**DIALECTICAL JOURNAL**

Take your annotation to a higher level of analysis!



|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ENTRY #** | **Section or Page #** | **IMPORTANT QUOTES**  **FROM TEXT**  *Quotes from text can be from*  *stage directions, narration, or dialogue* | **WHY IS IT IMPORTANT? (OIC’s!)**   1. **Observations: Literary devices, rhetorical elements, etc.** 2. **Insights: explain, analyze, claim, support w/evidence** 3. **Critical Questions (How… /Why…?)** (*may or may not be answerable, but shows high – level thinking)* |
|  |  |  |  |

***REQUIREMENTS for OIC’s (“Oh - I see!”)***

* **OBSERVATIONS** (list or 1 sentence): literary / rhetorical elements and brief explanation of how it displays the elements; connects to the assigned focus or foci (ex. main idea, author’s purpose, tone, conflicts, characterization, connotation, persuasion, theme, etc.);
* **INSIGHTS** (5-7 sentences): Conclusions SUPPORTED BY TEXT about characters / action in the story, or topic; understandings about motivation, cause/effect, significance to plot/topic; connections to self (experience), other text (literature, non-fiction) or world (current events, geography);
* **CRITICAL QUESTIONS** (1): (Why..? How…?) Level-2 or -3 questions related to the topic/text; avoid yes/no or short-answer questions – they must relate to the quote and prompt thoughtful responses!

FEEDBACK CODES FOR DJs:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PINK | YELLOW | GREEN/BLUE |
| Needs detail or analysis – revise. | Caution – off-track or needs some revision. | Way to go! Right on track! |

**Dialectical Journal Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Critical Reader**  **5** | **Connected Reader**  **4** | **Thoughtful Reader**  **3** | **Literal Reader**  **2** | **Developing Reader**  **1** |  |
| ***POINTS:*** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Quotations &**  **Critical**  **Thinking**  **(overview)** | Detailed, meaningful;  uses academic language to explain the quotation in terms of a universal significance, as  aspect of self or life | Less detailed,  but still meaningful.  Explains the quotation in  the text and shows some  ability to make meaning  from what you read. | Few good details.  Trouble including ideas about the quotation in  context | Poor, if any details.  Rarely includes ideas  about the quotation in the written response. | Includes few ideas  other than summary or superficial  interpretation. |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Literary / Rhetorical**  **Elements &**  **Style**  **(Observations)** | Identifies several rhetorical/style elements, connects them to the insights in an academically insightful, interesting way | Identifies some rhetorical / style elements and analyzes them in some depth in the insights | Lists required elements, but incudes little discussion of their meaning in the text | Few elements,  almost no discussion  of meaning.  Disregards author’s  style as means to  further meaning. | Regards author’s style as impediment to further  understanding. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Interpretation**  **(Insights)** | Uses academic language to discuss ideas in depth; avoids clichés; analyzes the “so what?”, “why?” and “how?” of the text;  Makes high-level connections to self, text, and world;  considers different  possible interpretations or perspectives from the selection. | Uses academic language to discuss ideas in some depth; analyzes the “so what?”, “why?” and “how?” of the text;  Makes some connections to self, text, or world; | Uses vague language to discuss ideas in some depth; lacks analysis of the “so what?”, “why?” and “how?” of the text;  Makes few connections to self, text, or world;  Simple, superficial  interpretation of the text. | Unable to understand  meaning of story;  summarizes, and doesn’t reach  obvious connections  to the text | Makes few/no  connections, no  development |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| **Questions and**  **Connections**  **(CQs)** | Uses academic language to produce Insightful, text-text, text-self, text-world connections,  thought- provoking Level-2 or -3 question that prompts high-level response; | Uses academic language to produce personal connections, thought- provoking Level 2 or 3 question that prompts academic response; | Few to some general connections,  Level 1 or low-level 2 (obvious to simple) question about the text. | Obvious question, few to no connections.  Sometimes confused  by unclear or difficult sections of the text. | No attempt to question or make connections |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Coverage of**  **Text:**  **Analysis** | Covers text thoroughly.  Uses academic language to “read” between the  lines” to carry on an on-  going dialogue with the  text: question, agree,  disagree, appreciate, object | Covers important parts;  Constructs a thoughtful,  believable interpretation of the text.  Explain why you  agree or disagree with text  by providing support. | Covers most parts, but  omits details necessary to  make connections to your  own past experiences,  feelings, or knowledge. | Minimal coverage.  You accept the text  literally without  thinking of different  possibilities in  meaning. | Little if any coverage.  Text is confusing, and little effort is shown in trying to figure it out. |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |
| **Presentation** | Neat, organized, looks  professional; clearly legible and marked; follows or goes beyond the scope of the assignment | Neat and readable;  Follows most directions of the assignment; | Somewhat difficult  to read,  follows some directions | Difficult to read,  doesn’t follow  directions | Illegible; doesn’t  follow directions |
| **TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_\_ / 50** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

REFLECTIONS / COMMENTS: