

Notes on writing a persuasive essay

introduction

TOLENTINO TUITION

Modbury Heights, tolentinotuition.com

Grade 5 English

25 March 2026

Contents

- 3 Essay
- 4 Thesis statement
- 5 Signposting arguments

Essay

We have been asked to

prepare a persuasive essay on one of the following arguments:

1. *People should have unlimited freedom*
2. *People should not have unlimited freedom*

Student response:

I strongly believe that people should not have unlimited freedom. This is three reasons why, firstly imagine a world with criminals roaming around the streets just because people had unlimited freedom. Do you really want that? Prisoners are walking hazards! Secondly without limitations the stronger and louder will dominate and the others will be left with less freedom then before. Thirdly too much freedom can lead to someones harmful actions, Law are made for peoples safety not just for fun. Here are more detailed versions of why I think people should not have unlimited freedom.

Firstly, I believe that if people have unlimited freedom and just can steal peoples stuff without going to prison is just absolutely unfair. Our law can save people from getting robbed and punish the bad. Having freedom is good but too much can be bad. People who are good can get hurt for no reason. Research has shown that people who get stolen from that they were glad there was law. This is why people can't have unlimited freedom.

Secondly, imagine a world dominated by the loud and strong not giving the intelegint but quiet a chance. The science say that 61 % of people who don't have the chance to speak have creative mind and ideas but can't share them due to their quiet voice or shyness. And people who can't speak up for them self. Do you want that to happen? We must all give them a chance and without unlimited freedom we can do that!

Lastly, safety to our people are essential and if we have unlimited freedom kids could drive car risking the life of themselves and others. Having unlimited freedom can also lead to people making bad choices like riding a roller coster under the hight limit and might cause a danger for the person and might even result in death. Recerch has shown that moe then 58 percent of people have been saved by the law . Unlimited freedom is not good.

In conclusion unlimited freedom can result in many bad thing and people would be unsafe and it can result in many bad things. Do you want that to happen? So this is exactly why we can't have unlimited freedom.

Here, we will discuss writing an introduction to a persuasive essay.

Thesis statement

I strongly believe that people should not have unlimited freedom. This is three reasons why, firstly imagine a world with criminals roaming around the streets just because people had unlimited freedom. Do you really want that? Prisoners are walking hazards! Secondly without limitations the stronger and louder will dominate and the others will be left with less freedom then before. Thirdly too much freedom can lead to someones harmful actions, Law are made for peoples safety not just for fun. Here are more detailed versions of why I think people should not have unlimited freedom.

Figure 1. Thesis statement

1. We begin our introduction with our *thesis statement*.

Explanation	Notes for student
Our <i>thesis</i> is simply 'what we are arguing', and our goal when writing a <i>thesis statement</i> is to make it very clear to the reader as to <i>what we will be arguing</i> .	This is done well! After reading the <i>thesis statement</i> , I know that in the essay, the speaker will be arguing that <i>people should not have unlimited freedom</i> .

Signposting arguments

2. After writing our thesis, we should *signpost* our arguments.

Explanation
<p>To <i>signpost</i> means to simply state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How many supporting arguments we will make to persuade the reader of our thesis; and2. List our supporting arguments, without providing any evidence for them yet – we will do this later in the <i>body</i> of our essay!

I strongly believe that people should not have unlimited freedom. This is three reasons why, firstly imagine a world with criminals roaming around the streets just because people had unlimited freedom. Do you really want that? Prisoners are walking hazards! Secondly without limitations the stronger and louder will dominate and the others will be left with less freedom then before. Thirdly too much freedom can lead to someones harmful actions, Law are made for peoples safety not just for fun. Here are more detailed versions of why I think people should not have unlimited freedom.

Figure 2. Signposting

Notes for student
<p>This is wonderful <i>signposting</i>!</p> <p>'<u>This is three reasons why</u>' makes it very clear to me that I will be presented with three arguments.</p> <p>To make this phrase more <i>formal</i>, we could say:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Three reasons for this argument <u>will be presented</u>, or• I strongly believe that people should not have unlimited freedom, <u>for three reasons</u>.

I strongly believe that people should not have unlimited freedom. This is three reasons why, firstly imagine a world with criminals roaming around the streets just because people had unlimited freedom. Do you really want that? Prisoners are walking hazards! Secondly without limitations the stronger and louder will dominate and the others will be left with less freedom than before. Thirdly too much freedom can lead to someones harmful actions, Law are made for peoples safety not just for fun. Here are more detailed versions of why I think people should not have unlimited freedom.

Figure 2. Signposting and sub-argument 1

Notes for student

Using the sentence starters 'firstly ... Secondly ... Thirdly' makes it very clear as to which sub-argument is which! This is very helpful for me as a reader.

As the reader, I can tell that the three sub-arguments for the thesis that 'people should not have unlimited freedom are':

1. Criminals roaming the streets ... prisoners are walking hazards

- However, I think that we could no longer call them criminals! Because a criminal is someone who has committed a crime *under the law*. But with unlimited freedom, the law would not exist! Therefore, criminals would not exist!
- So, to make it clearer as to what we mean, we could say:

Firstly, unlimited freedom would result in the 'law' ceasing to exist. This would allow individuals who would otherwise be criminals or prisoners to freely interact with society, resulting in more unwanted physical harm.

What did we do differently here?

- i. The sub-argument was split into two sentences; this is completely okay! Our priority is making sure that our reader understands *exactly* what we are trying to say, which may require more words!
- ii. If we say that 'prisoners are walking hazards', someone might ask 'okay ... so what?'. So, in the above, we explain *what exactly the hazard is*, and *why* it would not be good for society.

I strongly believe that people should not have unlimited freedom. This is three reasons why, firstly imagine a world with criminals roaming around the streets just because people had unlimited freedom. Do you really want that? Prisoners are walking hazards! Secondly without limitations the stronger and louder will dominate and the others will be left with less freedom than before. Thirdly too much freedom can lead to someones harmful actions, Law are made for peoples safety not just for fun. Here are more detailed versions of why I think people should not have unlimited freedom. 2

Figure 3. Sub-argument 2

Notes for student

2. 'The stronger and louder will dominate and the others will be left with less freedom than before'

- My first question as a reader when reading this argument would be, 'but who are the *others*?' I might guess that these *others* are people who are *not* strong and loud, but I can't be sure!
- So, rather than saying 'the others', we should be *specific* and state *who we really mean by 'the others!'*:
 - i. ... will dominate, resulting in those who are not naturally strong or loud to ... OR
 - ii. ... will dominate, causing those who do not desire power to ...
- My second question might be 'but why would these *others* be left with less freedom than before if the strong and the loud *dominate*'?

So, in this case, we need to more specifically explain what we mean by *dominate*, and why this would be bad!

- i. Will the strong and the loud make the weak individuals work for them? Why would this be bad for the weak?
- ii. Will the strong and the loud steal from the weak?
- iii. Will the strong and the loud take all the resources (food, clothing, shelter etc.) for themselves? Why would this be bad for the weak?

I strongly believe that people should not have unlimited freedom. This is three reasons why, firstly imagine a world with criminals roaming around the streets just because people had unlimited freedom. Do you really want that? Prisoners are walking hazards! Secondly without limitations the stronger and louder will dominate and the others will be left with less freedom than before. Thirdly too much freedom can lead to someones harmful actions, Law are made for peoples safety not just for fun. Here are more detailed versions of why I think people should not have unlimited freedom.

Figure 4. Sub-argument 3

Notes for student

3. 'too much freedom can lead to someones harmful actions, Law are made for peoples safety not just for fun.'

In my opinion, the meaning of this argument is very strong!

There are a few things we can do in order to express it more clearly:

- i. We should use apostrophes in the words *someone's* and *people's*, because:
We are talking about *someone's* harmful actions - the harmful actions *belong* to them.
And, we are talking about the *people's* safety - the safety *belongs* to the people.
- ii. A reader might ask 'but who is this *someone*?, and *what harmful actions* would they take? Also, what does the *law* have to do with *too much freedom*?'

Again, we can answer these questions by being a bit more specific in our argument!

- *In a world of unlimited freedom, laws that protect the people's safety would not exist. Without these laws, there would be no punishments to deter wicked individuals from harming whoever they please - creating chaos in society.*