

# The Effects of Different Levels of Fertilization on *Brassica rapa* Plants

## Allderdice, Diehl, Thansum

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

<b>Layout and Appearance</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>
<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>Poster is neatly constructed.</p> <p>Nice use of colored paper for contrast.</p> <p>Each section has a descriptive heading.</p> <p>Good use of space.</p> <p>Layout flows from top left to bottom right.</p> <p>Good balance between text and figures.</p>	<p>Make font size of body larger.</p> <p>Reduce amount of text by using bullets for the main points.</p> <p>There are a number of grammatical errors and word choice issues (e.g., “ring” instead of “wring”; “effect” instead of “affect”).</p>
<b>Content</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>
<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 understand? Were any graphics distracting?</p> <p><b>CONCLUSIONS:</b> 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><b>Hypothesis</b> is clearly stated in the introduction.</p> <p><b>Methods</b> are clearly described.</p> <p><b>Graphs</b> are easy to understand.</p> <p>The <b>conclusions</b> are supported by the data.</p> <p>Potential sources of error are pointed out.</p>	<p><b>Title</b> is descriptive, but does not hint at the results.</p> <p>Center <b>authors’ names</b> below the title.</p> <p>In the <b>introduction</b>, do not say: “<i>prove</i> our hypothesis right or wrong.” Instead, say something like “to test our hypothesis” or “to see if our hypothesis is supported or negated.” Use CSE in-text citation format<sup>1</sup> in the <b>introduction</b>.</p> <p>Each item in the <b>methods</b> section could be shortened by eliminating “we” did this and that.</p> <p>In the <b>photos</b>, include a ruler as a size bar. Include a caption that states the important result.</p> <p><b>Graph format:</b> delete gridlines and gray background; choose dark colors for lines and symbols (the yellow line on the gray background is barely visible).</p> <p>Delete the first paragraph of the <b>results</b> section. Describe the actual</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><i>results</i>, not just the <i>variables</i> on the axes. Where is Figure 3? Do not interpret the results in the results section (e.g. “This data suggests that...”); save interpretations for the conclusion.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between the variables you measured (height, # leaves, # buds) and the variable mentioned in the hypothesis (chlorophyll). Therefore, there is no clear connection between the <b>conclusions</b> and the hypothesis.</p> <p>The <b>Work cited</b> section is out of place.</p>
--	--	---