



Results & discussion

EDUCATION EXAMPLE

In this example thesis, the results and discussion sections appear in the same chapter.

Example: discussion section in a thesis (combining Results & Discussion)

Results and Discussion

5.1 Modelling and joint negotiation of texts

This study set out to investigate the effects of extending the negotiation of text phase of the DSP teaching/learning cycle with English for Further Study students to incorporate student/teacher joint negotiation and construction of a marking instrument. The following discussion will focus on the application, appropriateness and usefulness of the curriculum innovation from both the students' as well as the teacher/researcher's perspective.

5.1.1 Classroom text analyses

The first research question was "How do students benefit from analysing model texts?" This involved analysing classroom discourse to determine whether there was a shift from the archetypal classroom discourse of Teacher Initiation, Pupil Response, Teacher Feedback identified by Sinclair and Coulthard (Stubbs 1983: 29) to students taking on the role of primary knowers. This research question also involved investigating how students' knowledge about language and texts developed through ongoing modelling and analyses of texts. A related research question was "Will students adopt and /or develop a metalanguage to talk about language? The main data forming the basis of the following discussion are the transcripts of the recordings of the classroom text analyses.

The first teaching stage of the project focussed on identifying the schematic staging of an exposition genre and how cohesion is achieved in expositions (see Chapter 4 for a description of the curriculum process). The initial analysis of the model text was very teacher directed. The transcript of this segment of the lesson (see Appendix C) shows that most of the input came from the teacher with the pattern of classroom talk being:

- teacher question
- student response
- teacher confirmation

For example when analysing the analytical exposition for schematic structure, one exchange was as follows:

T Now, we've been talking about causes. What happens now in the very short paragraph?
 S1 Effects?

recaps main aim of thesis outlined in previous chapters

subsections follow a pattern:

- link aspect of the study to a research question
- present results supported by data
- discuss and Interpret findings
- summary.

links findings to findings of other studies

Incorporates data to support findings



Example: discussion section in a thesis (combining Results & Discussion)

T Mmm. Now the writer starts to talk about effects. So we've got a second Thesis.

SS Yeah.

T Which is?

S1 These three.

S2 The whole thing

S3 These three events

T So the second Thesis is the whole sentence. "These three events planted the seeds of a great change in society, and the effects of this change are being felt at all levels ..."

(Appendix C: Analysis of Analytical Exposition)

The above exchanges correspond to the pattern identified by Sinclair and Coulthard as characteristic of teacher-pupil talk with the underlying exchange structure of Teacher Initiation, Pupil Response, and Teacher Feedback. This exchange structure allows the teacher to retain the conversational initiative (Stubbs 1983: 29). In the above exchange the teacher was the primary "knower" of information and her questions prompted and guided the students onto the next stage.

relates findings to relevant literature

[follows more presentation of data and discussion of results]

To sum up this discussion of the data in response to the first research question "How do students benefit from analysing model texts?" there are two main points to be made:

summarises discussion of findings for this subsection

- i) The students' ability to analyse texts improved. By the third analysis they were able to examine a number of language features on their own, draw conclusions on the status of the text on the mode continuum (more factual, or more persuasive) and give examples to support their points. The systemic functional model of language was a valuable teaching resource to make explicit language features of different genres to the class.
- ii) No "new" classroom metalanguage emerged, and at times "language to talk about language" caused problems for a few members of the group (What's cohesion again?" and "What's the difference between Thesis and Introduction?" Appendix C: Transcript of Discussion Genre and Text Analysis). Students took a pragmatic approach to explain a concept in some instances, but also adopted more explicit terms that described the purpose of a textual feature. On the whole their classroom language reflected their extended knowledge about texts: students developed from talking about "friendly" sounding texts to "distanced", "sophisticated," and "more abstract" texts.

5.1.2 Development of the writing checklists

My second research question "Do classroom negotiated writing checklists aid the writing process?" will be discussed in three parts. The first part will evaluate the data as to the sub question "Is the process of negotiating writing checklists with students beneficial?" The data for this discussion will be transcripts of the constructions of checklists, and classroom observations. The second part will discuss the writing checklists in light of the classroom joint negotiations, while the third part will evaluate the students' responses to questionnaires on the drafting and editing process.

[discussion of data]



Example: discussion section in a thesis (combining Results & Discussion)

Data from the investigation of the effects of extending the joint negotiation of texts to include joint negotiation of writing checklists suggest that there is a place for the checklists in the teaching /learning cycle, however these should be included as a teaching resource prior to the joint construction of a text in order to revised and sum up the key language features and stages of the genre in question.

5.2 The students' writing

5.3 Teacher response to student writing

5.3.1 The writing checklists as a marking tool

5.3.2 Improving the writing checklists

5.4 Implications of the project for teaching practice

The project focussed on using writing checklists with one TAFE English of Further Study class. The results suggest that teachers and students can benefit from extending the DSP teaching/learning cycle to include writing checklists. However, the checklists need to be written in a way which is accessible to students. That is, the students and teacher must share a classroom language to talk about language, and this should be the language of the writing checklists. This shared classroom language can be developed when working through the stages of the DSP cycle, namely modelling texts, jointly constructing texts, and individual constructions. Teacher development of writing checklists also needs to be seen as an ongoing process incorporating additions and modifications as the students' understanding of textual features develops.

The possible benefits of extending the teaching/learning cycle to include checklists are considerable. Writing teachers and students can use checklists compiled from analysis of model texts to:

- revise language features and schematic staging of specific genres
- guide and prompt the teacher and student in the joint negotiation phase of the DSP cycle
- allow the student to communicate to the teacher his/her area of difficulty when writing
- allow the teacher to make explicit written comments about how well the student's
- writing approximated the genre in question
- assist students to draft and revise their essays

These features of the checklists should assist English for Further Study students to develop as writers of factual texts.

results of these aspects of the project each sub-section includes a discussion of these findings

discussion of implications and applications of this research

