

# The Effects of Different Color Light on Plant Growth

Schloss and Steiman

Presented in an introductory course for non-majors at Bucknell University

Layout and Appearance		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p><b>APPEARANCE:</b> Is the poster neatly constructed? Do the text and the figures stand out against the background? Are colors and fonts used consistently? Is the text large and legible from 3–6 feet away?</p> <p><b>SECTIONS:</b> Does each section begin with a descriptive heading? Is there sufficient space between sections? Do the sections naturally flow from top left to bottom right?</p> <p><b>BALANCE:</b> Is there a nice balance between text and figures? Is there too much text?</p> <p><b>PROOFREADING:</b> Is the text free of typos and grammatical errors?</p>	<p>Each section has a descriptive heading.</p>	<p>Poster looks sloppy because (1) title, authors' names, and figure titles are handwritten (not even neatly), (2) the graph looks hastily thrown together, and (3) the edges of the printed pages and the colored borders are uneven.</p> <p>Reduce amount of text by using bullets for the main points.</p> <p>Sections are out of order; they do not flow logically from top left to bottom right.</p> <p>Text and figures are not balanced.</p> <p>In the title, use “colored” (adjective) instead of “color” (noun). Proofread carefully to catch errors such as “we placed the quads <b>in their under</b> different types of light.”</p>
Content		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p><b>TITLE:</b> Does the title grab your attention?</p> <p><b>AUTHORS:</b> Are the authors' names, affiliations, and contact information provided?</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION:</b> Were the objectives clearly stated? Do you understand why this study was done? Did you get enough background information to understand the system? Were any abbreviations defined for the general visitor? Were the hypotheses rational?</p> <p><b>METHODS:</b> Were the methods described clearly and concisely?</p> <p><b>RESULTS:</b> Were the graphs easy to un-</p>	<p>Good use of pictures to show <b>setup</b>.</p> <p>There is a clear connection between the objectives and the conclusions.</p>	<p><b>Title</b> is vague. What aspect of plant growth is being studied?</p> <p>Use CSE in-text citation format<sup>1</sup> in the <b>introduction</b>. The hypotheses do not follow logically from the background info provided.</p> <p>The usual heading is “<b>Materials and Methods</b>” or “<b>Procedures</b>,” not “Materials and Procedures.” Use bullets to highlight actual steps. Eliminate verbiage such as “The member would then...” The</p>

<sup>1</sup> Council of Science Editors, Style Manual Committee. 2006. *Scientific style and format: The CSE manual for authors, editors, and publishers*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Reston (VA): The Council. 680 pp.

<p>derstand? Were any graphics distracting?</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS: Do the conclusions match the data? Are reasonable ideas put forth to explain the observed patterns? Is there a clear connection between the conclusions and the original objectives?</p>		<p>last sentence is unnecessary.</p> <p>Do not include tables of raw data in the <b>results</b>. Instead, summarize the data with mean and standard deviation on the graph.</p> <p>Include a ruler as a scale bar in the photos.</p> <p>The <b>conclusions</b> section contains a contradiction concerning no light (“no light would grow the least” and then “these plants grew rather tall”).</p> <p>The usual heading is “<b>References</b>” or “<b>Works Cited</b>,” not “Resources.”</p>
--	--	---