RESULTS VS DISCUSSION

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
RESULTS

• Short and straightforward
• Lots of numbers
• Includes
  • Information on data transformation
    • Did you exclude data? Fill in missing data? Reverse code? How did you score your surveys?
• Results of your primary research question
  • Descriptive stats, inferential stats, sig?, direction
• Results of your secondary research question
  • Use your demographic questions (Were there gender differences in self-esteem?)
  • Descriptive stats, inferential stats, sig?, direction
• One table or figure (Use a figure unless you have a complex study)
RESULTS

• **Data Exclusion – Exclusion of data for specific reasons**
  - Subjects did not follow instructions
  - How much was excluded and what criteria you used for making this decision.
RESULTS

• Calculated overall variables – variables/subscores that are created from items
  • How you scored questionnaires or otherwise aggregated multiple responses into a single dependent variable.
  • For example, you might explain that you began by computing the mean morality rating given to each of 10 moral scenarios primed with science and each of 10 moral scenarios not primed with science.
RESULTS

• **Descriptive Statistics – Describe your data**
  • Report measures of central tendency and variability for your dependent variable, separately for each condition. This usually means reporting the mean and standard deviation for each condition.
RESULTS

• TABLES AND FIGURES
  • TABLES AND FIGURES ARE MEANT TO ADD DEPTH TO YOUR WRITING.
    • SHOULD NOT BE USED NEEDLESSLY
  • “AS FIGURE 1 SHOWS, ....”
APA FIGURES

• Descriptive title on the bottom
• No color (BUT you can add color when you put it on your poster!)
• Axis Labels and/or Legends
• Should be interpretable on its own

*Figure X. Relationship between scores on the Rosenberg self-esteem scale taken by 25 research methods students on two occasions one week apart. Pearson’s r = .96.*
RESULTS

• Inferential Statistics – What null hypothesis tests were used
  • Report the relevant inferential statistics used.
  • Reporting the test statistic, the degrees of freedom, and whether or not the p value was less than .05.
  • Be clear about whether or not you rejected the null hypothesis.
    • In general, you should address each of your hypotheses one at a time. Discuss your primary hypothesis first, and then discuss each of your secondary hypotheses in turn.
DISCUSSION

• **Looks like**
  • Longer section; one of the most important parts of the paper
  • No/ limited use of numbers (since you already presented this evidence in your results section)

• **Includes**
  • Results with no numbers
    • What happened? Was this the hypothesized result?
  • Result Implications
    • Theoretical importance? Relate back to your introduction articles - does this agree with previous literature/ theory? Why or why not?
    • Practical importance?
    • Yes; use in-text citations!
  • Study limitations (critical of your own study) & Recommendations for future research – be specific! (more than just increase sample size)
• **Plain language results:** “The first hypothesis was supported by the results. People who were exposed to music with prosocial content were more likely to act in a prosocial manner than were those who were exposed to music with neutral lyrics.”
• **Theoretical Implications:** “The results found by Jacob et al. (2010) could not be confirmed.... There could be three explanations for this result: ...”
• **Limitations:** “They could have been influenced by the music itself or by the server who was potentially influenced by the different music conditions as well. Another experimental group with no music would have been necessary to test if the lyrics or the music itself affects the guests …”
DISCUSSION

• **What did you find and did it conform to your hypotheses or not?** Summarize the results in words and whether they support the hypotheses.

• **Identify and discuss theories as to why the results turned out the way they did.**
  - This is the explanation, one of the most important parts of the paper and needs to be thought about and addressed adequately.
  - Were the hypotheses supported, why might that be?
  - A great idea is to look to other research on the topic and address their theories in relation to yours. It is OK to speculate a little here, just do not assume the statements reflect a certainty when there is not one.

• **What were the limitations and what went wrong with your study?**
  - Note that it is common for new students to focus too much of the discussion section on the limitations, but it is just one part.

• **Future research and applied uses should be ideas that are relevant to the results/question, not just random alternative variables that could be tested.**
  - I found a relationship between priming for science related concepts and moral judgment, I might suggest future research could further explore the extent of how this relationship might be influenced by the history of scientific training/coursework. I could also suggest that this could have bearings on situations that call on people to make moral judgments (future research studies could take this into account as could legal situations).