis statement	Assessing the ability to select and use appropriate evidence
Warrant	Explaining the connection between evidence and the thesis statement	Assessing the quality of reasoning and the logic of the argument
Backing	Reinforcing the validity of the backing	Assessing the reliability and depth of the argumentation system
Qualifier	Showing the degree of certainty of the argument	Assessing the ability to perceive issues flexibly and objectively
Rebuttal	Considering or responding to opposing viewpoints	Assessing the capacity for critical thinking and defending viewpoints

A notable feature of the Toulmin model is its ability to clarify the relationship among claims, evidence, and warrants in an argument. Instead of focusing solely on the conclusion, the model allows for an analysis of how learners use grounds and reasoning to defend that conclusion. As a result, evaluation does not just focus on the final product but also points toward the quality of the thinking process demonstrated in the writing.

By clarifying the relationship among claims, evidence, warrants, and rebuttals, the Toulmin model becomes a useful tool in research, teaching, and assessing argumentative competence. From an educational assessment perspective, the components of the model can be transformed into specific and observable evaluation criteria within students' written products. This is an important foundation for constructing rubrics to assess argumentative text creation competence, oriented toward the development of learners' capacity (Clark et al., 2007; Stapleton & Wu, 2015; Landrieu et al., 2022).

3.2.2. *Studies applying toulmin in assessment*

From a model built to analyze the structure of argumentation in practical life, Toulmin has gradually been widely applied in educational research, especially in the field of teaching and assessing argumentative competence. The development of related studies can be summarized

through three main approaches: analyzing argumentative structure, supporting the development of argumentative competence, and applying in assessment.

In the early stages, the Toulmin model was mainly used as a tool to analyze the structure of arguments. Studies focused on identifying the presence and relationships among components such as claims, evidence, warrants, and rebuttals in learners' language products. This approach contributed to clarifying the manifestations of argumentative competence, while creating a theoretical foundation for researching the quality of argumentation in speaking and writing activities (Toulmin, 2003).

From this approach, the Toulmin model continued to be applied in studies on teaching argumentation. Guiding students to identify and apply the components of an argument contributes to improving their ability to construct claims, use evidence, and defend points of view with appropriate reasoning. At the same time, this approach also supports the development of learners' critical thinking and debating competence (Simon et al., 2002).

Reality shows that alongside its role in supporting teaching, the Toulmin model is increasingly used in assessment activities. Instead of only using the model as an analytical tool, researchers began to view Toulmin's components as indicators to evaluate the quality of learners' argumentation. According to this approach, argumentative competence is examined through the ability to establish claims, select appropriate evidence, develop reasoning, use rebuttals, and defend viewpoints. Argument assessment needs to concern itself not only with the presence of the components but also with the quality and the relationship among those components. This approach allows for the evaluation of the thinking process expressed in the language product, while creating a basis for building assessment frameworks and rubrics for argumentative competence (Clark et al., 2007).

When evaluating argumentative essays, the quality of argumentation depends not only on the number of components appearing in the essay but also on the level of connection among claims, evidence, and warrants. This shows that the Toulmin model can be used as an effective tool to evaluate the depth and persuasiveness of argumentation in learners' written products (Stapleton & Wu, 2015). Besides, the evaluation of argumentative texts needs to be based on clear and consistent criteria in order to accurately reflect the writer's quality of argumentation (Landrieu et al., 2022).

In general, previous studies have all affirmed the value of the Toulmin model in analyzing, developing, and assessing argumentative competence. However, most of these studies were conducted in foreign educational contexts and focused on evaluating the quality of oral or written argumentation in general. Meanwhile, the transformation of the Toulmin model's

components into a system of assessment criteria and rubrics for argumentative writing in Literature and English subjects at Vietnamese high schools has not yet been systematically researched. This highlights the necessity of researching the feasibility of applying the Toulmin model to build tools for assessing argumentative text creation competence, meeting the requirements of innovating testing and assessment oriented toward capacity development in the 2018 General Education Program.

3.2.3. The feasibility of applying the Toulmin model to assessing argumentative writing

In the current context of educational reform, testing and assessment activities in Vietnamese high schools are shifting from a content-based approach to an approach focused on developing learners' qualities and competencies. The 2018 General Education Program defines assessment not only as a means to confirm learning outcomes but also as a tool to monitor, support, and promote students' competency development (Ministry of Education and Training, 2018). This orientation is further emphasized in Official Dispatch No. 3175/BGDĐT-GDTrH, which requires innovating the testing and assessment of Literature towards competency development, focusing on students' thinking, reasoning, and knowledge application abilities instead of merely assessing the level of content memorization (Ministry of Education and Training, 2022).

In Literature and English, argumentative writing is a text type that clearly demonstrates learners' thinking, communication, and reasoning competencies. The Literature curriculum requires students to know how to present perspectives, use arguments and evidence to clarify issues, and at the same time, know how to consider and respond to different opinions (Ministry of Education and Training, 2018a). Similarly, the English curriculum also sets requirements for students to express opinions, construct arguments, and use appropriate evidence in writing tasks (Ministry of Education and Training, 2018b). These requirements show that the quality of argumentation is an important component that needs to be considered in the process of assessing argumentative writing.

However, in teaching practice, the assessment of argumentative writing is often implemented through criteria regarding content, structure, and language expression. Manifestations of argumentative competency, such as establishing claims, using evidence, developing warrants, or rebutting opposing views, have not always been concretized into clear and consistent assessment criteria. This makes it difficult to identify the quality of students' argumentation as well as to provide feedback to support learners in developing their argumentative writing competency.

The Toulmin argumentation model provides a suitable reference framework to identify and assess the quality of argumentation. The six components of the model, including claim, data/grounds, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal, allow assessors to examine not only the content but also the structure and the process of argument formation in writing (Toulmin, 2003). As a result, the assessment can better reflect how students use reasoning and evidence to defend their perspectives.

The feasibility of the Toulmin model has been recognized in several studies on teaching and assessing argumentation. Guiding students to identify and use components of argumentation contributes to improving the quality of debate and developing argumentative competency (Simon et al., 2002). In research on English argumentative writing, applying the Toulmin model in the guidance and assessment process helps learners improve their argumentative structure as well as enhance the overall quality of argumentative essays (Heidari, 2019). These results indicate that the components of the Toulmin model can be transformed into specific assessment criteria, contributing to clarifying the manifestations of argumentative competency in written products.

The above analyses show that the Toulmin model has a clear theoretical foundation, has been applied in educational research and practice, and has a high degree of compatibility with the requirements for assessing argumentative writing competency in the 2018 General Education Program. Therefore, applying this model to build tools for assessing argumentative writing competency in Literature and English is feasible. This is also the basis for the study to propose an assessment rubric for argumentative writing competency using the Toulmin model in the next section.

3.3. Proposing a toolkit to assess argumentative text construction competence using the Toulmin model

3.3.1. Principles for toolkit construction

The toolkit is constructed based on five principles:

First, ensuring the core nature of Toulmin's argument. The criteria need to reflect the six basic components of the Toulmin model, including claim, data/evidence, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal. However, the assessment does not stop at identifying the appearance of each component but needs to consider their quality and the degree of logical connection within the entire argument. Among these, the warrant plays a central role as it demonstrates the ability to explain why the evidence can support the writer's claim (Toulmin, 2003; Stapleton & Wu, 2015).

Second, aligning with the curriculum and subject specificities. The toolkit needs to closely follow the requirements for developing writing and argumentative competence in the 2018 General Education Curriculum, while also being appropriately adjusted to the characteristics of each subject. In Literature (Literature), the rubric focuses on assessing the ability to establish viewpoints, select and analyze evidence, apply knowledge, organize arguments, and use the Vietnamese language. In English, in addition to the quality of argumentation, the toolkit also assesses the level of meeting communicative tasks, the ability to use vocabulary, grammar, and cohesive devices to express viewpoints clearly and coherently (Ministry of Education and Training, 2018a, 2018b, 2022).

Third, aiming for learner progress. The rubric is not only a tool for grading the final product but also functions to orient and support the writing process. Through the criteria and level descriptors, students can understand the quality standards, recognize what has been achieved, detect gaps in their argumentation, and identify content that needs adjustment. Therefore, the rubric needs to be introduced before writing and used in combination with sample essays, self-assessment, peer assessment, feedback, and draft revision (Sadler, 1989; English et al., 2022; Panadero et al., 2023).

Fourth, ensuring clarity and observability. Each criterion needs to reflect a relatively independent dimension of writing competence, thereby limiting overlap or duplication during the assessment process. The levels must be described with specific expressions that can be identified in the product, such as the clarity of the claim, the appropriateness of the evidence, or the ability to explain the connection between the evidence and the conclusion. This method of description helps reduce subjective comments while enhancing transparency and consistency among graders (Brookhart, 2018).

Fifth, ensuring openness. The rubric does not impose a single viewpoint, a single system of evidence, or a unique way of developing the essay. Students have the right to express their own understanding, choose their stance, and organize their own arguments, provided that the viewpoint is relevant to the issue, supported by valid evidence, and logically reasoned. This principle facilitates the assessment of learners' independent thinking and creativity, while ensuring that the quality of the essay is considered based on the persuasiveness of the argument, rather than on the alignment with the grader's viewpoint.

3.3.2. Assessment Rubrics in Literature and English

In the assessment rubric for argumentative writing in English based on the Toulmin model below, the research team selected the English writing skill assessment criteria from the HKDSE exam to develop the rubric for evaluating argumentation based on the Toulmin

model. This set of assessment criteria consists of 3 main criteria: Content, Language & Style, and Organization. Among these 3 criteria, the Content criterion will be evaluated based on the Toulmin model.

The Toulmin model is composed of 6 elements: Claim, Grounds, Warrant, Backing, Qualifier, and Rebuttal. The Toulmin model was first introduced by the author Toulmin (1958) in his book *The Uses of Argument*.

In this article, we consistently develop a rubric describing how instructors rely on the Toulmin model to evaluate the Content criterion in learners' argumentative writing in both English and Literature.

Criteria / Levels		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Content (60%)	Claim (10%)	No clear thesis statement, or the thesis is completely off-topic from the prompt.	A thesis statement is presented but is vague, unfocused, or only touches the surface of the issue.	The thesis statement is generally appropriate but is occasionally generic and lacks sharpness.	The thesis statement is clear and detailed in most points, well-meets the prompt requirements, and engages the reader's interest.	Clear, focused, fully comprehensive, demonstrating deep awareness and capturing the reader's attention.
	Data (10%)	No evidence is provided, or the evidence is completely irrelevant to the thesis statement.	A few familiar examples are presented but do not truly align with the thesis statement.	Relevant evidence is provided but is not particularly distinctive or is occasionally lacking in specificity.	The evidence is appropriate, fairly detailed, and fully present in most sub-arguments.	The evidence is rich, diverse, accurately cited, and perfectly suited to strongly support the thesis statement.
	Warrant (10%)	No explanatory reasoning is provided; the argument is fragmented.	Reasoning is weak, mostly based on subjective speculation, or merely lists points without connecting	Explanations of the connection are provided, but the reasoning is occasionally forced	Reasoning well-connects the data and the thesis statement, maintaining logic and persuasiveness	Providing sharp and creative reasoning; excellently and evidently connecting the logical flow

		d and completely illogical.	them to the evidence.	and does not deeply capture the nature of the issue.	throughout the essay.	between the evidence and the thesis statement.
	Backing (10%)	Completely lacks backing elements.	Very little or almost no backing to defend the reasoning.	Backing elements are present but remain at a basic level, not yet strongly supporting the reasoning.	Appropriate backing is provided, reinforcing the reasoning well.	Extremely solid backing, maximizing the absolute persuasiveness of the reasoning.
	Qualifier (10%)	Do not use any qualifiers.	Rarely use qualifiers; arguments are often one-sided and overgeneralized.	Begin to consciously use qualifiers, but they are occasionally formulaic or not entirely accurate.	Use appropriate qualifiers in most cases, preventing the arguments from becoming overgeneralized.	Use qualifiers (modal verbs, adverbs of certainty) flexibly, showing a nuanced awareness of the scope and limitations of the argument.
	Rebuttal (10%)	No counter-argument elements are present, completely ignoring multi-dimensional perspectives.	Only mention opposing viewpoints without successfully refuting them.	Opposing viewpoints are mentioned, but the rebuttal is still simple and not fully thorough.	Identify and respond to opposing viewpoints in a fairly effective and logical manner.	Anticipate and refute opposing viewpoints in a comprehensive, sharp, and highly persuasive manner.
Language & Style (20%)		- Sentence structure: Writing fragmented or disconnected	- Sentence structure: Developing mainly simple sentences.	- Sentence structure: Writing simple sentences well and	- Sentence structure: Using different sentence structures	- Sentence structure: Flexibly and accurately applying a

		ed sentences. - Vocabulary: Vocabulary is extremely limited and impoverished. - Grammar: Making serious grammatical errors that cause difficulties for the reader to understand. - Style: The writing style is completely inappropriate for the argumentative essay genre.	- Vocabulary: Vocabulary is limited with frequent repetition and spelling errors. - Grammar: Making many basic grammatical errors, but some main ideas can still be understood. - Style: The style lacks formality, overusing personal pronouns and everyday conversational language.	beginning to apply some basic complex sentences. - Vocabulary: Correctly using common vocabulary within the curriculum. - Grammar: Mastering basic grammar and punctuation, though errors are still present. - Style: Beginning to consciously use an objective tone, although conversational style and personal emotions are still mixed in.	well. - Vocabulary: Having a relatively wide range of vocabulary and correctly spelling most words. - Grammar: Grammar and punctuation are accurate enough, with minor errors that do not affect the general meaning. - Style: Tone and style are largely appropriate for argumentative writing.	variety of sentence structures (simple, compound, complex sentences). - Vocabulary: Vocabulary is rich, effectively using advanced academic vocabulary. - Grammar: Grammar and punctuation are highly accurate, expressing nuanced meanings. - Style: Excellently maintaining an objective tone and a formal writing style that perfectly matches argumentative standards.
Organization (20%)		- Organization: The essay lacks organization, written as a single block of text.	- Organization: Recognizing the essay structure (Introduction - Body - Conclusion)	- Organization: The Introduction - Body - Conclusion structure can be recognized	- Organization: The essay structure has a complete Introduction - Body - Conclusion; the essay	- Organization: The essay structure is extremely tight (Introduction - Body -

		- Paragraphing: No paragraphing. - Cohesion: Not using any transition words or seriously misusing transition words, failing to create cohesion.	only at a sketchy and disorganized level. - Paragraphing: Paragraphs are divided but lack logic, being based on the train of thought while writing rather than the logical analysis of the issue. - Cohesion: Sentences and paragraphs are connected to each other using very basic transition words, making the essay disconnected.	, and the essay displays coherence in some core sections. - Paragraphing: Paragraphs are divided, but the arrangement of ideas within paragraphs is occasionally irrational. - Cohesion: Transition words are used but in a mechanical and repetitive manner.	structure is coherent in most paragraphs. - Paragraphing: Paragraph division is effective, helping to maintain the overall flow of thought. - Cohesion: Using cohesive devices (transition words) between sentences and paragraphs quite successfully.	Conclusion) - Paragraphing: Excellent paragraphing skills (each paragraph clearly conveys one idea). - Cohesion: Cohesion between sentences and paragraphs occurs smoothly through a diverse system of transition words.
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

3.4. The significance of applying the Toulmin model in assessing argumentative writing

The application of Toulmin's argument model in developing evaluation rubrics for argumentative texts in Literature and English brings a dual significance to both assessment and teaching and learning methods. In terms of measurement, Toulmin's structure provides an objective and standardized system of criteria, helping teachers and students accurately outline and visualize the requirements of argumentative text production. Regarding capacity development, this model transforms the assessment tool into an effective "rudder" to guide writing organization skills and creative capacity for learners. Through the rubric, students can actively identify logical gaps in their own writing, thereby improving their ability to produce

texts consistently and systematically according to universal academic standards, specifically the intersection at the international level.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The research has specified the application of the Toulmin model to build a standardized rubric system, providing an objective and consistent measurement tool for the cross-disciplinary argumentative text production capacity in Literature and English of 10th-grade students. Moving beyond a mere testing tool, this set of rubrics acts as a critical thinking mind map, helping learners shape the organizational structure of their essays according to international standards. This is a creative step, opening up a new approach to innovating assessment oriented toward developing comprehensive qualities and capacities for students in the context of modern education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We hope that the application of the Toulmin model to build rubric systems will be evaluated in other languages around the world. Through this, the academic intersection will increasingly expand. The boundaries of knowledge will truly be shortened, and learners will have a clear framework in producing argumentative texts.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND INFORMATION NOTE

We are deeply grateful to the editorial board of this prestigious journal for giving us the opportunity to publish our work.

6. REFERENCES

1. Toulmin, S. E. (2003). The uses of argument (Updated ed.). *Cambridge University Press*. (Original work published 1958).
2. Simon, S., Erduran, S., & Osborne, J. (n.d.). Enhancing argumentation in school science. *King's College London*.
3. Clark, D. B., Sampson, V., Weinberger, A., & Erkens, G. (2007). Analytic frameworks for assessing dialogic argumentation in online learning environments. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(3), 343-374.
4. Simon, S., Erduran, S., & Osborne, J. (2002, April 7–10). Enhancing the quality of argumentation in school science [Conference paper]. Annual Meeting of the National

- Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST), New Orleans, LA, United States.
5. Ministry of Education and Training. (2018). General education curriculum: Master curriculum (Issued with Circular No. 32/2018/TT-BGDĐT dated December 26, 2018). *Ministry of Education and Training*.
 6. Ministry of Education and Training. (2018). General education curriculum for Literature (Issued with Circular No. 32/2018/TT-BGDĐT dated December 26, 2018). *Ministry of Education and Training*.
 7. Bui, M. D., Tran, T. H. P., & Duong, T. M. H. (2025). Application of the Delphi method in building a competence framework for writing literary argumentative texts for gifted Literature students in Vietnamese high schools. *Journal of Education*, 25(18), 36-41.
 8. Heidari, F. (2019). The effect of dynamic assessment of Toulmin model through teacher- and collective-scaffolding on argument structure and argumentative writing achievement of Iranian EFL learners. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 11(2), 115-140.
 9. Ministry of Education and Training. (2018a). General education curriculum for Literature (Issued with Circular No. 32/2018/TT-BGDĐT dated December 26, 2018).
 10. Ministry of Education and Training. (2018b). General education curriculum for English (Issued with Circular No. 32/2018/TT-BGDĐT dated December 26, 2018).
 11. Ministry of Education and Training. (2022). Official Dispatch No. 3175/BGDĐT-GDTrH dated July 21, 2022 on guiding the innovation of teaching methods, testing, and assessment for Literature in general schools.
 12. Brookhart, S. M. (2018). Appropriate criteria: Key to effective rubrics. *Frontiers in Education*, 3, Article 22. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2018.00022>
 13. English, N., Robertson, P., Gillis, S., & Graham, L. (2022). Rubrics and formative assessment in K–12 education: A scoping review of literature. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 113, Article 101964. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101964>
 14. Landrieu, Y., De Smedt, F., Van Keer, H., & De Wever, B. (2022). Assessing the quality of argumentative texts: Examining the general agreement between different rating procedures and exploring inferences of (dis)agreement cases. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, Article 784261. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.784261>
 15. Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., Pinedo, L., & Fernández-Castilla, B. (2023). Effects of rubrics on academic performance, self-regulated learning, and self-efficacy: A meta-analytic review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35, Article 113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09823-4>

16. Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
17. Stapleton, P., & Wu, Y. A. (2015). Assessing the quality of arguments in students' persuasive writing: A case study analyzing the relationship between surface structure and substance. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 17, 12-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2014.11.006>
18. Toulmin, S. E. (2003). The uses of argument (Updated ed.). *Cambridge University Press*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511840005>
19. Uludag, P., & McDonough, K. (2022). Validating a rubric for assessing integrated writing in an EAP context. *Assessing Writing*, 52, Article 100609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100609>
20. Ananda, C. R., Mardiah, R., & Fajaryani, N. (2024). Writing argumentative essays: Jambi EFL students' challenges and strategies. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 339-357.
21. Budjalemba, A. S., & Listyani. (2020). Factors contributing to students difficulties in academic writing class: Students perceptions. *UC Journal: ELT, Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 1(2), 135-149.
22. Cambridge Assessment English. (2020, August). Assessing writing for Cambridge English Qualifications: A guide for teachers. *Cambridge English*.
23. Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010, June 2). Common Core State Standards for English Language arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. learning.ccsso.org.
24. Dang, T. H., Chau, T. H., & Trai, T. Q. (2020). A study on the difficulties in writing argumentative essays of English-majored sophomores at Tay Do University, Vietnam. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1).
25. Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority. (2014, November 25). Hong Kong diploma of secondary education examination English language level descriptors writing descriptors.
26. Huseynova, F. (2024). Evaluation of students' writing skills in higher education. *Universidad y Sociedad*, 16(1), 145-154.
27. Nguyen, T. M. N. (2022). Competence-oriented teaching to meet the requirements of the 2018 general education curriculum. *Hanoi National University of Education Journal of Science: Social Sciences and Education*, (66), 114-120.

28. Setyowati, L., & Sukmawan, S. (2019). Authentic materials for teaching writing: A critical look. *International Journal of Language Education*, 3(2), 68-77.
29. Suastra, I. M., & Menggo, S. (2020). Empowering students' writing skill through performance assessment. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(3), 432-441.
30. Prime Minister. (2025, October 27). Decision approving the project "Making English the second language in schools for the 2025 - 2035 period, with a vision to 2045".
31. Toulmin, S. (2003). The uses of argument. *Cambridge University Press*.
32. IELTS. (2023, May). Writing band descriptors.
33. Huyen, D. T. T., & et al. (2022). Guidelines for testing and assessing the competence of high school students in teaching Literature (According to the 2018 general education curriculum). *University of Education Publishing House*.
34. Bao, N. T. N. (2014). An initial study on the concept of "competence-based assessment" and proposals for some forms of assessing the Literature competence of students. *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science*, (56), 157-165.
35. Hanh, V. H., & et al. (2023). Current status of managing the testing and assessment of English teaching results in lower secondary schools towards developing student competence. *Vietnam Journal of Educational Sciences*, 19(S3), 68-72.
36. An, D. T. T., & Ninh, T. T. (2016). Testing and assessment in competence-oriented integrated teaching at high schools. *Journal of Science and Education*, Hue University of Education, 02(38), 16-24.
37. Bao, N. T. N. (2017). Rubric for assessing argumentation skills through argumentative essays. *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science*, 14(4b), 149-158.
38. Bao, N. T. N. (2018). Rubric for assessing the competence of high school students in producing literary argumentative texts. *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science*, 15(10), 54-64.
39. Tram, N. N. M. (2021). Describing and building the structure of writing competence for argumentative texts among high school students oriented towards the 2018 Literature Curriculum. *Ho Chi Minh City University of Education Journal of Science*, 18(8), 1457-1469.