3.4.2 Vocabulary for the Results section

1. REVISITING THE RESEARCH AIM/EXISTING RESEARCH

as discussed previously, as mentioned earlier/before, as outlined in the introduction, as reported, in order to..., we examined... it is important to reiterate that... it is known from the literature that... it was predicted that... our aim/purpose/intention was to... since/because..., we investigated... the aforementioned theory/aim/prediction etc. to investigate..., we needed to... we reasoned/predicted that...

- Since the angular alignment is critical, the effect of an error in orientation was investigated experimentally.
- We reasoned that an interaction in one network between proteins that are far apart in the other network may be a technology-specific artifact.
- **In earlier studies** attempts were made to establish degradation rate constants by undertaking ozonation experiments.
- The main purpose of this work was to test algorithm performance.
- As mentioned previously, the aim of the tests was to construct a continuous crack propagation history.
- In this work, we sought to establish a methodology for the synthesis of a benzoxazine skeleton.
- It was suggested in the Introduction that the effective stress paths may be used to define local bounding surfaces.

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

generally speaking,
in general,
in most/all cases,
in the main,
in this section, we compare/evaluate/present
it is apparent that in all/most/the majority of cases,
it is evident from the results that
on the whole
the overall response was
the results are divided into two parts as follows:
using the method described above, we obtained

Here are some examples of how these are used:

- It is apparent that both films exhibit typical mesoporous structures.
- It is evident that these results are in good agreement with their FE counterparts.
- In general, coefficients for months close to the mean flowering data were negative.
- Our confidence scores have an **overall** strong concordance with previous predictions
- **On the whole,** the strains and deflections recorded from the FE model follow similar patterns to those recorded from the vacuum rig tests.
- Levels of weight loss were similar in all cases.

INVITATION TO VIEW RESULTS

(data not shown) (Fig. 1) (see also Fig. 1) (see Fig. 1) (see Figs. 1–3)	Figure 1:	contains corresponds (to) demonstrates displays gives
according to Fig. 1 as can be seen from/in* Fig.1		illustrates lists

as detailed in Fig.1 as evident from/in the figure as illustrated by Fig. 1 as indicated in. Fig.1 as listed in Fig.1 as shown in Fig.1 as we can see from/in Fig.1 can be found in Fig.1 can be identified from/in Fig.1 can be observed in Fig. 1 can be seen from/in Figure 1 comparing Figs. 1 and 4 shows that data in Fig. 1 suggest that displayed in Fig. 1 evidence for this is in Fig. 1 from Fig. 1 it can be seen that inspection of Fig. 1 indicates is/are given in Fig. 1	plots presents provides reports represents reveals shows summarises
is/are represented (<i>etc.</i>) in is/are visible in Fig. 1 in Fig. 1 we compare/present etc results are given in Fig.1 we observe from Fig. 1 that	

**from* means 'can be deduced/concluded from' the figure/table whereas *in* means that it actually 'appears in' the figure/table

- The stress data in Fig. 18 indicate a more reasonable relationship.
- Figure 3 illustrates the findings of the spatial time activity modelling.
- The overall volume changes are **reported** in Fig. 6(d).
- Similar results were found after loading GzmA into the cells (data not shown).
- Typical cyclic voltammograms can be seen in Fig. 1.
- **Comparing Figs. 1 and 4** shows that volumetric strains developed after pore pressure had dissipated.

- The rate constants shown in Table 1 **demonstrate that** the reactivity is much greater at neutral pH.
- The results **are summarised** in Table 4.

SPECIFIC/KEY RESULTS IN DETAIL

When you look at your target articles, you will notice that it is harder to find examples of the language used to provide an *objective description* of the results than it is to find examples of the language used to provide a *subjective description* of the results, and that when it does occur, objective language is likely to be modified by a subjective 'add-on'. For example, a phrase like *slightly lower* or *much lower* is found more often than *lower* on its own. This is because, as mentioned earlier, an objective description of the results does not tell readers anything they don't already know from looking at the figure.

If you are having difficulty seeing the difference between *objective* and *subjective* language, remember that describing one level or quantity as being *higher* than another is an objective truth; to describe a level or quantity as *high* is a subjective evaluation.

accelerate(d)	is/are/was/were constant	match(ed)
all	is/are/was/were different	none
change(d)	is/are/was/were equal	occur(red)
decline(d)	is/are/was/were found	peak(ed)
decrease(d)	is/are/was/were higher	precede(d)
delay(ed)	is/are/was/were highest	produce(d)
drop(ped)	is/are/was/were identical	reduce(d)
exist(ed)	is/are/was/were lower	remain(ed) constant
expand(ed)	is/are/was/were present	remained the same
fall/fell	is/are/was/were seen	rise/rose
find/found	is/are/was/were unaffected	sole/ly
increase(d)	is/are/was/were unchanged	vary/varied
	is/are/was/were uniform	

(i) Objective descriptions

Numerical representations of percentages, levels, locations, amounts *etc.*, *i.e. a 2% increase* are, of course, also 'objective'.

Here are some examples of how these are used:

- There was a lower proportion of large particles present at lower pH.
- As can be seen in Fig. 8, there were **different** horizontal and vertical directional pseudofunctions.
- As can be seen, in the second trial the level of switching among uninformed travellers **was unchanged**.
- This kind of delamination **did not occur** anywhere else.
- The CTOA **dropped** from its initial high value to a constant angle of 4°.
- It eventually levelled off at a terminal velocity of 300 m/s.

(ii) Subjective descriptions

abundant(ly)	impercentible(ibly)	remarkable(ably)
acceptable(ably)	importent(ly)	recombling
		resembling
adequate(ly)	in particular,	satisfactory
almost	in principle	scarce(ly)
appreciable(ably)	inadequate	serious(ly)
appropriate(ly)	interesting(ly),	severe(ly)
brief/(ly)	it appears that	sharp(ly)
clear(ly)	large(ly)	significant(ly)
comparable (ably)	likelihood	similar
considerable(ably)	low	simple(ply)
consistent(ly)	main(ly)	smooth(ly)
distinct(ly)	marked(ly)	somewhat
dominant(ly)	measurable(ably)	steep(ly)
dramatic(ally)	mild(ly)	striking(ly)
drastic(ally)	minimal(ly)	strong(ly)
equivalent	more or less	substantial(ly)
essential(ly)	most(ly)	sudden(ly)
excellent	negligible(ibly)	sufficient(ly)
excessive(ly)	noticeable(ably)	suitable(ably)
exceptional(ly)	obvious(ly)	surprising(ly)
extensive(ly)	only	tendency
extreme(ly)	overwhelming(ly)	the majority of
fair(ly)	poor(ly)	too + adjective
few		unexpected(ly)

general(ly)	powerful(ly)	unusual(ly) valuable
high(ly)	radical(ly)	very
immense(ly)	rapid(ly)	virtual(ly)

PLUS all the rest of the language from the **frequency** and **quantity** lists (Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3).

Here are some examples of how these are used (including examples from the frequency and quantity lists):

- In **the majority of** cases, SEM analysis revealed a **considerably** higher percentage of fine material.
- As can be seen, the higher injection rate gave **satisfactory** results from all three methods.
- Similar behaviour was observed in all cases, with no sudden changes.
- It can be seen in Fig. 5 that the Kalman filter gives an **excellent** estimate of the heat released.
- The effect on the relative performance was **dramatic**.
- A striking illustration of this can be seen in Fig. 5.
- Comparing Figs. 4 and 5, it is obvious that a **significant** improvement was obtained in **the majority of** cases.
- It can be observed from Fig. 5 that the patterns are **essentially** the same in both cases.
- Figure 1 shows a **fairly** consistent material.
- It can be observed from Fig. 2 that there was **only** a **very small** enhancement when H_2O_2 was present.

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER RESULTS

If you are referring to other research, make sure that the location of the reference citation or number is accurate or other researchers may end up 'owning' your work. Remember that the right place for a research reference is not necessarily at the end of a sentence.

as anticipated	is/are better than
as expected,	is/are in good agreement
as predicted by	is/are identical (to)
as reported by	is/are not dissimilar (to)
compare well with	is/are parallel (to)
concur	is/are similar (to)
confirm	is/are unlike
consistent with	match
contrary to	prove
corroborate	refute
correlate	reinforce
disprove	support
inconsistent with	validate
in line with	verify

Many of these can be modified to match the level of certainty you want to express by adding expression such as:

It seems that It appears that It is likely that

(See Section 3.2.4 for more of these.)

- It is evident that the SFS results obtained here are in exceptionally good agreement with existing FE results.
- Distributions are **almost identical** in both cases.
- Our concordance scores strongly confirm previous predictions.
- We see that the numerical model tends to give predictions that **are parallel to** the experimental data from corresponding tests.
- These results demonstrate that improved **correlation** with the experimental results was achieved using the new mesh.
- This is **consistent** with results obtained in [1].

- The results are qualitatively **similar** to those of earlier simulation studies.
- These trends are **in line with** the previously discussed structure of the of the ferrihydrite aggregates.

PROBLEMS WITH RESULTS

Remember that research is not necessarily invalidated by inappropriate results, provided they are presented in a conventional, professional way. The vocabulary below will help you to achieve this.

minimise the problem/focus on	suggest reasons for the problem
good results	may/could/might have been
(a) preliminary attempt	or
despite this,	was/were:
however,	
immaterial	beyond the scope of this study
incomplete	caused by
infinitesimal	difficult to (simulate)
insignificant	due to
less than ideal	hard to (control)
less than perfect	inevitable
(a) minor deficit/limitation	it should be noted that
negligible	not attempted
nevertheless	not examined
not always reliable	not explored in this study
not always accurate	not investigated
not ideal	not the focus of this paper
not identical	not within the scope of this study
not completely clear	possible source(s) of error
not perfect	unavoidable
not precise	unexpected
not significant	unfortunately
of no consequence	unpredictable
of no/little significance	unworkable
only	unavailable
reasonable results were obtained	

room for improvement	offer a solution
slightly (disappointing)	further work is planned
(a) slight mismatch/limitation	future work should *
somewhat (problematic)	future work will*
(a) technicality	in future, care should be taken
unimportant	in future, it is advised that

* Remember that the phrase *future work should* is used to suggest a direction for the research community, whereas *future work will* tells readers that this is your next project.

Here are some examples of how these are used:

- The correlation between the two methods was **somewhat** less in the case of a central concentrated point load.
- It should, however, be noted that in FE methods, the degree of mesh refinement may affect the results.
- Nevertheless, this effect is only local.
- Full experimental data was **only** obtained at one location.
- **Reasonable results were obtained** in the first case, and good results in the second.
- It is difficult to simulate the behaviour of the joints realistically.
- Although this was not obtained experimentally, it can be assumed to exist.
- **Future work should** therefore include numerical diffusion effects in the calculation of permeability.
- This type of control saturation is fairly common and therefore **of no significance**.

Here is an interesting table. It is supposed to be funny, but as you can see, it reflects a set of shared assumptions and a kind of 'code' used in the research community.

WHEN YOU WRITE THIS	DO YOU MEAN THIS?
It has long been known that	I can't remember the reference
This is of great theoretical and practical importance	This is interesting to me

It has not been possible to provide definite answers to these questions	The experiments didn't work out
High purity/very high purity/ extremely high purity	Composition unknown
Three of the samples were chosen for detailed study	The results of the others didn't make sense, so we ignored them
Typical results are shown	Only the best results are shown
Although some detail has been lost in reproduction, it appears to be clear from the original micro- graph that	It is impossible to tell much from the original micrograph
Agreement with the predicted curve was: perfect excellent good reasonably good satisfactory fair not perfect as good as can be expected	Agreement with the predicted curve was: good fair poor very poor awful really awful imaginary non-existent
These results will be reported at a later date	I might get round to this sometime if I don't change careers
It is suggested that It is believed that It seems that	I think that

It is clear that much additional work is required before a complete understanding can be reached	I don't understand it
Unfortunately, a quantitative theory to account for these effects has not yet been formulated	Neither does anyone else
Correct within an order of magnitude	Wrong
It is hoped that this work will stimulate further research	This paper isn't very good, but neither is anyone else's
It is obvious	but impossible to prove

POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS OF RESULTS

At some stage (usually late) in the Results, it is appropriate to provide a general explanation or interpretation of what your results might mean. This is often the pivotal point in a paper, and signals the move towards the Discussion/Conclusion.

Choose your verb tense carefully. You can use the Present Simple or the Past Simple. Because the Present Simple is the tense used to express permanent truths and facts, using the Present Simple will give your sentence the status of a fact. Using the Present Simple therefore 'unlocks' your interpretation from your research and enhances its truth-value (*We found that x occurs, which indicate/suggests that y causes z*), If you are less confident, use the Past Simple (*We found that x occurred, which indicated/ suggested that y caused z*).

Notice how many words from the list of vocabulary used to describe causal relationships are found here (see Section 3.2.4).

apparently	it is logical that
apparentity	it is thought/haliawad that
	it is thought/believed that
could' be explained by	it seems that
could* account for	it seems plausible (<i>etc</i> .) that
could* be attributed to	likely
could* be interpreted as	may/might
could* be seen as	means that
evidently	perhaps
imply/implies that	possibly/possibility
indicate/indicating that	potentially
in some circumstances	presumably
is owing to	probably
is/are associated with	provide compelling evidence
is/are likely	seem to
is/are linked to	suggest(ing) that
is/are related to	support the idea that
it appears that	tend to
it could* be concluded that	tendency
it could* be inferred that	unlikely
it could* be speculated that	there is evidence for
it could* be assumed that	we could* infer that
it is conceivable that	we have confidence that
it is evident that	would seem to suggest/indicate
	00

**could* can be replaced by *may* or *might* or sometimes *can*; there is a grammar section on these modal verbs in the next unit.

- This suggests that silicon is intrinsically involved in the precipitation mechanism.
- These curves **indicate that** the effective breadth is a minimum at the point of application of the load.
- Empirically, **it seems that** alignment is most sensitive to rotation in depth.
- Only the autumn crocus produced a positive response, **suggesting that** other species would flower earlier under climate warming.

- It could be inferred therefore that these may have reacted with ozone to form organic acids, such as formic acid.
- This indicates that no significant crystalline transformations occurred during sintering.
- It is therefore speculated that at pH 7.5 a major part of the reaction was via hydroxyl radical attack.
- It is apparent that this type of controller may be more sensitive to plant/model mismatch than was assumed in simulation studies.
- The results **seem to indicate that** this causes the behaviour to become extremely volatile.
- It is evident that the ψ at midspan increases with the increasing *r*.

In your native language you intuitively choose words and phrases which reflect exactly the appropriate strength of your claim and the level of risk you want to take in stating it. You need to be able to do this in English, both in this section and in the Discussion/Conclusion.

The sentence *We found that sunbathing causes cancer* expresses a very strong claim, but you can communicate a weaker form of it in many different ways. Here are some examples:

We found that sunbathing **is related to the onset of** cancer.

We found that sunbathing was related to the onset of cancer.

We found that sunbathing **may have been related to** the onset of cancer.

We found **evidence to suggest that** sunbathing may have been related to the onset of cancer.

We found evidence to suggest that in **some cases/in many cases**, sunbathing may have been related to the onset of cancer.

We found evidence to suggest that in some cases, **excessive** sunbathing may have been related to the onset of **certain types of** cancer.

It is thought that excessive sunbathing may sometimes be considered as contributing to the onset of certain types of cancer.

3.5 Writing a Results Section

In the next task, you will bring together and use all the information in this unit. You will write a Results section according to the model, using the grammar and vocabulary you have learned, so make sure that you have the model (Section 3.3.3) and the vocabulary (Section 3.4) in front of you.