Conclusion

I want to be clear here: I do not claim that merely by teaching students the structure of problems and their articulation as PROBLEMS in introductions that they will suddenly become “good critical thinkers” and write papers that pose and solve “interesting problems.” The criteria for “interesting” are too deeply entrenched in social practice to yield to any simple algorithm of discovery or evaluation (Davis and Kaufer).

Nevertheless, a tacit or explicit understanding of the form of both problems and PROBLEMS is a necessary condition for reporting how we find and solve them. Further, introductions are important because how successfully they articulate their PROBLEMS profoundly influences how we read what follows. Among our first criteria in judging a paper are these:

1. Does this introduction articulate an “interesting” PROBLEM?
2. Does this introduction articulate a PROBLEM in a way expected by its intended community of discourse?

A paper that does neither is apt to be judged as Berkenkotter et al judged Nate’s first paper – as “ineffective,” “evidence of an “isolated newcomer.”

The underlying structure of introductions that pose PROBLEMS is quite direct and in fact quite simple. What’s difficult, of course, is creating a good one. To the degree that we think finding, inventing, and articulating PROBLEMS is a competence that we want our students to learn and demonstrate, to that degree we must teach it.