









## You delve into the meaning, importance, and relevance of your results.

Focus on **explaining and evaluating** what you found, showing how it **relates** to your **literature review and paper or dissertation topic**, and making **an argument** in support of your overall conclusion.

It should not be a second results section.







## Step1: Summarise your key Findings

- Reiterating your research problem and concisely summarizing your major findings.
- Clear statement of the overall result that directly answers your main research question. This should be no more than one paragraph.

## Examples: Summarization sentence starters

- The results indicate that ...
- The study demonstrates a correlation between...
- This analysis supports the theory that...
- The data suggest that...









- Relate your results back to the scholarly work that you surveyed in the literature review.
- The discussion should show how your findings fit with existing knowledge, what new insights they contribute, and what consequences they have for theory or practice.
- Ask yourself these questions:
  - Do your results support or challenge existing theories? If they support existing theories, what new information do they contribute? If they challenge existing theories, why do you think that is?
  - Are there any practical implications?
- Your overall aim is to show the reader exactly what your research has contributed, and why they should care.

















Lastly, the researcher cannot be certain whether demographic factors such as gender, race and age may affect the test scores' measures as often revealed in previous works (Alturki, 2016). This is because the sample sizes and representation were not appropriate to run statistical analysis and derive meaningful findings. Nevertheless, from general observation of the students' data patterns, it can be seen that it is not necessarily the case that students with higher pre-test marks exhibit greater improvement on the post-test, and vice versa. Instead, what this study might have here, for example, were students who (1) may start the course with little prior knowledge, learnt a great deal, engaged with learning very well and got average/high marks, and (2) may have adequate prior knowledge, learned a little, did not perform well and earned low marks. Consequently, this situation might lead to difficulty detecting any at-risk students from the very beginning of the course. On a positive note, it is good to see that prior knowledge and experience in using authoring software tools did not influence the test scores, as that might have indicated failure to control for the selection- maturation interaction threat.	Limitations
In summary, from a quantitative viewpoint, the Authoring System post-test results typically increased to a significant medium effect as a result of reflection embedded with a feedback strategy. Lack of information on observation means that it is not possible to predict the other possible factors that may dynamically challenge the significant intervention result. For better learning benefits, perhaps the instructor could adhere to a more efficient method of evaluation that can give instant feedback to the students and thus support them to be more focused on the lecture topic before can fully comprehend the relation between reflection and academic performance.	Recommendations



The presence of an individualistic orientation was noted for one student in the P3 category, where the DR type of reflective thinking was repetitive and independent, meaning that it was not associated with other types of reflective thinking skills and feedback (DR $\Rightarrow$ DR $\Rightarrow$ DR). It also reached a certain degree of continuity and happened quite frequently (DR $\ge$ 329.5 times). Although the DR type of reflective thinking was commonly used and easily mastered without requiring any trigger from specific questions/support due to its low level reflective thinking condition (Hatton & Smith, 1998), this pattern might not reflect normal learning progress; moreover, not many students practiced these learning pathways (P3 = 1 student; P4 = 1 student). The difference between students in P3 and P4 is just how frequent they were in repetitively projecting the DR level in reflection (P3 = DR < 329.5 times); P4 = DR $\ge$ 329.5 times). For future intervention purposes, it is the role of the instructor to break this kind of repetitive chain by asking more questions to model its usage, and to judge whether that can raise students' reflective thinking skills and feedback to a higher level.	Implications Limitations
In summary, from a quantitative viewpoint, the Authoring System post-test results typically increased to a significant medium effect as a result of reflection embedded with a feedback strategy. Lack of information on observation means that it is not possible to predict the other possible factors that may dynamically challenge the significant intervention result.	
For a learning performance pathway to be practical, it can be programmed and embedded in the blogging environment in widget/plugin form. EnquiryBlogger is an example of a learning analytics plugin to track and support learners' awareness and reflection using blogs (Fergusen, Shum & Crick, 2011). Additionally, the Other Sensors recommendation system provides students with recommendation based on their post behaviour (Holanda et al., 2012). Holanda and colleagues also found that by interacting with the recommender system, the percentage of interaction increased up to 83.3%. This kind of intelligent recommender has been implemented in many previous works related to learning analytics for personalised learning, as reviewed by Bodily and Verbert (2017).	Recommendations





Below is a list of questions to guide you when organizing the structure of your discussion section (Viera et al., 2018):

- What experiments did you conduct and what were the results?
- What do the results mean?
- What were the important results from your study?
- How did the results answer your research questions?
- Did your results support your hypothesis or reject your hypothesis?
- What are the variables or factors that might affect your results?
- What were the strengths and limitations of your study?
- What other published works support your findings?
- What other published works contradict your findings?
- What possible factors might cause your findings different from other findings?
- What is the significance of your research?
- What are new research questions to explore based on your findings?



## Frequent mistakes

- The discussions are too static and mechanical Avoid having same ways of discussion across RQs
- Discussing findings that weren't included in the results chapter
- Poor linkage to the research aims, objectives and research questions.
- Poor linkage to existing research and/or the theoretical framework.
- Only answering what. Not answering Why? If your research is quantitative, how to answer why?
- When the **findings are contradicting** with the literature, the discussion **underate the findings**!
- Too perfect discussions of findings!
- False Citations!
- Use irrelevant previous research findings to support yours.
- Incorrect Interpretation
- The "Bully Pulpit"







Discussio		Cond	clusion	
Interpret your	results	?	Restate your hypothesis	
Compare your studies	r results with those from previous	vs. 帐	Restate your most impo	rtant findings
Discuss the lir	nitations of your results	M	Highlight limitations of	our study
Highlight the	unexpected results, if any	<b>*</b>	Highlight the overall sig	nificance of your study
Mention how from the prev	your results add value to those ious studies		State future direction	
	Wish to learn more about drafting eff	ective manuscripts? Visit	enago.com/academy now!	
@Enago	enagoacademy	<b>?:</b> enago.	com/academy	enago.com/app









**First**, from the implementation of two types of blogging environment, namely course blogs and individual blogs, the researcher learned that the dominant reflective thinking skills were merely description of tasks or experiences that took place (this is equivalent to the first and second levels, i.e. DW and DR). Students were seen to make hardly any attempt to engage in critical or in-depth reflections. Fourth, this study has presented some key associations to model how feedback through questioning may manipulate the direction of reflective thinking skills through association rules analysis.

....

**Fifth**, reflection and feedback play a key role in stimulating students' learning performance when learning Authoring System, as evident in the overall post-test marks, where all of the students scored just above average and none were in the low achievers' category.

**Finally**, eight learning performance pathways were identified in relation to the respective increment categories. This also points to the notion that there is no one-size-fits-all concept for reflection in the learning process. Among all variables, DR was acknowledged as the most influential attribute that differentiated all three learning increment categories. Although not all types of reflective thinking and feedback emerged in the learning performance pathways, it was evident that those pathways suggest a clear nexus between an increase in learning performance and students' reflective thinking and feedback ability. To put it another way, as the increment categories improved, so did their reflective thinking and feedback levels, while the converse was true for the lower increment category. In fact, by manipulating the usage of other reflective thinking and feedback types instead of sticking to the same level of reflection and feedback most of the time. These learning performance pathways further highlight the potential advantage of a recommender system for future adoption, which can assist in developing a more systematic reflective thinking the possible at-risk students based on the frequency value gained.

