

## Methodology

### General Observations

-short para  
-sub-titles and sub-sub-titles  
-simple S-V-O (subject, verb, object) sentence structure; significant repetition; signposting, clear, concise (read out a couple of sentences to illustrate)

-organization: starts with data-set as source, then focuses on what was done to / with data

**-Q. What is significant about last sentence in second paragraph?**

-A. emphasizes import of data (not asked since or before)

**-Q. Why the level of detail in para 3?**

**-Q. Why all the sources in para 5?**

**-Q. Why do authors define “neighbourhood” in para 7? Doesn’t everyone know? Isn’t this common knowledge?**

-A. defining key terms is essential in any discipline. Many different understandings of and definitions of neighbourhood—legal and colloquial.

## Results

-Note topic sentences of para 1 and 3 (both foreground fact that data tables are being explained); constant link to “data” is essential to success of narrative. Grammatical subject of sentence is focus of paragraph, and this continues through paragraph.

-note repetition of word “respondents” in para 1; thesaurus is NOT used and this is good.

Q. Why the use of the **passive voice** in Results (para 2; “were associated”) but active voice in Methods (para 1; “we used” or “the survey used”)?

A. methods selected and applied by scientist; results generated by scientific world

**-note use of word “suggested” in para 3. (“Why is this word used? What is the rhetorical effect”?)**

-note reference to “maps” in para 4 and 5 (again, first noun in topic sentence of paragraph connects text to figures/tables and data that provide evidence to support thesis)

**-note shift in verb tense between present tense for tables and charts (“Table one shows” in para 1) created by author and past tense for all interpretations of the data in those tables and charts** (curiously, maps are described in past tense—likely because they were created by someone else before the study was conducted); “Maps provided” and there “were direct correlations” in para 4; “were near perfectly correlated” in para 3.

-in general, past tense is used . . . but references to other parts of paper can be in present

-all of this is simple, concise, focused, well-organized, easy to follow—data is clearly connected to narrative explanation

Discussion

**Q. What is the purpose of Para 1?**

-note emphasis on data and methods in first sentence of para 1 (this is what can be replicated, and so what is of most importance to reader)

-specific application of methods and interpretation of results detailed in second sentence; for example, note the “strong associations” between x and y

-rest of para 1 provides concrete and specific conclusions drawn from data

**Q. Why all the references in para 2?**

A. filling gap; standing on shoulders of giants (others focused on positive, not negative perceptions; none specifically focused on regions)

-Note this sentence in para 3: “Such maps may be useful for bringing political attention to neighborhood situations.” Authors are emphasizing “implications” of their research; this is what the Discussion should do. The rest of the para focuses on how one could use the research to effect policy—typical of “Discussion” (good for students to model).

-para 4 also tries to connect research results to policy; note and explain the rhetorical strategy of using words like “appear, suggest, may”)

-para 5 “improves on previous work” is a key phrase in topic sentence; rest of paragraph explains “how” this is true

-para 6: the phrase “future application” in topic sentence says it all; very good signposting throughout

-as an aside, this whole essay provides good illustrations of value of reverse outlining exercise; the first sentence in each para, when isolated from rest of paragraph, tells reader precisely what the essay is doing.

-rest of Discussion focuses on strengths and limitations

-para 7: “Our approach has several strengths. We explored relationships among and between three separate measures of the food environment and two separate measures of dietary intake. We used a large, city-wide dataset to demonstrate findings specific to Philadelphia, and employed a method that could be transportable to other municipalities having similar community-health survey . . .”

-the authors’ description of their “approach” is described in present tense; details of that approach (strengths) is described in past tense

-this is summary of what the research achieved—a kind of recap, emphasizing methods and the results it generated; the first two words of every sentence in this para are “we” and a verb (“used”, “calculated” etc.); repetitive but effective and easy-to-read structure

-para 8: same points as in para 7, but with regards to limitations; students should be reminded of the value of showing an awareness of the limitation of their work.