



 EDITORIAL COMMENT

Maximizing the impact of your innovation research: a guide to writing a compelling discussion section

 Fernando Antonio Ribeiro Serra¹  Isabel Cristina Scafuto²  Vânia Maria Jorge Nassif³ and  Priscila Rezende da Costa⁴

¹ Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE) / São Paulo, SP - Brazil 

² Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE) / São Paulo, SP - Brazil 

³ Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE) / São Paulo, SP - Brazil 

⁴ Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (ESPM) / São Paulo, SP - Brazil 

Cite como – American Psychological Association (APA)

Serra, F. A. R., Scafuto, I. C., Nassif, V. M. J., & Costa, P. R. (2024, Sept./Dec.). Maximizing the impact of your innovation research: a guide to writing a compelling discussion section. [Editorial Comment]. *International Journal of Innovation - IJI*, São Paulo, 12(3), Article e27925. <https://doi.org/10.5585/2024.27925>

¹ PhD in Engineering.

² PhD in Business Administration.

³ Livre-Docente in Human Resources from FEARP/USP, Postdoctoral in Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurial Skills at FGV-SP. Doctor in Business Administration.

⁴ Doctor in Business Administration from FEA USP.

Introduction

The Discussion section in an academic article holds significant importance, particularly within the context of innovation research. It is in this section that authors can move beyond the presentation of results and delve into the implications of their findings for the advancement of knowledge and practice in the field. A well-crafted Discussion section not only elucidates the meaning and relevance of the research findings but also connects them to the broader body of literature, highlighting the unique contributions of the study and paving the way for future research avenues. The proper structuring of the discussion is a fundamental element for the quality and acceptance of academic articles (Ferreira, 2013; Serra, 2017).

This editorial comment aims to provide authors with practical guidance on how to effectively write a Discussion section that meets the standards of the International Journal of Innovation (IJI).

To achieve this objective, we will first identify common pitfalls observed in Discussion sections. We will then draw on comments from experienced editors and established guidelines to offer concrete recommendations for improvement. Finally, we will present a structure for organizing the Discussion section to maximize its impact and contribution to the field of innovation research.

Common Problems in Discussion Sections

A well-structured Discussion section is important for impactful research, especially in a journal like the IJI that seeks to advance understanding of innovation across various levels, from individual entrepreneurs to entire ecosystems. Yet, authors often encounter challenges in crafting this component of an academic article. As highlighted by Ferreira et al. (2014), issues in the structuring of the discussion are one of the main reasons for the rejection of articles in scientific journals. Como destacam Ferreira et al. (2014), problemas na estruturação da discussão são uma das principais causas de rejeição de artigos em periódicos científicos.

One recurring issue is a lack of focus and structure, where the discussion meanders without a clear and concise narrative tied to the key findings. This lack of focus can hinder the understanding of the research's specific contribution to the field of innovation. For example, in a study on the impact of government policies on corporate innovation, the Discussion section should

MAXIMIZING THE IMPACT OF YOUR INNOVATION RESEARCH: A GUIDE TO WRITING A COMPELLING DISCUSSION SECTION

not dwell on general economic trends without linking them directly to the specific policies and their effects on innovation outcomes.

Another common pitfall is a superficial interpretation of the findings. Given the IJI's broad scope, which encompasses individual, organizational, ecosystem, and policy levels of innovation, a deep and nuanced interpretation of results is necessary. Authors need to move beyond simply describing their results; they must explain the meaning of those results, explore relationships between variables, and consider alternative explanations. For instance, if a study finds a positive correlation between R&D spending and firm growth, the authors should not merely state the correlation but delve deeper into the mechanisms by which R&D spending contributes to growth, considering factors such as industry dynamics, firm size, and technological intensity.

Furthermore, many Discussion sections suffer from an insufficient connection to the existing literature, particularly in the context of a globally focused journal like the IJI. Authors should strive to connect their work to research from diverse regions and economic contexts, particularly those relevant to emerging markets. This global perspective enriches the discussion and helps to position the research within a broader scholarly conversation. For example, when discussing the adoption of a new technology, connecting the findings to research on technology adoption in both developed and emerging economies provides valuable context and insights.

Another frequent oversight is the neglect of unexpected findings. Researching innovation in emerging markets often yields unexpected results due to the unique dynamics and complexities of these contexts. These findings could reveal unique challenges or opportunities for innovation in emerging markets and should be explored in detail. For instance, if a study on the factors driving social entrepreneurship in a developing country reveals an unexpected role of traditional community networks in supporting social ventures, this finding should be analyzed and discussed in terms of its implications for social innovation and community development.

Finally, some authors fail to acknowledge the limitations of their research, which can affect its credibility and hinder the accurate interpretation of the findings. Transparency about limitations is important for demonstrating a critical stance and ensuring that the research is understood within its appropriate context. For instance, limitations related to sample size, generalizability, or potential biases should be openly discussed. It is particularly important for authors in the IJI to consider the generalizability of their findings to different innovation contexts, particularly

emerging markets, and to discuss how limitations might affect the interpretation and application of their research in diverse settings.

Recommendations for Improvement

To enhance the quality of the discussion section, it is important to follow established guidelines in the literature (Ferreira, 2013; Serra, 2017) and consider the editorial process as a whole (Ferreira et al., 2014). To overcome the challenges discussed in the previous section and enhance the quality of Discussion sections in the IJI, authors should strive for clarity, conciseness, and a strong connection between their findings and the broader context of innovation research. This can be achieved by organizing the discussion logically around the key findings, ensuring a clear and concise narrative that directly addresses the research question.

Instead of simply reiterating the results, authors should explain their meaning and implications for the field of innovation. For instance, if a study reveals a positive relationship between a specific managerial practice and a firm's innovation performance, the authors should elaborate on the reasons behind this relationship and discuss its implications for management practices in various organizational contexts.

Furthermore, it is essential to integrate the findings with the existing body of knowledge, demonstrating how the research contributes to or diverges from previous work. This can be done by comparing and contrasting the findings with relevant studies, highlighting areas of agreement, disagreement, and potential reasons for divergence. For example, if a study examines the impact of open innovation strategies on firm performance, the authors should discuss their findings in relation to previous research on open innovation, exploring whether their results support or challenge existing theories and frameworks.

Another critical aspect is addressing unexpected or counterintuitive results, as these may offer important findings or spark new research directions. Authors should analyze the potential reasons for such findings and discuss their implications for the overall study and the field of innovation. For instance, if research on the relationship between organizational culture and employee creativity reveals an unexpected negative correlation between certain cultural traits and creative output, the authors should investigate this finding further and discuss its potential implications for organizational development and innovation management.

MAXIMIZING THE IMPACT OF YOUR INNOVATION RESEARCH: A GUIDE TO WRITING A COMPELLING DISCUSSION SECTION

Acknowledging the limitations of the research is equally important, as it demonstrates a critical stance and ensures that the research is interpreted within its appropriate context. Authors should address issues such as sample size, generalizability, potential biases, and methodological constraints, discussing how these limitations may have influenced the findings and conclusions.

Finally, authors should provide specific and focused suggestions for future research, building upon the findings and limitations of their study. This can involve identifying specific research questions, methodologies, or data sources that could be explored in future studies. For example, if a study examines the role of leadership in fostering a culture of innovation within a specific industry, future research could investigate the effectiveness of different leadership styles in promoting innovation across various industries or explore the interplay between leadership, organizational culture, and innovation outcomes at different organizational levels.

Structuring the Discussion Section

While there is no single "correct" way to structure the Discussion section, a clear and logical organization enhances its readability and impact. Authors in the IJI are encouraged to adopt a structure that guides the reader through the interpretation of the findings, connecting them to the existing literature and drawing out their implications for both theory and practice. The logical and clear structuring of the discussion, as pointed out by Ferreira (2013) and Serra (2017), is essential for effectively communicating the research contributions.

The Discussion section should begin by concisely summarizing the research objective and the main question addressed in the study. This opening paragraph serves to remind the reader of the study's core focus and sets the stage for the discussion of the findings.

Following the opening paragraph, the discussion should be organized around each key finding, dedicating a paragraph or two to elaborate on its meaning and implications. Explain how each result contributes to answering the research question and connect it to relevant literature. For example, if a study examines the relationship between innovation and firm performance in a specific industry, the authors should discuss how their findings align with or diverge from previous research on the topic, highlighting any unique findings or contributions.

After discussing the individual findings, the authors should then delve into the broader theoretical and practical implications of their research. For theoretical implications, explain how the findings contribute to existing knowledge, challenge prevailing assumptions, or offer new

MAXIMIZING THE IMPACT OF YOUR INNOVATION RESEARCH: A GUIDE TO WRITING A COMPELLING DISCUSSION SECTION

perspectives on innovation. For practical implications, discuss how the findings can be applied by innovators, entrepreneurs, policymakers, and other stakeholders in the innovation ecosystem.

Acknowledging the limitations of the study is equally important. This demonstrates a critical stance and transparency, which are crucial for ensuring that the research is interpreted within its appropriate context. For instance, limitations related to sample size, generalizability, or potential biases should be openly discussed, along with their potential influence on the findings and conclusions.

Finally, the Discussion section should conclude with concrete and focused suggestions for future research. Identify specific research questions, methodologies, or data sources that could be explored in future studies, building upon the insights and limitations of the current research.

Conclusion

In this editorial comment, we aimed to guide authors in writing impactful Discussion sections for their innovation research. By avoiding common pitfalls and following the outlined recommendations and structure, authors can ensure their contributions are clearly articulated and well-integrated with the existing literature. A well-written Discussion section not only clarifies the meaning and relevance of the research findings but also connects them to the broader field of innovation, highlighting the unique contributions of the study and paving the way for future research avenues.

To help authors in this process, we offer the following checklist as a quick reference (Table 1). This checklist was developed considering the recommendations of various authors on academic writing and the editorial process (Ferreira, 2013; Ferreira et al., 2014; Serra, 2017).

Table 1*Discussion Section Checklist*

Aspect	Description	Example
Structure and Focus	Organize the discussion logically around your key findings, ensuring a clear and concise narrative that directly addresses the research question.	Begin by explicitly stating the main findings and their implications for the research question. For instance, instead of simply reporting that "variable A was positively related to variable B," explain what this relationship means within the context of the study and its implications for the broader field of innovation.
In-depth Interpretation	Go beyond descriptive analysis and delve into the meaning of the results, exploring their nuances and complexities.	Discuss the "why" behind the observed patterns and offer potential explanations for unexpected findings. Consider alternative interpretations and address potential confounding factors that may have influenced the results.
Strong Connection to Literature	Integrate the findings with the existing body of knowledge, demonstrating how the research contributes to or diverges from previous work.	Compare and contrast the findings with relevant studies, highlighting areas of agreement, disagreement, and potential reasons for divergence. Use the literature to support the interpretation of the findings and to position the research within the broader field of innovation.
Address Unexpected Findings	Analyze and interpret unexpected or counterintuitive results, as they may offer findings or spark new research directions.	Explore the potential reasons for these findings and discuss their implications for the overall study and the field of innovation. For example, if a study on the adoption of a particular innovation yielded a surprisingly low adoption rate, investigate the potential barriers and facilitators to adoption in the specific context, and discuss how these insights could inform future research and practice.
Acknowledge Limitations	Be transparent about the limitations of the research, discussing their potential influence on the findings and conclusions.	Address issues such as sample size, generalizability, potential biases, and methodological constraints. By acknowledging limitations, authors demonstrate a critical stance and ensure that the research is interpreted within its appropriate context.
Specific Future Research Directions	Provide concrete and focused suggestions for future research, building upon the finding and limitations of the current study.	Identify specific research questions, methodologies, or data sources that could be explored in future studies. For example, if a study on innovation in a particular industry focused solely on large firms, suggest future research that examines innovation in small and medium-sized enterprises within that industry, or that explores the role of specific factors, such as government policies or entrepreneurial networks, in driving innovation within that sector.

MAXIMIZING THE IMPACT OF YOUR INNOVATION RESEARCH: A GUIDE TO WRITING A COMPELLING DISCUSSION SECTION

We encourage authors to use this checklist as they finalize their Discussion sections, ensuring their manuscripts meet the standards of the IJI and contribute meaningfully to the advancement of innovation research.

References

- Ferreira, M. A. S. P. V. (2013). A pesquisa e a estruturação do artigo acadêmico em Administração. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estratégia*, 12(2), 1-11.
<https://doi.org/10.5585/ijsm.v12i2.2034>
- Ferreira, M. A. S. P. V. (2014). Responder aos revisores. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estratégia*, 13(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.5585/ijsm.v13i1.2099>
- Ferreira, M. A. S. P. V., Canela, R., & Pinto, C. F. (2014). O processo editorial nos periódicos e dicas para a publicação. *Revista de Gestão e Secretariado*, 5(2), 1-22.
<https://doi.org/10.7769/gesec.v5i2.307>
- Serra, F. A. R. (2017). Dez recomendações para aumentar a possibilidade de publicação do seu artigo. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estratégia*, 16(3), 1-11.
<https://doi.org/10.5585/ijsm.v16i3.2563>