CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the methodology of this study was delineated and justified. Merriam (2009) states 'there is no standard format for reporting qualitative research. Diversity in style of reporting has characterized qualitative research over the years and is even more experimental today' (p. 245). So, reporting the analysis of the two experiments will be in accordance with the methodology chosen. For this study, the most suited layout to report the findings of this study would be to follow the primary objectives of the study, i.e. to compare TPR and OIR modes for quality of argumentative content and target vocabulary usage. For an unambiguous analysis of the data, the chapter will be divided into the following sub-sections. The first sub-section provides the TPR findings of the content analysis and vocabulary of Experiment 1 and Experiment 2, followed by the IOR content analysis and vocabulary findings of both the experiments conducted. The content analysis findings are supported by examples from the authentic data whilst the quantitative vocabulary data will be presented in tabular form. Finally, findings of both experiments will be collated, analyzed and supported with an in-depth discussion.

4.2. TPR Findings

4.2.1 Content Analysis Findings of Experiment 1

To recapitulate, in this first experiment two groups of participants were given the same reading materials on the topic of prisons and requested to write an argumentative essay. The quality of the argumentative content of these essays was graded using the modified argumentative rubric (Appendix 2) consisting of the following categories: Thesis, Support and Counter-arguments.

4.2.1.1 TPR: Thesis statement

The analysis of the argumentative essays began with the Thesis statements. The thesis statement in an academic essay usually comes at the end of the introduction. It summarizes what the entire essay is about. It contains the topic and the controlling idea for the whole essay. The topic is the theme or subject matter of the essay. The controlling idea defines the purpose of the essay and sets the direction' (Davis and Liss, 2006, p. 8). However, it can be written using two methods: a general thesis statement or a thesis statement with controlling ideas. A general thesis statement and thesis with controlling ideas would be for instance as below:

General thesis statement:

Reading is beneficial for various reasons.

Thesis with controlling ideas

Reading is beneficial as it enables a person to improve their language proficiency, relax and use their time productively.

Therefore, both of the examples above constitute a thesis statement as they both contain a main idea of the essay and clearly indicate the direction of the essay.

As an overall finding, it was discovered that although a majority of the respondents were able to write 'good' thesis statements in their argumentative essays, a number of participants faced difficulty formulating a thesis and organizing it in an orderly manner to aid their essay, and as such many had 'Average' and 'Poor' thesis statements. See Table 4.1 on the next page for a breakdown of the findings.

Table 4.1: TPR: Experiment 1: Thesis: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	15	65%
Average	6	26%
Poor	2	9%
Total	$n = 23$	

Findings of the 23 participants ($n = 23$) who wrote their essays after reading the text from the traditional print reading mode indicated that 65% of the participants were capable of writing 'Good' thesis statements for their essays. The participants in this group were able to develop an unambiguous statement stating their claim on the topic and including either a general thesis statement or a thesis with controlling ideas and positioned the thesis at the end of the introductory paragraph.

The next category of the rubric scale is coded 'Average' and from the analysis we can conclude that 26% of the data consisted of 'average' quality thesis statements. Generally the thesis was not in a single statement but jumbled and disorganized over various sentences and phrases. It was also found that these thesis statements were stated in the introductory paragraph and also repeated in the body paragraphs of the essay.

The subsequent category along the scale was deemed 'Poor' and this was the lowest and weakest level of writing, which means there was no thesis present or is out of topic. It was generally discovered that 9% of the respondents fell into this group and that they had weak content and no main idea of the topic. This category mainly consisted of writing which had no thesis and the respondents wrote Introductions without a thesis statement anywhere and were generally off topic. The beginnings of the essays in this category were written in an informal style and used personal experiences in the introduction.

Illustrations of the three categories can be found in Table 4.2 below, which includes quality, respondent's code and excerpts of essays. (Note that student mistakes have not been corrected); for more samples of these different categories, see also Appendix 5, 6 and 7 respectively.

Table 4.2: TPR: Experiment 1: Examples of Thesis statements

Quality	Examples:
Good	STXM: Despite the true fact that prisons do strike fear into the hearts of many, abandoned prisons make a good tourist attraction as it does bring some educational and experience values, as well as providing a source of income for the country. JMTT: In my opinion, abandoned prisons should turned into a tourist attraction.
Average	LXY: However the questions that should prisons be turned into tourist attractions are remain unanswered. MS: For this reason, different people have different opinions on what to do with these prisons.
Poor	TOT: Recently Malaysia's Pudu jail – once set a record of the longest mural in the world, Pudu jail's wall has been struck down for further modernization in road widening. ATA: I recall when I was in my high school, will all visited the prisons just to have an ides of how it looks like, before that visit, I have not idea of what a prisons is all about, but after visited the prisons I have know how or what it does to people whose commit crime, every sine I have fear in me so not to go into the prisons world.

4.2.1.2 TPR: Support

The bulk of an essay is in the support of points which in turn support the thesis. Similarly, in the rubric, the criterion for 'Good' support is when points clearly support the thesis and the writer is aware of the exact kind of support to provide. Therefore, parts of the essay have been considered to be 'support', firstly when they support the thesis statement developed in the Introduction and secondly, when they provide supporting details which support the main idea within the body paragraphs. Table 4.3 below, illustrates the breakdown of the participants' essays in terms of the quality of the support.

Table 4.3: Experiment 1: Support: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	20	87%
Average	0	0%
Poor	3	13%
Total	$n = 23$	

As can be seen from the table above, a majority of respondents were capable of writing points and providing details in their argumentative essays to clearly support the main ideas. A total of 87% wrote 'good' support for their essays and none had 'Average' support for their argumentative essays. All the respondents were clear with regards to the importance of support in an essay and therefore, no one fell into the 'Average' category. Nevertheless, there were 13% of the respondents who wrote 'Poor' support for their essays. Clearly, this group wrote out of topic (see the two 'poor' participants in Table 4.1) and the one person who failed to support the thesis or main points of their essay and thus lacked proof. Examples of these support elements are given below in Table 4.4 on the next page and in Appendices 7 and 8.

Table 4.4: TPR: Experiment 1: Examples of Support

Quality	Examples
Good	JJC: On the other hand, converting old jails into tourist attractions would also help boost the economy. One fine example would be the infamous Alcatraz Prison on Alcatraz Island in San Francisco, California. Although the United States government has spent millions promoting, preserving and maintaining the prison complex, hundreds of thousands of visitors come to the prison yearly bringing currency into the country. The attraction can also host educational trips for schools and other educational organizations. Turning an old jail into a tourist attraction requires much less capital than bull-dozing it down and building an entirely new shopping mall or sky scrapper on top of it. Demolishing and then constructing a new shopping mall or structure in the heart of any commercial area would just add more problems rather than solving any. LQL: Furthermore, tourists can learn about criminals in these prisons. For example, some of the America's best known and most dangerous criminals were housed in Alcatraz. They can learn that these criminals were securely incarcerated in a no-privilege and no-escape prison so that understand more about how was the life in prison. Tourists can also learn about the histories of these well-known criminals and the reasons that they went into jail
Poor	TOT: *Thesis*: Recently Malaysia's Pudu jail – once set a record of the longest mural in the world, Pudu jail's wall has been struck down for further modernization in road widening. *Support:* Prisons can also be turned into tourist attraction… ATA: *Thesis*: … Every sine I have fear in me so not to go into the prisons world. *Support*: Although making it a place for tourist attraction make the people in the prisons fell bad because peoples all over the world come and look at them, that can make them not to change their bad behavioral knowing that if them keep on committing crime all the government can do is to show their to the public in making the prisons a turned attractions.

In summary the data allow us to conclude that a large majority is aware of the importance of supporting details in an argumentative essay and is capable of supporting their thesis and main points.

4.2.1.3. TPR : Counter-arguments

Counter–arguments, refutations and concessions are an essential component of an argumentative essay and they set the argumentative essay apart from other genres of academic essay writing. Davis and Liss (2006) explain that,

> 'the counter-argument is the writer's opinion about the opposing point of view. It gives reasons why the writer's point of view makes sense. By including the counter-argument, the writer shows an understanding of the opposing point of view' (p. 100).

Thus, counter-arguments are crucial in writing persuasive and effective argumentative essays, whereby this element reflects the writer's composition skills and more importantly their critical and mature thought processes. The data show that a majority of the respondents were able to include some form of counter-arguments; a modest number did not incorporate this aspect of argumentative essay writing into their essays. The total number of respondents and the categories they belong to can be seen in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: TPR: Experiment 1: Counter-arguments: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	9	39%
Average	5	22%
Poor	9	39%
Total	$n = 23$	

39% of the respondents scored 'Good' as they were able to take a more general perspective and consider potential counter-arguments. For some illustrations of this category, see Table 4.6 on page 64 and Appendices 8 and 9: it is evident that the opposing

points are taken into consideration and that an effective rebuttal of the counter-argument is presented.

A smaller percentage of respondents, 22% were able to write some counter-examples, but missed the more obvious ones whilst their responses were non-existent or mere claims of refutation. These essays were categorized as scoring 'Average'. As seen in Appendix 7, counter-arguments in this category were found to lack depth and were merely stating the apparent.

An equally large percentage of respondents, totaling 39% belonged to the category 'Poor'. The counter-arguments written by this group were seen to be deficient in any form of argumentation and their points mainly consisted of facts and thus emerged as one-sided essays. These essays did not reflect an argumentative essay, but had a factual nature, in terms of content and structure, and as a result were deemed of 'Poor' quality as defined in our rubric (see also the samples in Appendix 9).

Table 4.6: TPR: Experiment 1: Examples of counter-arguments

Quality	Examples
Good	LXY: A few naysayers had argued that prisons are worthless to visit as it can gain us no knowledge. However it is absolutely untrue, we can all learn from the prisoners that committing crime isn't a wise thing to do. JJC: Some exceedingly optimistic individuals assert that demolishing old jails to make way for development would help boost the nation's economy. On the other hand, converting old jails into tourist attractions would also help boost the economy.
Average	NSL: Sometime it is because of government management that do not consider about the function of prison as a tourist attraction. The income of the prison is not enough to cover the operation costs; it ends up as a memory in some people minds. TOT: The tourist may want to see the art of the wall drawn. Therefore, it could dramatically increase the tourism rate in one's country.
Poor	A: Prisons in the past tell many historical stories about a country. It contains stories on how the prison was built, why it was built, procedures run by the officers, how and why famous inmates were brought to prison, weapons, escape plans and many more. These stories in the past let us know what was going on in our country back in those early days LQL: Tourist can learn about the punishments in the prisons. Punishments like hang up, fire shooting, injection and others should be perform for the tourists so that they can know what those punishments do and what crimes that can lead to these punishments. Moreover, by visiting these prisons we can learn more about the rules and laws in prisons. Different countries have different rules and regulations.

To conclude, a majority of the respondents were able to come up with some good counter-arguments but an equal percentage of the respondents did not incorporate this aspect of argumentative essay writing into their essays at all. A small number finds itself writing 'average' counter-arguments.

4.2.2 Content Analysis Findings of Experiment 2

Experiment 2 had 23 respondents ($n = 23$); the same methodology was used. As in Experiment 1, they were instructed to write an argumentative essay but on a different topic (see Section 3.4.2). Below is the breakdown of the data according to the rubric (Appendix 2) and presented in the same order as in Section 4.2 above.

4.2.2.1. Thesis statement

The thesis statement for Experiment 2 was also tabulated in accordance to the criterion in Experiment 1. Table 4.7 below gives a detailed breakdown of the quality of the thesis statements for this group of respondents.

Table 4.7: TPR: Experiment 2: Thesis statement: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	22	96%
Average	1	4%
Poor	0	0%
Total	$n = 23$	

From the table above, it is evident that 22 of the respondents were capable of writing unambiguous and precise thesis statements. One respondent was unable to construct a clear thesis statement and the introductory paragraph was somewhat convoluted: the essay was therefore placed in the 'Average' quality category. All the respondents were able to formulate some sort of claim. The examples of these thesis statements are listed in Table 4.8, on the following page.

Table 4.8: TPR: Experiment 2 : Examples of thesis statements

Quality	Examples
Good	IA: Although some may insist that imprisonment for offense is not enough to avoid crime itself, confinement of lawbreakers should definitely be mete out because it effectively deters crime by inflicting penalty, keeping the prisoners away from society and apply treatments for them.
Average	SS: Despite having a reputation of being the safest method in deterring crime, many people believe that imprisonment does not play a big role in rehabilitating a criminal. Since then, one idea that is often debated is whether imprisonment deters crime. Though many may argue its existence, imprisonment definitely plays a big role in creating a world of law-abiding citizens.

The data gathered indicated that overall, 96% of the respondents were capable and were knowledgeable on the importance of the thesis statement in an essay and were able to write clear thesis statements.

4.2.2.2 Support

Support makes up the main bulk of an essay. The data reveal that a majority of the respondents were able to support their thesis and/or their main points with relevant support. Table 4.9 breaks down the overall findings in terms of the quality of the support provided by this group.

Table 4.9: TPR: Experiment 2: Support: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	19	83%
Poor	4	17%
Total	$n = 23$	

From the table above, it is evident that the respondents were either able or unable to provide sufficient support for the thesis and main points and therefore, no respondents fell into the 'Average' quality category. On the whole, 83% of the respondents supported parts of their essays well, while 17% provided false supporting points or no support at all. Table 4.10 below includes exemplars of these supports.

Table 4.10: TPR: Experiment 2 : Examples of support

Quality	Examples
Good	KA: Furthermore, socio-economic problems in the world outside prison also weaken the capability of the prison system as crime deterrence. When faced with such a crippling recession that jobs are virtually impossible to get and yet the price of living continues to rise, criminals often turn to crime and gang activities for "employment".
Poor	LCZA: Due to many reports that inmates die in the prison due to malnutrition….. This arises the question, how is it even possible for inmates to get malnutrition? Though fighting do occur once in a while, the management tries their best to keep the inmates occupied.

As can be seen, the differentiation between 'Good' and "Poor' quality of support is clear-cut. The 'poor support' example also shows that with weak support, the points and main content of the essay are incoherent and confuse the reader.

4.2.2.3 Counter-argument

Counter-arguments are the core of argumentative essays. Table 4.11, gives a detailed breakdown of the total number of respondents according to the quality of their counter-arguments.

Table 4.11: TPR: Experiment 2: Counter-arguments: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	11	48%
Average	3	13%
Poor	9	39%
Total	$n = 23$	

We can conclude that, almost half of the respondents, 48% had written strong counter-arguments and counter-examples. However, 13% had 'Average' quality counter-arguments as they merely stated the refutation and did not provide sufficient responses. Finally, 39% of the respondents did not include any counter-arguments in their essays as seen below in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: TPR: Experiment 2 : Examples of counter-arguments

Quality	Examples
Good	HAM: Some opponents think that prisons are the places where only bad people are gathered and can make the criminals worse, but prisons can really change people's personality.
Average	WKS:… opponents feel that only after being locked in the prison and punished, they understand crime is an immorality action. However, others feel, there is no any temptation in prison.
Poor	LIS: Imprisonment is not the solution since there are people who always imitate the famous people such as actor, actress, comedians, and even notorious criminals. For instance, there are many people who killed themselves followed by a few celebrities. In this sense, it is potential that someone will imitate the exact same thing that serial criminals did.

4.2.3 Summary of Content Analysis of TPR Findings

To conclude it is clear that the findings from Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 point in the same direction in that in both experiments, the majority of the respondents have high-quality thesis statements and support, and that for both, only a small number of the respondents develop good quality counter-arguments.

4.2.4 Vocabulary Profiler Findings :Experiment 1 : TPR

The essays of all the respondents from Experiment 1 ($n = 23$) were combined and evaluated using the online www.lextutor.ca/vp/eng Web V3 classic. The online software enables one to generate a thorough breakdown of the textual data to evaluate vocabulary use and frequency of occurrence of certain target words. The data is divided into K1, K2 and Academic Word List (AWL) words drawn up by Coxhead (2000): K1 words are the most frequent one thousand words, K2 are the next one thousand most common words, and so on and so forth. Additionally, AWL is made up of the most frequent words from families of words which are commonly used in general academic writing and these range from 570 headwords to 3,000 words altogether. Using this classification, it will be easier to identify the level of difficulty of the words used from the traditional print reading mode and clearly gauge the respondents' receptiveness towards the use of the words from the specific target vocabulary list (Appendix 3). The vocabulary evaluation of the combined essays from Experiment 1 is shown in Table 4.13 on the following page. For a sample essay of this group, refer to Appendix 10.

Table 4.13: TPR: Experiment 1: Vocabulary Profiler Findings

Words	Families	Types	Tokens	Percentage
K1 words (1-1000)	479	763	6855	78.84%
K2 words (1001-2000)	121	172	985	11.33%
1k + 2k	…	…	…	90.17%
AWL words	135	180	404	4.65

From the data above, it is evident that a majority of 78.84% of the vocabulary used in the essay was of KI word level and only 11.33% consists of K2 level words. It can also be noticed that only 4.65% of the words used in this TPR group consist of AWL words. The total of K1 and K2 words used are 90.17%. It must be noted that these percentages may not add to 100% as the essays consist of off-list words too, which does not appear in the tabulation. A breakdown of the total words used in the essays of this group is given Table 4.14, which is on the proceeding page.

Table 4.14: TPR: Experiment 1: Overall Target Vocabulary Findings

TYPE	TOKEN TOTAL
1. prison	261
2. tourist attraction	97
3. criminal	21
4. Alcatraz	8
5. island	5
6. escape	5
7. infamous	3
8. military fort	3
9. Rock	2
10. convict	2
11. secure	2
12. Al Capone	2
13. dormant	2
14. war	1
15. defend	-
16. penitentiary	-
17. high-profile	-
18. notorious	-
19. birdman of Alcatraz	-
20. incarcerate	-
TOTAL:	413

Table 4.14 above, provides a clear overview of the words used in the TPR respondents' essays based on target vocabulary list complied (Appendix 3). From the data reported in the table above, the types of 'prison' and 'tourist attraction' comprising 'prisons', 'imprisonment' and 'tourist attractions' were used the highest number of times in the essays and with a much small number of occurrences for words related to the input text such as 'Rock', 'Alcatraz', 'Al Capone' and 'island'. Therefore, in total 14 word types from the target vocabulary list were used repetitively adding up to 413 words out of 1,369 tokens for this group of essays.

4.2.5 Vocabulary Profiler Findings : TPR Experiment 2

Experiment 2 consisted of 23 respondents ($n = 23$) as well and the vocabulary used in the essays collected was tabulated using the same method as in Section 4.2.4.1 above. The breakdown of the findings is as in Table 4.15 below:

Table 4.15: TPR: Experiment 2: Vocabulary Profiler Findings

Words	Families	Types	Tokens	Percentage
K1 words (1-1000)	527	854	6784	76.46%
K2 words (1001-2000)	156	218	818	9.22%
1k + 2k	…	…	…	85.68%
AWL words	186	246	486	5.48%

The overall findings for this group show a similar breakdown of vocabulary use to the one in Experiment 1. Again, as in the preceding section, a large majority of the vocabulary consists of K1 words totaling 76.46% and K2 words with a much smaller percentage of 9.22%. A detailed list of the vocabulary incorporated in the essays from the specific target vocabulary is given in Table 4.16 on the proceeding page:

Table 4.16: TPR: Experiment 2: Overall Target Vocabulary Findings

TYPE	TOKEN TOTAL
1. prison	138
2. convict	49
3. inmate	34
4. law	28
5. offender	15
6. cell	13
7. behavior	7
8. educational activities	4
9. violent	3
10. dangerous	3
11. maximum security	2
12. incarcerated	2
13. notorious	1
14. penitentiary	1
15. warden	1
16. handcuffs	1
17. leg irons	1
18. secure	-
19. escape proof	-
20. correctional officer	-
21. necessities	-
22. control	-
23. disruptive	-
24. nominal wage	-
25. release	-
TOTAL	303

Table 4.16 above provides a comprehensive list of the target vocabulary used by the TPR mode group in Experiment 2. From the table above, it can be noted that types like 'prison' and 'convict' (i.e. both words as well as 'prisons', 'imprisoned', convicts' and 'convicted') were used more frequently compared to 'cell', 'offenders' and 'behavior'. Apparently, this group was not very receptive to these words from the input text and did not use them a lot in their essays. The 25 types from the target list yielded only a total of 303 tokens out of a grand total of 1,646 words.

4.2.6 Summary of Vocabulary Profiler Findings of TRP groups

The vocabulary data from Experiments 1 and 2 show parallel findings; the respondents were not strongly inclined towards using the thematic vocabulary from the text to write their argumentative essays. Additionally, it was noted that respondents generally depended on their existing vocabulary, which, it can be assumed, they were more comfortable and familiar with.

4.3 IOR Findings

4.3.1. Content Analysis Findings of Experiment 1

4.3.1.1 IOR: Thesis statement

A total of 22 participants ($n = 22$) read the same text online via the Internet. In Section 4.2.1.1 above, the content analysis findings for the IOR group started with the thesis statement. The respondents in this group were all, i.e. 100%, able to write a 'Good' thesis statement. The table below, Table 4.17 indicates the respondents' quality of thesis statement according to the scale adopted in this study.

Table 4.17: IOR: Experiment 1: Thesis statement: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	22	100%
Average	0	0%
Poor	0	0%
Total	$n = 22$	

All the thesis statements were clear in their claim and were written in a well structured and organized manner which did not need to be reformulated in any way again. Examples of these can be viewed in Table 4.18 below.

Table 4.18: IOR: Experiment 1 : Examples of thesis statements

Quality	Examples
Good	MR: Although old abundant prisons are aged buildings, I believe that it should be turned into a tourist attraction spot as it is not only educational but also has the potential to attract more foreigners to visit the country. IA: Even though people may perceive that disrespectful and insensitive tourists only come to gawk or indulge in sadism, prisons should be turned into tourist attractions as it can boost the tourism industry, and educate the people on crime, punishment and history.

4.3.1.2 Support

As explained in Section 4.2.1.2 earlier, support can be seen in two ways: namely either as supporting the main thesis or as supporting details to support the main points. The data from this online group indicated that a large portion of the respondents was able to write effective support in their essays and a few had support that was deemed 'Average'. However, there were no respondents who did not provide some sort of support for parts in their essay. Table 4.19 below shows the total respondents in this group and the quality of their support.

Table 4.19: IOR: Experiment 1: Support: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	18	82%
Average	4	18%
Poor	0	0%
Total	$n = 22$	

It was found that 82% of the argumentative essays were deemed 'Good' as they comprised well organized and effective support for the thesis and main points in the essays. Nonetheless, 18% of the support recorded were not directly related to the thesis or the main points and thus were viewed as 'Average'. Exemplars of these two qualities of support can be seen in Table 4.20 below.

Table 4.20: IOR: Experiment 1 : Examples of support

Quality	Examples
Good	NLA: Prominently, prisons which have existed for centuries certainly have interesting historical backgrounds which will definitely attract the tourists. The architecture of the building will reflect the period of time when it was built. Besides that, the history of the development of the prison is also related with the world history. For example, the history of the prison in Alcatraz Island began during the era of renaissance specifically when the Spanish invades the bay in 1775.
Average	MR: *Thesis* - Although old abundant prisons are aged buildings, I believe that it should be turned into a tourist attraction spot as it is not only educational but also has the potential to attract more foreigners to visit the country. *Support* - Although it is enjoyable to get out of class and explore, visiting the prisons would require the usage of money, time and transportation.

These examples clearly show the differences between the two qualities of support provided from the data. It is also obvious that the respondents are well aware of the importance of support in an essay.

4.3.1.3. Counter-argument

The final category which was analyzed was the counter-arguments. As established in Section 4.2.1.3, counter-arguments are the core of an argumentative essay. It was revealed that a majority of respondents were able to write well and also that they argued and defended their claims with counter-arguments; there were a minimal number of

respondents who were able to write some basic claims and also an average number of respondents who did not include any arguments or counter-arguments in their essays. Table 4.21 below shows a breakdown of the respondents according to the quality of the counter-argument provided.

Table 4.21: IOR: Experiment 1: Counter-argument: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	17	77%
Average	1	5%
Poor	4	18%
Total	$n = 22$	

As the table makes clear, 77% of the respondents incorporated counter-examples in their arguments. However, 5% of the respondents only wrote 'Average' counter-arguments and moreover 18% wrote 'Poor' counter-arguments, meaning that there were no opposing arguments and/or subsequent refutations and only factual information regarding the point that were made in the essay. Examples of these three categories can be found in Table 4.22 on the next page.

Table 4.22: IOR: Experiment 1 : Examples of counter-arguments

Quality	Examples
Good	IA: People may think that prison tourism has no advantages whatsoever and it only wastes money from maintaining the prisons and making renovations for tourist's convenience. On the contrary, making prisons into tourist attractions boosts the tourism industry. This is a great economic benefit, and visitors may even contribute financially to depressed areas
Average	TZX: People who want to tear down the derelict buildings indicate that turning the space into a mall or a plaza of shops would much better.
Poor	MR: Turning old prisons into a tourist attraction would also result in more foreigners coming to the country as it is a heritage building. This is also a good way of attracting tourist' to the country as the more tourists who comes to the country to visit the building would automatically increase the country's income. The building should have interesting sites so that when tourists give good feedbacks about the building it would also lift up the name and image of the country itself. This is a very good way to promote the culture of the country.

4.3.2 Experiment 2

4.3.2.1 Thesis statement

Data was compiled from 22 respondents ($n = 22$) in Experiment 2 and found that all the respondents in this group were able to make clear claims thus were able to write effective thesis statements. From the total respondents, 19 had "Good' thesis statements, while 3 were grouped into the 'Average' category of thesis statements. Table 4.23 on the following page, provides a comprehensible overall breakdown of the quality of thesis statements.

Table 4.23: IOR: Experiment 2: Thesis statement: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	19	86%
Average	3	14%
Poor	0	0%
Total	$n = 22$	

The data indicates that a majority of the respondents are fully attentive to the need, function and importance of incorporating thesis statements in an essay thus, 86% of the respondents wrote "Good' thesis statements, as seen below in Table 4.24, whereas none-, i.e. 0%, were in the "Poor' category of quality. In addition, it was noted that 14% of the respondents wrote "Average' thesis statements: they were not stated in one sentence but fragmented throughout the introductory paragraph and other parts of the essay. Refer to Appendix 11 and 12 for sample essays from this group.

Table 4.24: IOR: Experiment 2 : Examples of thesis statement

Quality	Examples
Good	STXM: While it is true that some of the inmates who were released from jail return to their previous life of combating law, a majority of inmates do turn over a new leaf after bring released from jail, as life in prison has deterred them from committing crimes due to the prison's equipment and procedures as well as the recreation provided.
Average	A: In prison, inmates are treated very poorly. The food being served are lousy, they only get to shower twice a day. But does this make the inmates less violent or more violent when they are released

4.3.2.2. Support

The analysis reveals that the bulk of the respondents provided sufficient support in their essays, thus being able to elaborate and support some main points. A breakdown of the quality of support for the whole group can be viewed in Table 4.25 below.

Table 4.25: IOR: Experiment 2: Support: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	21	95%
Average	1	5%
Poor	0	0%
Total	$n = 22$	

From the statistics, it is apparent that a majority of the respondents, totaling 95%, provided sufficient support for the thesis statements and for the main points presented in the body paragraphs. Although only 5% of the respondents provided 'Average' quality support, none had 'Poor' support. This is evidence that the respondents were capable of elaborating and including sufficient details to support the claims and main ideas they were developing. Examples of these qualities of support are seen in Table 4.26 on the proceeding page and further samples of these essays are in Appendix 12 and 13.

Table 4.26: IOR: Experiment 2 : Examples of support

Quality	Examples
Good	SK: Sending the guilty parties to a prison will teach them a lesson in one way or the other. It is said that a person discovers his soul in prison. He 'finds himself' in his stay in a prison. Imprisonment is one of the ways for redemption, where an offender can reflect back to whatever horrendous deeds he has done. He can look back at himself and realize his mistake he has done in his life. In one way, prison is like a purgatory. His soul gets purified and he/she can change him/herself. It is also a good way to make a criminal realize his responsibility towards his family and the ones he loves.
Average	A: *Thesis*: In prison, inmates are treated very poorly……. *Support:* …some inmates even prefer staying in prison then on the outside. On the outside, some of them are without houses, families or money therefore they wouldn't mind being in prison.

4.3.2.3. Counter-argument

The importance of counter-arguments in argumentative essays has been established earlier in this study. The data show that 12 respondents included 'Good' counter-arguments, 5 respondents had 'Average' quality and another 5 respondents' essays had either no or false counter-arguments and examples and did not give any consideration to opposing points. The breakdown of the respondents in terms of their counter-argumentation quality is provided in Table 4.27 on the following page.

Table 4.27: IOR: Experiment 2: Counter-argument: Number of respondents according to quality

Quality	Number of respondents	
Good	12	54%
Average	5	23%
Poor	5	23%
Total	$n = 22$	

In percentage figures, the tabulation indicates that a modest percentage of 54% had 'Good' counter-arguments, where obvious and not so obvious counter-examples, counter-arguments and/or opposition positions and/or provides thoughtful responses were included throughout the essay. However, 23% of the essays contained 'Average' quality counter-arguments and only offered mere negation of claims while a further 23% of 'Poor' essays were comprised of facts only and did not acknowledge or even suggest any opposing points. Examples of these varying qualities of counter-arguments are depicted in Table 4.28 on the next page and samples can be found in Appendices 14, 15 and 16.

Table 4.28: IOR: Experiment 2 : Examples of counter-arguments

Quality	Examples
Good	JJC: A majority of individuals believe that the government should dedicate more money in building more correctional facilities. However, the government would only end up spending hundreds of millions of tax-payers dollars in a futile hope to correct or reeducate the criminal. The money spent could be used to build more hospitals, schools, libraries and other educational and recreational facilities. Is it worth spending millions on feeding and housing a killer or robber who is never going to change?
Average	H: They will be locked up in the cell most of the time everyday rather than having freedom to walk around and get some fresh air outside the cell. However, only during certain time of the day inmates are allowed to spent their day at mandatory work programs, educational classes, and recreational activities.
Poor	TZW: Educational work which provide in prison give changes for prisoner to learn new knowledge and discipline them. Most of the crime maker does not well educated as they maybe suffer from financial problem or social problems like gambling, take drug and etc. As we all know, person who holding a high school certificate or primary school certificate cannot get a proper work in this century.

4.3.3 Summary of IOR Findings

On the whole, it is obvious from Experiments 1 and 2 that a vast majority of the respondents are able to write clear and effectively developed claims in the correct structure. Additionally the findings also reveal that a sizeable group of these respondents included adequate and coherent support for their thesis statements and main points. Nevertheless, only an average number of these respondents made counter-arguments to further solidify their arguments. All this indicates that the respondents are familiar and comfortable with the structure and organization of argumentative essays but still lack substantial ideas and are unable to foresee opposing points.

4.3.4 Vocabulary Profiler Findings: IOR: Experiment 1

The vocabulary used in the essays written in the IOR condition ($n = 22$) was classified using the online vocabulary profiler software. As reflected in Table 4.29 on the next page, the main finding is that the essays mainly consisted of vocabulary in the K1 and K2 levels and only to a lesser extent of AWL words.

Table 4.29: IOR: Experiment 1: Vocabulary Profiler Findings

Words	Families	Types	Tokens	Percentage
K1 words (1-1000)	497	756	6174	76.90%
K2 words (1001-2000)	125	174	885	11.02%
1k + 2k	…	…	…	87.92%
AWL words	145	192	421	5.24%

The percentages above indicate that a large majority of the vocabulary used in the essays of the 22 respondents consisted of K1 words, totaling 76.90%, while 11.02% of the vocabulary was of K2 level. Together, K1 and K2 words form a strong majority of 87.92%. These essays were further analyzed in terms of their usage of the topic-specific target vocabulary used in this study, as summarized in Table 4.30 on the following page.

Table 4.30: IOR: Experiment 1: Overall Target Vocabulary Findings

TYPE	TOKEN TOTAL
1. prison	302
2. tourist attraction	99
3. Alcatraz	43
4. criminal	28
5. island	21
6. high-profile	20
7. convict	18
8. infamous	14
9. notorious	11
10. Al Capone	7
11. escape	7
12. war	6
13. penitentiary	5
14. Rock	3
15. secure	3
16. Birdman of Alcatraz	3
17. defend	1
18. dormant	1
19. incarcerated	0
20. military fort	0
TOTAL:	592

The data above visibly reflects that a majority of the words from this particular text mode were used in the essays, with a large percentage of the respondents' essays incorporating types like 'prison' and 'tourist attraction' frequently. Similarly, words like 'Alcatraz', 'criminal' and 'high-profile' were also used with average regularity. The 20 types from the target vocabulary list yielded a total of 592 tokens.

4.3.5. Vocabulary Profiler Findings- IOR- Experiment 2

The second experiment was based on 22 respondents' essays on a different essay topic and targeting a different topic-specific vocabulary. Again, the vocabulary used by this group was categorized using the online vocabulary profiler to identify their levels of vocabulary usage. A detailed breakdown of the data is given in Table 4.31 and a sample is provided in Appendix 17.

Table 4.31: IOR: Experiment 2: Vocabulary Profiler Findings

Words	Families	Types	Tokens	Percentage
K1 words (1-1000)	506	809	6245	76.91%
K2 words (1001-2000)	139	192	772	9.51%
1k + 2k	…	…	…	86.42%
AWL words	138	180	378	4.66%

Table 4.31 shows a high percentage of K1 level vocabulary, totaling 76.91%, whilst a small percentage of 9.51% was made up of K2 level vocabulary. Of the total vocabulary used in the essays, 86.42% consisted of K1 and K2 level words. The findings on the use of target vocabulary from this group of respondents are described in detail on the following page, in Table 4.32.

Table 4.32: IOR: Experiment 2: Overall Target Vocabulary Findings

TYPE	TOKEN TOTAL
1. prison	157
2. inmate	82
3. convict	61
4. law	33
5. educational activities	29
6. release	28
7. cell	26
8. violent	17
9. control	15
10. behavior	14
11. dangerous	11
12. secure	11
13. notorious	7
14. escape proof	7
15. correctional officer	7
16. nominal wage	6
17. maximum security	5
18. handcuffs	4
19. necessities	4
20. incarcerated	4
21. warden	1
22. offender	-
23. penitentiary	-
24. disruptive	-
25. leg irons	-
TOTAL	529

It is clear that a large number of words from the interactive online text were incorporated in the essays of the IOR group. Words such as 'prison', 'convict' and 'inmate' are amongst the highest types used, whereas 'release', 'cell', 'educational activities' and 'law' were also used relatively frequently. The remaining words on the list were also included in the essays, but infrequently. Nevertheless, from the topic-specific target vocabulary list, a total of 529 tokens were used.

4.3.6 Summary

All in all, the group of respondents who read the text on an interactive online site were more receptive to the vocabulary used compared to those who read the text via the

traditional print reading mode. This holds true for both Experiment 1 and Experiment 2. Although the vocabulary used in the essays were mainly K1 level words with only a small percentage of K2 level words, this group of respondents also incorporated into their argumentative essays a large number of word types from the text.