

Plants on Acid

Gray, Masterson, Gentile, Ingard

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

Layout and Appearance		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p>APPEARANCE: 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>SECTIONS: 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>BALANCE: Is there a nice balance between text and figures? Is there too much text?</p> <p>PROOFREADING: 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>Font size of body could be larger.</p> <p>Reduce amount of text by using bullets for the main points.</p> <p>Handwritten figure captions and authors' names look sloppy when everything else is typed.</p> <p>There are numerous grammatical errors. Gibberellic acid (“Gibrilic Acid”) and abscisic acid (“Absiscic Acid”) are repeatedly misspelled and should not be capitalized.</p>
Content		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p>TITLE: Does the title grab your attention?</p> <p>AUTHORS: Are the authors' names, affiliations, and contact information provided?</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: 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>METHODS: Were the methods described clearly and concisely?</p> <p>RESULTS: Were the graphs easy to understand? 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>Hypotheses are clearly stated in the introduction.</p> <p>Methods are clearly described.</p> <p>There is a clear connection between the objectives and the conclusions.</p> <p>The conclusions are supported by the data.</p> <p>Potential sources of error are pointed out.</p>	<p>Title is catchy, but does not hint at the results.</p> <p>Type authors' names and center them below the title.</p> <p>Use CSE in-text citation format¹ in the introduction. For Latin names of organisms, capitalize the genus (<i>Brassica</i>), make the species name lower case (<i>rapa</i>), and italicize both.</p> <p>Include a ruler as a scale bar in the photos.</p> <p>Graph format: x-axis scale should be spaced proportionally. To do so, use “scatter” not “line” as the chart type in Excel. Delete the gridlines.</p> <p>Eliminate the tables, because they show the same data as the graphs. Give the figures accurate and descriptive captions.</p> <p>In the results section, describe the important differences between the treatments. Describe the trends—do not list the individual numbers. Use</p>

¹ Council of Science Editors, Style Manual Committee. 2006. Scientific style and format: the CSE manual for authors, editors, and publishers. 7th ed. Reston (VA): The Council. 680 p.

		<p>precise language: “The seeds had grown to ...16 mm.” That’s a big seed! It makes more sense for the <i>seedlings</i> to grow to a height of 16 mm.</p> <p>Condense the first three paragraphs of the conclusion into a <i>summary</i> of the results. Give possible explanations for the results or compare your results to those in the literature.</p>
--	--	--