**Introduction to Academic Writing - 8th Class - October 10th 2018**

**(SUMMARY WRITTEN AND PROVIDED BY THE PRPPG7000 TEACHING ASSISTANTS)**

In today's class, Prof. Dr. Eduardo Figueiredo (CAPA's vice director) was substituting Prof. Dr. Ron Martinez, due to his absence. Prof. Eduardo presented the topic of today's class, *The Discussion Section*, and told that is a very difficult section for author's to write. But before he got into this topic, he also reminded students of the changing in the syllabus because last week event, the SIEPE.

After that, Prof. Eduardo went back to *Belcher (2007), Bordage (2001) & Pierson (2012)* table that shows the reasons why papers get rejected and told that is very common for people to get their papers rejected for any of the reasons presented in the table. He focused on the item *Poor Discussion (or overstating importance of findings)*, showing some examples of rejected papers. In addition to that, Prof. Eduardo did a survey through *Kahoot*, emphasizing in why the papers were rejected. The first question on it was: "What was the main reason the article was rejected?"; and the right answer for it was: "Problems in the methods section". However, he also explained that problems in the Discussion and Results sections should be considered as part of the reasons why a paper is rejected and should be worked better.

Prof. Eduardo returned the discussion to IMRaD (stands for *Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion)* to point how Introductions and Discussions are the most problematic parts of research articles for Non Native Speakers and Native Speakers to write. He mentioned that those parts are difficult because the author have to convince the editors and reviewers about the contribution of the research. Regarding to that, Prof. Eduardo asked the students to discuss with a partner these two questions: 1) Why is discussion section so challenging?; and 2) What should the discussion section "do"? What are the most common "ingredients"?. Then, he emphasized that the author should be persuasive in the writing style and that the author's voice needs to come through, in order to convince the editors and reviewers that the paper is worth publishing.

Moreover, Prof. Eduardo gave examples of articles focusing on the Discussion section and showed how the authors were revisiting points that they presented in the Introduction section, reminding their readers of what they intended to do in the research. Next, he showed

more examples and the moves the authors used to make the reader identify the main points in those sections. Most important, those authors are bringing their voices to their articles and signalizing the steps in a way the reader can identify them easily. In this regard, a student asked to Prof. Eduardo "When the researchers talk about their limitations, are they showing the weakness of their studies?", so the Professor orientated the class to another *Kahoot* research and the question he made through it was "Do you think limitations should be included in a research paper?", to what he answered that it is an integral part of research ethics. The limitations shows that the author understand the study can only goes to a certain extend.

Furthermore, Prof. Eduardo talked about the 6 common elements that a good Discussion section should include, which are:

- Revisit points raised in the Introduction;

- Compare with other studies;

- Expand, explain, extrapolate;

- Talk about applications and practical implications;

- Talk about limitations;

- Talk about how the study advances the area; what is still needed.

Continuing in this idea, Prof. Eduardo went back to the 4 articles Prof. Ron asked the students to take a look at previous class and focused in the Discussion section of each one of it. He read it with the students and identified the elements presented above.

So, Prof. Eduardo presented some questions to think about when writing the Discussion section:

1. How do your research and results compare to those of other studies that were published previously?

2. What data are particularly strong/relevant? What are some of the shortcomings in your data (or in other parts of the article)?

3. What are some possible applications/implications of your data/results?

4. What are some of the limitations of your study?

5. What is the main contribution of your research? How does it help your field of study advance?

6. What directions for further research are advanced by your study?

Finally, as homework, the students have to download and read the article on Ron's

website and to answer Module 7 on *Formative*, due to October 16th.