

Literacy and Numeracy for NCEA Level 1 - Writing

Templates for composing a persuasive text

Content

This resource supports the teaching and learning of composing a persuasive text within the broader context of planning, composing, revising and editing. The sequence is suitable for learners in any context which requires writing a persuasive text and also where tutors are gathering naturally occurring evidence for the achievement of the NCEA Level 1 Literacy Unit Standard 26622.

Alignment

The content aligns with steps 3 to 4 of the Write to Communicate strand of the Adult Learning Progressions and is designed to transition learners towards step 5.

Intent

The writing frames below can be used to support learners' composition of a persuasive text. The structure and sentence prompts provide scaffolding which support learners' initial text constructions while developing their knowledge of appropriate structure. The frame should be removed once learners are able to structure their writing independently.

There are two templates below. The first is a writing frame for a simple persuasive text which can be used with less skilled learners. A feature of the first template is that it does not require the writer to include an alternative position. By contrast, the second template is more advanced and does require the writer to include alternative arguments and why they might disagree with these. Learners can begin with the first template and transition to the second.

Keep in mind that learners do not have to stick to the template. It is a guide only.

Two examples of authentic learner work are included below. The first is the learner's first draft using template 2. The second example is the learner's final draft after revising and editing. Note that errors in the examples are the learner's errors.



Template 1

I think that
because
The reason why I think this is that
Another reason is
In addition to this,
To sum up, I have shown that

Template 2



There is a lot of discussion about whether
The people who agree with this idea, such as,
claim that
They also argue that
A further point they make is
However, there are strong arguments against this point of view. Other groups, such as believe that
Another counter argument is
After looking at the different points of view and the evidence for them I think
because



Learner Example 1: Early Draft

Why the driving age should not be raised to 18

There is a lot of discussion about whether the drivers age should be raised to 18. The people who agree with this idea, such as the New Zealand Police, claim that young people have more accidents than older people. They also argue that young people are easily pressured into dangerous activities as a way of looking cool. A further point they make is that young people think less about their actions.

However, there are also strong arguments against this point of view. I believe that most young people are good drivers. A counter argument is that teenagers are not the worse drivers, male drivers under the age of 25 are. Maybe we should ban males under 25 from driving?

Another counter argument is that focusing on the bad behaviours of some young people is unfair to those who are good drivers and unfair to their families. In farming communities, it is very useful to have young people able to drive, as they can help with the work. These young people show that young people can be mature and responsible.

After looking at the different points of view and the evidence for them I think that raising the driving age to 18 is a wrong because it is unfair to young adults who are good drivers. It also sends a message to young adults that society doesn't trust them.

Julie



Learner Example 2: Final Draft

Why the driving age should not be raised to 18

There is a lot of discussion about whether the age at which a person can gain a drivers licence should be raised from 16 to the age of 18. The people who agree with this idea, such as the New Zealand Police, claim that young people are over represented in the driver accident statistics and attract more Police time than other drivers. They also argue that young people are more prone to peer pressure and given that they have increasingly powerful vehicles are at greater risk of injuring themselves and others. A further point they make is that teenagers are less able to evaluate the consequences of their actions. They tend to be more impulsive and higher risk takers. This idea is often supported by references to immature frontal brain development.

However, there are also strong arguments against this point of view. I believe that most young people are good drivers and have a good understanding of consequences. A counter argument to that above is that teenagers are not the worst drivers statistically. Male drivers under the age of 25 have more accidents than any other group. Maybe we should ban males under 25 from driving?

Furthermore, the focus on the poor behaviours of a small amount of young people is unfair to those who are mature, well behaved and capable of driving safely on the roads. Many families and communities require young people to drive. Farmers, for example, benefit greatly from having sons and daughters able to drive vehicles on the farm. These young people are rarely in accidents and demonstrate that young people can be mature and responsible.

Finally, the research used to support the argument that teenagers have less developed frontal lobes and therefore an undeveloped ability to make decisions is flawed. The correlation between undeveloped frontal lobes and poor decision-making ability proves nothing. Has any research been done on the thousands of responsible teenagers' frontal lobes? How about the 14 and 15-year olds in some countries taking sole responsibility of their siblings in cases where the parents have died?

After looking at the different points of view and the evidence for them I think that raising the driving age to 18 is a poor solution to the problem because it disadvantages the majority of responsible young adults who stand as example of what should be expected of young people. It also sends a message to young adults that society has a low expectation of their behaviour therefore endorsing it.

Julie