

APPENDIX A

Read the following article. Drawing information from the article, write a detailed outline in answer to the following question :

In what ways the jury system protects innocent people ?
What are some of its limitations ?

The Jury — Citizens' Friend?

adapted from *Law and Order* by Adam Hopkins and Gaby Macphedran

In trial by jury, a system 800 years old, a group of ordinary citizens is called upon to decide whether or not the person accused is guilty. The aim is for the community to retain some power over the law so that it cannot be used unjustly. But some argue that juries are bound to be inferior to expert judges, and want to see the system abolished. Among those who support the jury system, there are disagreements over central questions.

In the past, juries were often chosen only from the well-to-do. This meant they were worthy, middle-class and predominantly male, and might have little sympathy with large numbers of the accused.

Members of juries are now generally chosen at random by computer. But research has shown that women and immigrants of all nationalities are still under-represented. Those who want a fully democratic system are unhappy about this.

Yet it may be argued that

young jurors lack a proper understanding of crime; that modern juries are sometimes ignorant because there is no educational qualification, and that they may include both the irresponsible and the inadequate.

For the jury to be fair, its members should clearly be not only representative of the people but as free of prejudice as possible. In some countries, and particularly the USA, the defence is allowed to question potential jurors freely about their beliefs. Many are rejected.

Law and order campaigners often consider challenges an attempt to get rid of anyone who looks 'respectable', particularly in cases where the defendant is black, working-class or political-ly committed to the far left.

Those in favour of fully representative juries are equally angry when the prosecution obtains information against jurors from the police and security agencies. This can happen in cases involving political hostility

to the established order. It is known as 'jury vetting'.

Juries deliberate in secret and are not allowed to disclose what happened, even afterwards. Interesting comparisons have been made, however, between jury verdicts and the opinions of the judge and other court officials in particular cases. Usually all agree. But enough disagreement occurs to cause concern — even a small percentage of disagreement may mean that innocent people are being convicted.

In some countries, judges are allowed to accept a majority verdict. The main reason is police fear that individual jurors may be threatened or 'nobbled' by criminals. But majority verdicts also make it easier for juries to convict.

Jury vetting, majority verdicts, and transfer of some cases to non-jury courts are seen by critics as part of a campaign against the power of juries.

APPENDIX B

Read the following article. Drawing information from the article, write a detailed outline in answer to the following question:

How important have pharmaceutical products been in improving our lives, and can they be a guarantee of good health?

PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCTS NOT THE ONLY ANSWER

There is no more precious commodity than health. Without it, life can be hardly worth living. That is why those who trade in health are dealing with something qualitatively different from the normal commodities of the marketplace. Doctors and medicines occupy a unique position.

Health is priceless. Who quibbles about money when listening to the fevered moans of their child? Hope and anxiety make you vulnerable to persuasion about a medicine's good effects.

Surely modern drugs are a blessing, one of the main reasons for the good health we enjoy in the industrialised world? This is what industry and many doctors would like us to believe. The reality is different.

The single most important cause of ill-health is poverty. Malnutrition has been the direct cause of 6 per cent of deaths of children under five in the Third World, and contributed to 57 per cent of all child deaths. Simple

childhood diseases become fatal due to poverty.

'Disease and death in Europe in the not too distant past was strikingly similar to that in today's underdeveloped world' points out Zimbabwean physician, David Sanders. Then came improvements in social conditions.

The wonder drug was a better standard of living. Water-related infections were reduced by efficient sewage disposal, clean tap water and safe milk. Airborne infections like tuberculosis were reduced by better housing. And underpinning all this was a better supply of good food. This is not to deny that smallpox vaccinations or, more recently, antibiotics have been useful. But medicines do not lie at the basis of Western health. Decent living conditions certainly do.

The belief in a medical cure is held by the weak, the poor and the infirm from Chicago to Calcutta. For they can do little to change their living

conditions. Medicine, at a pinch, they might afford.

It was discovered in the late 19th century that by-products of petroleum refinement could be used to manufacture synthetic chemicals and drugs. Around the turn of the century institutions like the Rockefeller Foundation which stemmed from Standard Oil, donated massive sums of money to guide medical education. Pharmacology became integral to the curriculum, medicine an indispensable tool of the doctor.

Bangladeshi doctors during the five years' training in Dhaka do not have lectures on the appropriate non-pharmaceutical treatment for diarrhoea, though this accounts for half of a children's illness and death in the country. Doctors are reluctant to use oral rehydration salts (ORS), a cheap and simple mixture of water, sugar and salt. Every year five million children die from diarrhoea, yet 3.5 million of those deaths would have been preventable by these salts.

Based on an article in *New Internationalist*, No. 165, November 1986

APPENDIX C

Read the following article. Drawing information from the article, write a detailed outline in answer to the following question :

Why is the wilderness worth preserving ? What are some of the arguments against preserving wilderness areas ?

The Importance of Wilderness

adapted from *Living in the Environment* by G. Tyler Miller, jun., and Patrick Armstrong

A wilderness is recognised as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by people, where visitors do not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined as an area of undeveloped land retaining its natural character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions.

In Australia, it has been strongly argued that a major portion of the south-west of Tasmania be totally excluded from any proposals for mining, forestry, hydroelectricity and conventional tourist development.

Some would enquire why we must spend public and private funds to buy up large tracts of wild untamed lands and protect them from extensive use. Is it not an elitist idea that sets aside wilderness areas for use by only a few 'nature lovers' while starvation exists in some developing countries and immense problems

of poverty, congestion and pollution continue in inner-city areas?

At first glance this argument appears to have some merit. For example, one study revealed that each year only a few hundred people used the south-western forested region of Tasmania for wilderness experience recreation. It has been suggested that the wilderness cult, based upon the idea that 'urban-dwellers must have a last place where they can experience beauty and diversity, breathe clear air, drink pure water and get away from it all' is a selfish one. After all, our idea of beauty and our response to wilderness has changed throughout history from fear and dread to awe and a perhaps over-romanticised worship.

However, some of the most potent arguments for the preservation of wild nature are biological: wilderness is an ecological laboratory and a genetic bank. We get our living

from manipulating eco-systems. We are dependent for our food, water and raw materials on the forests, farmlands, oceans and grazing lands of the world. Wilderness areas store and preserve genetic strains of plant and animal life that might serve as new hybrid food crops, as sources of drugs like penicillin, as animals for medical research, or perhaps provide some tiny predator that would assist in the elimination of some terrible pest.

Wilderness is also important for active recreation. The 'wilderness experience' - being out of all contact with the trappings of civilisation - is valued by an increasing number of people. But here we come upon a conflict, since all physical recreation to some extent degrades the wilderness quality of the area in which it occurs. Too many visitors will ultimately destroy a wilderness, however careful they may be to minimise their influences.

Appendix D

Why is the wilderness worth preserving? What are some of the arguments against preserving wilderness areas?

Detailed Outline

Thesis 1 : Reasons for Preserving Wilderness

1. Biological Reason

Wilderness - an ecological laboratory and genetic bank.

- a. Humans dependent on wilderness for food, water, raw materials.
- b. Source of - new hybrid food crops
 - drugs eg. penicillin
 - animals for medical research
 - tiny predators which eliminate pests

2. Recreation purpose

Wilderness - out of the trappings of civilisation

- provides beauty and diversity, clean air, pure water

Therefore, final retreat for urban dwellers to get away from hustle-bustle of city.

Thesis 2 : Arguments Against Preserving Wilderness

1. Economic Reason

- a. Wilderness - potential economic resources eg. mining, forestry, h.e.p., tourism.
- b. Widespread social-economic problems in the world
 - Example - starvation in developing countries
 - poverty, congestion, pollution in city areas
 - Hence - waste of money to preserve unused lands.

Developing wilderness will help solve social-economic problems.

2. Elitist Idea

- a. Wilderness used by only a few nature lovers eg. only a few hundred people used south-western Tasmanian forest for recreation.
- b. Response to wilderness changed from fear and dread to awe to over-romanticised worship.

Therefore, not practical to preserve wilderness for minority only.

- c. All physical recreation will degrade quality of wilderness to an extent.

Reason - too many visitors ultimately destroy a wilderness though care is taken to minimise influence.

Therefore, more feasible to develop than preserve wilderness.

Appendix E

Transcript of Teacher-led Discussion on the Passage, "The Jury"

Turns

- 1 T - What does the article tell us about the jury system?
- 2 S1 - It's 800 years old.
- 3 T - What is the implication if it's 800 years old?
- 4 S1 - It's very old.
- 5 T - What else does it imply?
- 6 S1 - It's reliable.
- 7 T - Yes. It's reliable otherwise it won't be used to try people. The fact that it's tried and tested, it is found to be reliable.
- 8 T - What is the jury system?
- 9 S2 - It consist of ordinary men and women who decide if the accused is guilty.
- 10 T - It compose of ordinary people - lay people - who sit in court and decide whether the accused is guilty.
- 11 T - What else are we told about the jury system?
- 12 S3 - It enables the community to retain power over the law.
- 13 T - It aims at giving members of the public power over the law.
- 14 T - How does it intend to do this?
- 15 S4 - They decide whether the accused is guilty or not.
- 16 T - Where do they come from?
- 17 S5 - From society.

- 18 T - What class or group of society ?
- 19 S6 - Working class.
- 20 S7 - Middle class
- 21 S8 - Males
- 22 S9 - Ordinary citizens
- 23 T - Who else can sit as jury members?
- 24 S10 - Women
- 25 S11 - Immigrants
- 26 T - Can immigrants sit as jurors?
- 27 S12 - Not just immigrants
- 28 T - Why not?
- 29 S12 - Because they have more than one opinion.
- 30 T - But would you get them to sit as jurors ?
- 31 S12 - If they are citizens.
- 32 T - If they are not citizens ?
- 33 S12 - No
- 34 T - Why not ?
- 35 S12 - They don't have the power.
- 36 T - O.K. What happen if the jury consist of only the males or females or
from the working class or well-to-do ?
- 37 S13 - They would be prejudiced.
- 38 T - In what sense?
- 39 S13 - They have no understanding of the working class.

- 40 T - Yes, if they are from the well-to-do, they can only understand people of their own class or if they are only males, they will understand issues of their own sex.
- 41 T - What else would happen if they are only of their own class?
- 42 S14 - Different beliefs..... They have different opinion of people
What people do or think.
- 43 T - Is that good or bad ?
- 44 S15 - Not good. They have fixed opinion about people.
- 45 T - Oh! If jurors consist of only one class of people, then they have fixed opinion of accused. Then it wouldn't be fair to the accused.
- 46 T - Anybody else think that having only one class of people is good or bad?
- 47 Class - Silence
- 48 T - Should the jury consist of people from different class, sex, racial group or should it consist of only one class or racial group?
- 49 Class - Different
- 50 T - Yes, so that justice can be seen to be meted out.
- 51 T - Right. What issue is brought up here regarding the jury system?
- 52 S16 - There are some limitations.
- 53 T - Ah... we are told about some of the limitations. What are some of the limitations?
- 54 S17 - The jury has no educational qualification so lack proper understanding of crime and expert opinion.....

- 55 T - Anything else?No proper educational qualificationbecause of that no proper understanding of crime ...Anything else about the jurors? What else are some jurors like here?
- 56 S17 - They are irresponsible. They are inefficient.
- 57 T - What is the implication here if the jurors are irresponsible
.....uneducated
- 58 S18 - Innocent may be convicted
- 59 T - Yes, innocent may be convicted.
- 60 T - Any other limitations?
- 61 S19 - Women and immigrants of all nationalities are under-represented.
- 62 T - Yes, jury may leave out women and immigrants of different nationalities. Why does that happen?
- 63 T - Student 20?
- 64 S20 - Silence
- 65 S21 - Because they are bias.
- 66 T - Who is biased?
- 67 S21 - Silence
- 68 T - Women and immigrants have been left out. That's a limitation. Why have they been left out?
- 69 S22 - Because the defence is allowed to question jurors about their beliefs.
- 70 T - That is a different point. You haven't answered the question why women and immigrants are left out in the jury system. Why is that

so?

71 S23 - Discrimination

72 T - Yes ... the fact they are left out means there's some degree of discrimination but why does that occur ? Why have they been left out?

73 T - Who leaves them out ?.... or what leaves them out?

74 S24 - Since past jurors are chosen from the well-to-do and predominately male, so this may be the reason why women were left out in the election process.

75 T - That was in the past. In the past, jurors were chosen from the wealthy or middle class or consist of only males. Do you think that still happen today?

76 S24 - No

77 T - Implication it hasn't but we are still told that the jurors don't come from the well-to-do or compose of only men, yet we are still told that women and immigrant are left out.

78 S25 - Women are emotional.....

79 T - So you don't allow them to sit as jurors?

80 S25 - No, but they are under-represented!

81 T - But why are they under-represented? What factors cause under-representation?.....Look at the paragraph The answer is there.

82 S26 - They were not selected.

83 T - Why were they not selected?What is it that select them now?

84 S27 - The computer.

85 T - Why is it that the computer didn't select them?

86 S27 - Select at random.

87 T - Yes, the computer select at random. It doesn't know about their sex. In the past, when computer wasn't around, you have men selecting members of the jury. When people select , they select those who are rich or from the middle class or the males. They feel women are emotional - don't want to sit as jurors. So in the past, it was selected by men or people and since the selection is by people, people are subject to prejudice. But, today, selection is by computer but is the computer totally faultless?

88 S27 - No

89 T - It's not totally faultless, isn't it? It doesn't make a distinction between gender. It selects at random and it so happen that it may select people of the same sex or from a particular group. Therefore, women or immigrants may be left out from the list. So there's still flaw in the system!

90 T - Any other limitation?

91 S28 - Jury vetting

92 T - What about jury vetting?

93 S28 - Prosecution can obtain information against jurors.

94 T - So?

95 S28 - Can decide who gets to be in the jury.

- 96 T - Prosecution obtain information against jurors. What is the implication here? I get info. about her from police. I'm the lawyer. I get info from the police. What is the implication here?
- 97 S29 - Easier for the prosecution to influence jurors because they know about jurors belief. So at the trial I say certain things to win the jurors over.....
- 98 T - Hmm... .. I obtain info against her. Is it good for her ?
- 99 S29 - No
- 100 T - What is the implication? What can happen in court?
- 101 S29 - I can influence that person's decision during the session.
- 102 T - I can influence the juror to favour me orwhat else can I do with the information against her?
- 103 S30 - Blackmail her.
- 104 T - Ah.... I can use the info to blackmail her. If you don't vote for my defendent I can use the info in court to show that
- 105 S30 -you are not suitable as a juror.
- 106 T - Yes, that you are bias against my defendent, you are not suitable, you are prejudice. I can influence jurors' decision.
- 107 T - Any other limitation?
- 108 S12 - Accepting majority verdict.
- 109 T - What about accepting majority verdict?
- 110 S12 - The accused can be convicted easily.

111 T - If majority verdict is accepted, this means the accused can be convicted easily.... second last paragraph If say out of thirteen, ten say guilty, three not guilty, then based on majority decision, that means that person is guilty. But what is the implication if three say he is not guilty?

112 S12 - There's a chance the accused is innocent.

113 T - Yet there's a chance the accused is innocent. It doesn't mean that when all ten agree accused is guilty, he's guilty. The fact that even if 1 says he is not guilty there's a chance that that person may be innocent. Based on majority decision, that man is sent to prison. So not fair. Even if there is slight disagreement, it may mean that that man has not been given proper justice. Also mentioned in third last paragraph.

114 T - Any other limitation?

115 Class - Silence

116 T - Also mentioned in second last paragraph, if a person sits back and leave the decision to others. If others pass a guilty verdict and this person just sit there and didn't do anything, an innocent person can be convicted.

117 T - Any benefits in the system?

118 S15 - They deliberate in secret.

119 T - Yes.. so ...?

120 S15 - No outside influence.

121 T - Yes, no outside influence. What is the implication?

122 S20 - Jury is neutral.

123 T - Yes... jury is neutral, no outside influence who may blackmail or intimidate the accused.

124 T - Also when deliberate in secret what else is told about the verdict arrived at?

125 S20 - They aren't allowed to tell anyone else about the decision.

126 T - So?

127 S20 - So the jurors' safety is assured because nobody can visit or influence them.

128 T - So protection is assured to jurors because nobody would know how they arrive at the decision.

129 T - Although it's secret, what does the result show?

130 S30 - Interesting comparison have been made.....

131 T - What does it show?

132 S30 - Compare verdict of jury and judge and court officials.

133 T - What does it show?

134 Class - Show disagreement.

135 T - Are you sure it shows disagreement?

136 S12 - Usually they agree, but there is a small percentage of disagreement.

137 T - When comparison is made of the decision by the jury, judge and court official, it usually shows what ?... ..What does it show? Does it show they agree or disagree? Usually?

138 Class - Agree.

139 T - Yes, usually they agree. Is that good or bad?

140 Class - Good.

141 T - Yes, the fact they deliberate in secret - the judge on his own, the court officials on his own, the jurors on their own and when they come together and ask for the verdict and all the verdict agree though they have not met together. This shows that they are of the same opinion - that the person is guilty or not guilty. This is good. They did not influence each other. Again the possibility is that if there is slight disagreement, then the innocent may be convicted.

142 T - Any other benefits?

143 S12 - Verdict is decided by a group of people not just one person..

144 T - So, what is the implication?

145 S10 - The decision is fairer, it's impartial.

146 T - Any other examples to show that the decision is fair or impartial.

147 T - Which paragraph are you looking at?

148 S10 - Column 1, paragraph 1.

149 T - Read the line

150 S10 - A group of ordinary citizen called to decide whether a person is guilty or not.

151 T - O.K. If it is a group who decide compared to 1 person, what is the implication?

152 S12 - the individual can be easily threatened/ nobbled by the criminal , sotherefore they can't do that to a group.

- 153 T - Yes, if it's an individual, I can threaten him with injury, so, he will be influenced. But if it is a group how many can I threaten or buy or bribed? If it's individual, I can threaten her I know your son goes to this school so if anything happen whereas if it's a jury system, how many can I threaten?
- 154 T - Back to the fact that many people make the decision, community decide over the case how is that an advantage?
- 155 S22 - Easier to convict
- 156 T - Is that an advantage or limitation?
- 157 S22 - A limitation.
- 158 T - The fact that many people make the decision and not just 1 person, how is that an advantage?
- 159 S28 - Wide understanding of the trial.
- 160 T - In what way?
- 161 S28 - More people think about the good and bad side.
- 162 T - Yes, more people think about the case. There will be more views. If it's just one person?
- 163 S12 - One view only.
- 164 T - Yes, it's a narrow perspective. Only one individual is thinking over the case so it's a narrow view compared to when many decide on the case. How else is it an advantage?
- 165 S22 - Prevent corruption.
- 166 T - How?

- 167 S22 - If it's one person , can easily be corrupted by others.
- 168 T - Yes, how else? What does it show about authority here?
- 169 S8 - Undemocratic.
- 170 T - Yes, what else?Only one person has the sole authority. What does it show ?
- 171 S16 - Too much power.
- 172 T - Yes, too much power invested in one person. One person makes all the decision whereas jury group makes the decision. When a group makes the decision, what do you prevent here?
- 173 S19 - Prejudice.
- 174 T - What else? The fact that authority is vested in one person. He has all the power.
- 175 S12 - Abuse of power.
- 176 T - Yes, it would check abuse of power. One person makes the decision, too much power vested in one person, whereas if it's a group making the decision or cross-section of society making the decision, then power is distributed. That helps prevent abuse of power.
- 177 T - Any other benefits mentioned about the jury system?
- 178 S12 - Defence is allowed to question potential jurors.
- 179 T - How is that a benefit?
- 180 S12 - Know whether they have any prejudice or not.
- 181 T - If they have?

- 182 S12 - Then, can know if they have fixed opinion about the accused. If they have , it is taken into consideration before accepting the verdict.
- 183 T - Yes, which paragraph?
- 184 S12 - Column 2, paragraph 2. They shouldn't be prejudiced.
- 185 T - Yet, for it to be fair, effective, justice is meted out. It must be impartial, free of prejudice. How can it ensure it's free of prejudice? In countries like U.S.A., defence can question jurors about their beliefs and if found bias they can reject them. Some people have fixed opinion. All blacks are always guilty. All women are emotional. All men are aggressive if have all women jury. When there's such fixed opinion, accused won't stand a chance.
- 186 T - Any other parts to show jury is impartial?
- 187 S12 - Law and order campaigners will consider challenges to rid anyone who is 'respectable' in cases involving blacks, working class.
- 188 T - What does that mean? Law and order campaigners ensure that justice must be meted out. Who is the anyone who is respectable whom they will get rid of?
- 189 S5 - Rich
- 190 T - What else ? Notice 'respectable' is in quote. Seem respectable. What else do you understand by respectable?
- 191 S8 - High status
- 192 T - Yes, have high social status. Look at them, think they can be trusted. Wow... respectable but could be con man.

193 T - What else?

194 S12 - Highly educated.

195 T - Yes, doctor degree. Highly educated but may be narrow-minded.

Highly opinionated. Seem respectable or well-dressed. May be a manager but could be actually mafia boss. So these people seem respectable but law and order campaigner will get rid of these people.

Why do law and order campaigners get rid of them?

196 S12 - Because they may convict an innocent person.

197 T - Why would they convict an innocent person?

198 S12 - Because they have prejudiced opinion.

199 T - Yes, outwardly they seem respectable but may already have fixed opinion. May think all working class people can't be trusted. Come from slum so always tell lies. Or if have black on trial that all blacks can't be trusted. Any one wants to add anything else?

200 Class - Silence.

Appendix F

Transcript of Student-Student Discussion on “Pharmaceutical Products”

Turns

- 1 T - Student 1, ask Student 2 a question based on the article.
- 2 S 1 - What is the most important cause of ill-health?
- 3 S 2 - The most important cause of ill-health is poverty.
- 4 S 1 - What does poverty leads to?
- 5 S 2 - Poverty leads to malnutrition and therefore contribute to death of children.
- 6 T - Student 3, ask Student 4 a question based on Student 2 answer.
- 7 S 3 - What is the percentage of contribution to children’s death?
- 8 S 4 - It is 6% of death of children under 5 and 57% of all child deaths.
- 9 T - Student 5, ask Student 6 a question based on the article.
- 10 S 5- Why does the poor believe in medical cure?
- 11 S 6 - Because they can change their living condition.
- 12 T - Are you happy with the answer?
- 13 S 5 - No
- 14 T - If you can’t answer, you can ask a member of your squad to help you.
- 15 S 7 - Because of poverty, childhood diseases become fatal.
- 16 T - Are you happy?
- 17 S 5 - No

- 18 T - Maybe you can guide her to get the answer. A more specific question to help her.
- 19 S 5 - Medicine can't guarantee good health, but why the poor believe in medical cure?
- 20 T - Who do you want to address the question to?
- 21 S 8 - Student 9?
- 22 S 9 - The poor live in poor social condition. That's why they can't change their living conditions.
- 23 T - O.K.?
- 24 S 8 - Yes
- 25 S 10 - What was discovered in the late 19 century that was used to manufacture medicine?
- 26 S 11 - In the late 19 century they discovered that by-products of petroleum refinement could be used to manufacture synthetic chemicals and drugs.
- 27 T - Student 12, based on the member's answer, ask Student 13 a question.
- 28 S 12 - What happen to the discovery of the by-products of petroleum in the late 19 century?
- 29 S 13 - It was discovered that the Rockeller Foundation which stemmed from Standard Oil donated massive sums of money to guide medical education.
- 30 T - Are you happy with the answer?
- 31 S 12 - Yes
- 32 T - Student 14, based on student 13's answer, ask Student 15 a question.

33 S 14 - Silence

34 S 15 - Why did the Rockefeller Foundation donate money?

35 S 14 - They donated the money to guide medical education and pharmacology became integral to curriculum and medicine an indispensable tool to the doctor.

36 S 15 - Yes

37 T - Student 16, ask Student 17 a question based on the article.

38 S 16 - What are the social improvement to social condition?

39 S 17 - Water-related infections were decreased by better sewage disposal, clean water and safe milk, air-borne infections were decreased by better housing and underpinning all this was a better supply of food.

40 T - Student 18, based on Student 17's answer ask Student 19 a question.

41 S 18 - How could airborne infection like tuberculosis be reduced?

42 S 19 - Could be reduced by better housing condition.

43 T - Student 20, based on Student 19's answer and discussion on that paragraph, ask Student 21 a question.

44 S 20 - How does this improvement to better condition lead to good health?

45 S 21 - Improvement in better social condition decrease infection and provides better health.

46 T - Student 22, based on discussion on the same paragraph, ask Student 1 a question.

47 S 22 - Even though a better standard of living decrease death, it is still undeniable medicine play a part. Why?

- 48 S1 - It is much cheaper to get medicine than change a person's living condition.
- 49 T - Student 17, ask Student 8 a question.
- 50 S 17 - What is the basis of western health?
- 51 S 8 - The basis of Western health is that medicine can't guarantee good health but better living condition play an important role.
- 52 T - Student 23, ask Student 24 a question.
- 53 S 23 - What are the other alternative beside drugs that can cure diseases like diarrhoea?
- 54 S 24 - Oral rehydration salt (ORS) - a simple mixture of sugar, water and salt.
- 55 T - Student 15, ask Student 13 a question based on Student 24's answer.
- 56 S 15 - Why are doctors reluctant to use ORS?
- 57 S 13 - Because it is cheaper.
- 58 T - Happy with the answer?
- 59 S 15 - No
- 60 S 13 - Could you repeat?
- 61 S 15 - Why are doctors reluctant to use ORS?
- 62 S 13 - Because they didn't have lectures on the appropriate non-pharmaceutical products.
- 63 T - Happy with the answer?
- 64 S 15 - O.K.
- 65 T - Student 12, based on the response of Student 13 and the discussion on that paragraph, ask Student 25 a question.

- 66 S 12 - Although every year 5 million children die of diarrhoea, why the doctors are reluctant to use ORS?
- 67 S 25 - It is because the doctors don't have lecture on non-pharmaceutical products so they don't know if it can cure or not.
- 68 S 12 - Right.
- 69 T - Student 26, ask any member in squad A a question based on the article.
- 70 S 26 - Student 27, why drugs are a blessing for the modern country?
- 71 S 27 - Drugs are not a blessing in Western world but better standard of living is.
- 72 T - Happy with the answer?
- 73 S 26 - No
- 74 T - She's not happy with the answer.
- 75 S 26 - Do you want me to repeat?
- 76 S1 - Drugs are not a blessing for industrialised country. This is what industry and many doctors say but at the end of the paragraph, it is stated that reality is different. This means drugs are not a blessing.
- 77 T - Student 27, you want to ask any member a question in squad B?or any member in squad A wants to ask a question? Student 1?
- 78 S 1 - Why are Bangladeshi doctors not equipped with adequate knowledge to treat diarrhoea?
- 79 S 2 - The doctors are reluctant to use non-pharmaceutical products because they believe diarrhoea can be cured only with medicine. Therefore, ORS is rejected among Bangladeshi doctors.

- 80 S 1 - It is one of the answers.
- 81 T - Can you be specific about your question to help student to get the other answer?
- 82 S1 - Why are doctors reluctant to use ORS although it is a cheap non-pharmaceutical products?
- 83 S 2 - Doctors believe in medicine to cure diseases not ORS.
- 84 S1 - Although it is cheap it can prevent 3.5m death but medicine couldn't do that. Why doctors reluctant to use ORS although it can cure 3.5m death? Although doctors use medicine, if they use ORS it can cure 3.5m death. If use medicine, the amount of death caused by diarrhoea is still very high.
- 85 T - What do you have in mind?
- 86 S 1 - Because ORS is a cheap mixture, doctors are reluctant to use it but prefer medicine because they want to make a profit out of it.
- 87 S 2 - Bangladesh is such a poor country, how can people pay for medicine and the doctors make a profit out of it!
- 88 T - Answer is based on your own assumption not on the article. Article specifically says doctors were not given lecture on it so they continue to believe that medicine is the only means to cure and because of that belief they didn't use simple home treatment and because of that 3.5m. people die.
- 89 T - Based on the question in the article, that is, the instruction question Student 22 ask Student 27 a question.

- 90 S 22 - Is pharmaceutical product important in improving our lives?
- 91 S 27 - To a certain extent. It helps cure infections like TB and smallpox. But the main cause of ill-health is poor living conditions. It does help to an extent.
- 92 T - S 28, based on the question again, ask Han a question.
- 93 S 28 - Why pharmaceutical product can improve our lives?
- 94 S 21 - They help cure diseases and reduce death.
- 95 S 28 - Why is it limited?
- 96 T - Can you rephrase your question?
- 97 S 28 - What are the limitations of pharmaceutical products?
- 98 S 21 - They are expensive and they are better ways to prevent diseases.
- 99 T - Student 14, based on the first part of the question do you have any more question to ask squad A?
- 100 S 14 - No
- 101 T - Student 17, ask any member in squad B a question based on the article.
- 102 S 17 - If pharmaceutical products are not important in improving our lives are there any other alternatives?
- 103 S - Improved living and social condition such as better sewage disposal, clean tap water, safe milk and a better supply of good food.
- 104 S 17 - Thank you
- 105 T - Student 5, direct a question at Student 7 based on the question again.

- 106 S 5 - Are pharmaceutical products important in improving our lives and why?
- 107 S 7 - I don't think pharmaceutical products has helped improved our lives. They can guarantee to cure certain diseases. They are other better alternatives such as better living conditions and ORS to cure diarrhoea.
- 108 T - Student 22, ask any member in squad A a question based on the question in the article.
- 109 S 22 - Why can't good health be guaranteed by pharmaceutical products?
- 110 S 7 - Ill-health is caused by poverty. Most people can't afford to get pharmaceutical products so can't guarantee good health.
- 111 T - Based on Student 7's answer, Student 2, ask any member in squad A a question.
- 112 S 2 - If pharmaceutical products can't guarantee good health, then why the poor still believe it can cure them?
- 113 S - Though pharmaceutical products can't guarantee good health the poor believe they can cure them because they can't afford to change their living conditions but they can afford to buy medicine at a pinch.
- 114 T - Anybody has any more question to ask?
- 115 S - No
- 116 T - Based on the discussion, write out a detailed outline.

APPENDIX G

Samples of Students' Detailed Outlines Before Discussion on the Passage,

“The Jury”

High Proficiency Student - Ming Han

Average Proficiency Student - Mei Chen

Low Proficiency Student - Michelle Liew

$$\frac{TS1}{m-1} \quad \frac{TS2}{m-3} = 4$$

$$\frac{TS1}{m-3} = 7$$

The jury - Citizens' Friend?

Detailed Outline

Introduction

- the jury system = a system whereby a group of ordinary citizens is called upon to decide on the innocence or guilt of the accused.

Content

Thesis 1: How ~~the~~ the jury system protects innocent people

1. Power over the law: - It prevents the law from being used unjustly by giving the community power over the law → the jury decides the verdict, not the judge.
2. Secret deliberations: - The jurors are protected by threats after the verdict is announced → deliberations are kept secret, so people who are unhappy about the verdict cannot exact revenge.

Thesis 2: The limitations of the jury system

1. Under-representation
 - i) Research has shown that women and immigrants are still under-represented.
 - ii) A large number of jurors are male, well-to-do and do not sympathise with the accused.
2. Unqualified juries
 - i) Young jurors lack a proper understanding of crime.
 - ii) Juries are sometimes ignorant because of lack of education.
 - iii) Random choosing of jurors means juries may include irresponsible and inadequate people.
3. Questioning of jurors - In the jury selection, the defence is allowed to question the jury freely. This means many people

4. Disagreement among jurors. i) a ^{small} disagreement among jurors may be enough for innocent people to be convicted.
 ii) majority verdicts are enough for a conviction.

Conclusion

- the jury system may be imperfect, but it is still the best way for democratic countries to retain it's community's power over the law.
- with refinements and improvements, it may yet prove to be the best way to champion the cause of law over chaos.

Name: Mei Chen Group: u Roll no: 30622

181
m=1
ni=1

12
m=0
ni=0

ESL

Info Domain

Date: 20/2/97

No.

Thesis: Ways the jury system protects innocent people

Choosing suitable juries X

- members of juries are now generally chosen at random by computer.
- in the past, juries were often chosen only from the well-to-do.
→ they were worthy, middle-class and predominantly male, and might have little sympathy with large numbers of the accused. X

Fairness of juries ✓

- should clearly be not only representative of the people
→ should free of prejudice
- In some countries - USA - the defence is allowed to question potential jurors freely about their beliefs.
- representative juries are angry when the prosecution obtains information against jurors from the police and security agencies.
∴ jury vetting is happened.

Law and order campaigners

- consider challenges an attempt to get rid of anyone who looks 'respectable'
- juries deliberate in secret and are not allowed to disclose what happened, even afterwards.
- Interesting comparisons have been made
→ between jury verdicts and the opinions of the judge and other court officials in particular cases.
- In some countries, judges are allowed to accept a majority verdict
→ Reason: police fear that individual jurors may be threatened or 'bribed' by criminals.

There: Some of its limitations

- Disagreement in choosing suitable juries at random by computer.
- Research: women and immigrants of all nationalities are still under-represented.
- Young jurors lack a proper understanding of crime.
- Modern juries are sometimes ignorant
 - no educational qualification
- ∴ may include both the irresponsible & the inadequate.

Reference

- Q. The ways of jury system protects innocent people?
- A. Free of prejudice. ✓
 - injury that may or does arise from some action or judgement.
 - example, in USA, the defence is allowed to question potential jurors freely about their beliefs.
 - B. Campaign which organise by law + order
 - for those who looks 'respectable', particularly where the defendant is black, working-class or politically committed to the far left. so?
 - C. Isolated from other influence. X
 - Jurors deliberate in secret and are not allowed to disclose what happens. 207
- Q. The limitations of jury system to protect innocent people.
- A. Jury vetting
 - Jurors are angry when they obtains information against jurors from the police and security agencies.
 - Especially cases involving political hostility to the established order.
 - B. Interesting comparison X
 - A small percentage of disagreement between the jury verdicts and the judge and other court officials may mean that innocent people are being convicted.

APPENDIX H

Samples of Students' Detailed Outlines After Discussion on the Passage,
"The Jury"

High Proficiency Student - Ming Han

Average Proficiency Student - Mei Chen

Low Proficiency Student - Michelle Liew

$$\frac{781}{m=2}$$

$$\frac{782}{m=2}$$

$$mi=5$$

$$mi=6$$

TOPIC: The Jury - Citizen's Friend?

INTRODUCTION

- Definition of jury - A group of ordinary men and women called upon to decide on the innocence or guilt of the accused.
- The purpose of trial by jury: - To give the community some power over the law.

CONTENT

THESIS 1: Ways the jury system protect innocent people:

1. Society: Representative of a cross-section of society
 - a) prevents abuse of power by investing power in a group of people instead of just one.
 - b) The community retains some power over the law.
2. Free from prejudice: a) potential jurors are questioned to ferret out prejudiced jurors.
3. Secret deliberations: a) no possibility of outside influence
 b) safety of jurors assured.
 c) general consensus among the jury, judge and court officials.

THESIS 2: The limitations of the jury system

1. Under-representation - a) women and immigrants are under-represented.
 b) jurors are chosen ^{at} random by computer.
 - no distinctions are made between race and gender, causing ^{the} possibility of a male majority jury.
2. Young jurors - a) lack a proper understanding of crime.
 b) no educational qualification
 c) may be irresponsible and inadequate.

3. Majority verdict:- Disagreement among jurors, judge and court officials may mean that some innocent people are wrongly convicted.

CONCLUSION

- The jury system has lasted 800 years, — testimony of its reliability. It should be refined so as to remove loopholes and problems.

Name: Mei Chen Group U Roll no: 30632

FS1
M=2
roll=5

FS2
M=2
roll=7

ESL

Info Domain

DATE 26/2/97

NO.

Thesis 1: Ways the jury system protects innocent people.

Representative of the society

- In trial by jury, a group which is made up from the members of public is called upon to decide whether or not the person accused is guilty.

→ the decision is made by many. ^{It is impartial that} the community will retain power over the law.

Free of prejudice

- Jurors should be free of prejudice as in some countries particularly the USA, the defence is allowed to question potential jurors freely about their beliefs.

∴ If found prejudice, it will be rejected.

- Law and order campaigners often try to get rid of anyone who looks 'respectable': - black, working class or politically committed to the far left because they are usually the one who convict crime.

→ The campaigners do not want to be 'influenced' by their outlook.

Deliberation of secret

- Jurors are neutral and are not influenced by outsiders.

- Individual jurors will be protected from harm by criminal

- because of the majority verdict are allowed to accept, juries are easy to convict.

Thesis 2: The Limitations

Under representative

- women and immigrants of all nationalities are still under-represented because the members of juries are chosen at random by the court which it does not distinguish the gender, race etc.

Young jurors

- young jurors lack a proper understanding of crime, no educational qualification, irresponsible and inadequate.

Jury Vetting

- Juries deliberate in secret and are not allowed to let other people know ^{what happened} so that the decision they have made may not be influenced by outsiders.
- Prosecution obtains information against jurors from the police and security agencies might happen mail

Disagreement with verdict

- comparisons between jury verdicts and the opinions of the judge and other court officials
- ∴ disagreement occurs - even a small percentage of disagreement may mean that innocent people are being convicted.

The Jury - Citizen Friend?

Reference

1. The ways of jury system protects innocent people.

① Jury is made up by cross-section society. ✓

- to retain some power over the law so that it cannot be used unjustly.

② Free of prejudice ✓

- Jury should be representative and free of prejudice.

Example: In USA, the defence is allowed to question potential jurors freely about their beliefs but many are rejected. ✓

- law and order campaigners get rid of anyone who looks 'respectable', particularly when the defendant is black, working-class or politically committed to the far left.

③ Jurors deliberate secretly

↳ No outsider influence

- small percentage of disagreement may mean that innocent people are being convicted.

- accept majority verdict to ensure individual jurors not be threatened or bullied.

2. Some of the jury system limitations.

④ Under represented ✓

- women and immigrants are still under represented.

- because it is chosen by the computer. ✓

⑤ Lack of proper understanding ✓

- no educational qualification.

- irresponsible and inadequate.

⑥ Jury vetting

- jurors are angry when the prosecution obtains information against jurors from the police and security agencies.

- cases involving political hostility to the established order.

- jurors may make the decision partially.

Unanimous Verdict

percentage of disagreement may mean that innocent people are being convicted.
opt a majority verdicts so that easier for them to convict.

APPENDIX I

Samples of Students' Detailed Outlines Before Discussion on the Passage,
"Pharmaceutical Products"

High Proficiency Student - Joo Yin

Average Proficiency Student - Li Shan

Low Proficiency Student - Ann Lay

$\frac{181}{11} = 16$	$\frac{182}{11} = 16$
$11 \times 1 = 11$	$11 \times 6 = 66$

Detailed outlineIntroduction :- Drugs are now being used commonly

- Pill popping is now a way of life for better health

Thesis 1 :- The importance of pharmaceutical products in improving our livesWonders of drugs

- vaccinations for diseases such as smallpox
- antibiotics to cure patients
- Oral rehydration salts (ORS), a cheap & simple mixture of water, sugar and salt to cure diarrhoea. Could have prevented 3.5 million of those deaths

Thesis 2 :- Pharmaceutical products, the guarantee of good health

1) No because -

2) Poverty

- most important cause of ill-health.
- malnutrition being the direct cause of 6% of deaths of children under 5
- contributed to 57% of all child deaths.
- simple childhood diseases become fatal due to poverty.

3) The need for a better standard of living

- water related infections reduced \Rightarrow efficient sewage disposal, clean tap water and safe milk
- airborne infections such as tuberculosis reduced \Rightarrow better housing
- a better supply of good food

Informational Domain:

The importance about pharmaceutical products that have been improving our lives.

Antibiotics.

- The wonder drug was a better standard of living.
- Water related infections were reduced by efficient sewage disposal, clean tap water and safe milk.
- Airborne infections like tuberculosis were reduced by better housing.
- A supply of good food.
- Smallpox vaccinations.

The belief in a medical cure.

- It is held by the weak, the poor and the infirm from Chicago and Calcutta.
- They can afford a little for medicine.
- The discovery of by-products of petroleum refinement could be used to manufacture synthetic chemicals and drugs.

Do they guarantee for good health?Oral rehydration salts (ORS).

- a cheap and simple mixture of water, sugar and salt.
- treatment for diarrhoea
- 5 million children die from diarrhoea every year.
- 3.5 million of those death would have been preventable by these salts.



Taylor's College

1, Jalan SS 15/8, 47500 Subang Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. Tel: 03-7340933

$$\begin{array}{l} T.S 1 \\ m=0 \\ w=0 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} T.S 2 \\ m=1 \\ w=2 \end{array}$$

NAME: Ann Lay

STUDENT NO: _____

SUBJECT: ESL

DATE: 19/3/17

How important have pharmaceutical products been in improving our lives and can they be a guarantee of good health?

Thesis 1: How important have pharmaceutical products been in improving our lives?

Introduction:

Health is priceless. Life can be hardly worth living without pharmaceutical products been in improving our lives.

1) Improvements in social conditions.

- Drug was a better standard of living.

- Water-related infections were reduced by efficient sewage disposal, clean tap water and safe milk.

- Airborne infections like tuberculosis were reduced by better housing.

- Underpinning all this was a better supply of good food.

- Disease and death in the not too distant past was strikingly similar to that in today's underdeveloped world points out.

2) Reason for good health.

- Hope and anxiety make you vulnerable to persuasion about a medicine's good effects.

- Modern drugs are a blessing, one of the main reasons for the good health we enjoy in the industrialised world.

Thesis II: They can~~X~~ be a guarantee of good health.

1) poverty cause of ill health ✓

- malnutrition has been the direct cause of death of children under five in the Third world and contributed all child deaths. ✓

- simple childhood diseases become fatal due to poverty. ✓

2) malnutrition X

- pharmacology become integral to the curriculum, medicine an indispensable tool of the doctor. X

- Doctors are reluctant to use oral rehydration salts, a cheap and simple mixture of water sugar and salt. X

- Those deaths would have been preventable by these salts.

conclusion:

Life can be hardly worth living without pharmaceutical products been in improving our lives and modern or wonder drug was a better standard of living.

APPENDIX J

Samples of Students' Detailed Outlines After Discussion on the Passage,
"Pharmaceutical Products"

High Proficiency Student - Joo Yin

Average Proficiency Student - Li Shan

Low Proficiency Student - Ann Lay

$$\begin{array}{r} 781 \\ 11 \overline{) 11} \\ 11 \\ \hline 00 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 11 \overline{) 3} \\ 11 \\ \hline 00 \end{array}$$
Detailed Outline

Introduction :- pharmaceutical products have been believed to be the only reason for the good health we enjoy.

- no longer so, merely a belief that doctors instill in our minds

Content :-

Thesis 1 :- The importance of pharmaceutical products is improving our lives

Importance of pharmaceutical products among the poor

- belief that medicine is the only cure
- they can do little to change their living condition, so their only hope is medicine to cure their ailments.
- do not know that medicine is useful only to a certain extent as they can hardly afford it.

The public's opinion on pharmaceutical products

- by-products of petroleum refinement could be used to manufacture synthetic chemicals and drugs
- foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation donated massive sums of money to guide medical education
- pharmacology became integral to the curriculum, medicine an indispensable tool
- all these lead the public to think that medicine can do wonders.

The ability of pharmaceutical products

- the invention of smallpox vaccination
- the usage of antibiotics

Thesis 2:- Pharmaceutical products cannot guarantee good health

a) Most important cause of ill-health is poverty

- malnutrition: the direct cause of 6 percent of deaths of children under five
- contributed to 57 percent of all child deaths
- childhood diseases become fatal due to poverty

b) Better standard of living

- a better standard of living guarantees good health
- water related infections were reduced by efficient sewage disposal, clean tap and safe milk.
- airborne infections like tuberculosis were reduced by better housing
- a better supply of good food.
- decent living conditions lie at the basis of Western health.

c) The usage of non-pharmaceutical products

- non-pharmaceutical products have proven to be more effective than pharmaceutical products
- Oral rehydration salts (ORS) a cheap and simple mixture of water, sugar salt, is able to cure diarrhoea.
- ORS is capable of preventing 3.5 million deaths related to diarrhoea
- unfortunately doctors are not equipped with non-pharmaceutical knowledge.

Conclusion:- it is undeniable that pharmaceutical products do help to maintain good health. Unfortunately not everybody can afford it. Most importantly is better living conditions and the eradication of poverty.

$$\begin{array}{r} 751 \\ \hline m=0 \\ m_i=5 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 752 \\ \hline m=3 \\ m_i=7 \end{array}$$

informational domain.

Pharmaceutical products not The only answer.

That importance about pharmaceutical products being improving our lives.

Introduction:

- Definition of pharmaceutical products.
- Nowadays, pharmaceutical products is said to be improving our lives. But how effective is it, it is still a question in mind.

Content

a) better standard of living.

- ~~Water related infections were reduced by efficient sewage disposal, clean tap water and safe milk.~~
- ~~A better housing can reduce airborne infections such as tuberculosis.~~
- ~~A better supply of good food.~~

a) The belief in medical cure.

- The weak and poor beliefs in medical cure.
- The reason is they can't do anything to change their living conditions.
- But they can still afford a little to get medicine.

b) The discovery of by-products of petroleum refinement.

- It is used to manufacture synthetic chemicals and drugs.
- Rockefeller Foundation has donated a massive sum of money to guide medical education.
- Pharmacology became integral to the curriculum, medicine an indispensable tool of the doctor.

c) usefulness of antibiotics.

- Act as a smallpox vaccination

Informational Domain

Can pharmaceutical products, a guarantee of good health?

Pharmaceutical products don't guarantee a good health.

a) Improvements in social conditions.

- Disease and death was striking today's underdeveloped world'

- So, standard of living have to be improve.

→ water-related infections have to be reduced by efficient sewage disposal, clean tap water and safe milk.

→ A better housing to reduce airborne infections such as tuberculosis.

→ A supply of good food to improve the condition.

b) Poverty.

- The most important cause of ill-health is poverty

- Malnutrition has been a direct cause of 6.7% of deaths of children under five in the 3rd world, contributes to 57% of all child deaths.

c) The use of oral rehydration salts (ORS).

- Bangladeshi doctors do not have lectures on the appropriate non-pharmaceutical treatment for diarrhoea.

- Doctors reluctant to use ORS. even though it is cheap and simple mixture of water, sugar and salt, even though 3.5 million of those death would have been preventable by these salts.



Taylor's College

1, Jalan SS 15/8, 47500 Subang Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. Tel: 03-7340933

$$\frac{TS1}{m=0} \\ n=3$$

$$\frac{TS2}{m:0} \\ n=4$$

NAME: Tan Ann Lay

STUDENT NO: 30299

SUBJECT: ESL

DATE: 2013/97

INFORMATIONAL DOMAIN

How important have pharmaceutical products been in improving our lives, and can they be a guarantee of good health?

Thesis I: How important have pharmaceutical products been in improving our lives.

Introduction

Life is priceless. Hope and anxiety make you vulnerable to persuasion about a medicine's good effects and no more precious commodity than health.

1) Improvements in social conditions. X

a) The wonder drug was a better standard of living.

b) antibiotics have been useful and decent living conditions certainly.

c) The belief in a medical cure is held by the weak, the poor and the infirm.

d) For they can do little to change their living conditions, medicine at a pinch, they might afford.

2) Became integral to curriculum

Thesis II: They do not be a guarantee of some health and medicine

a) other alternative

a) indispensable tool of the d

a) infection reduced

- Rockefeller foundation donat

- efficient sewage disposal

1. massive sums of money to

- clean tap water

guide medical education.

- soft milk

b) Airborn infection reduced

- better housing

- better supply of food

c) oral rehydration salts (ORS)

- mixture of water, sugar and salt

2) The poor do little change in their living conditions

- cannot afford enough medicine

Conclusion

and at horizon... with these salts like oral rehydration salts (ORS)