

Abstract

The abstract is a **brief overview (summary)** of the investigation written on a separate page.

- The abstract consists of **4 paragraphs and a maximum of 250 words**. (Do a word count!)
- The abstract form should not print onto more than one (1) page (check your printer margins!).
- The abstract should include the project title, a statement of the purpose, hypothesis, a brief description of the procedure, and the results.

Key Starter Sentences:

1. The purpose of this project was . . . I hypothesized (or predicted) that . . .
 - Note: Do not include the second sentence of the purpose.
2. The experiment involved . . . (Brief procedure of the experiment.)
3. The data collected [did/did not] support the original hypothesis (or prediction).
 - Include two or three sentences that use specific numerical data to give evidence of the support or lack of support for the hypothesis (or prediction).
 - USE AVERAGES of the data!
 - Include units when discussing data.
4. These findings lead me to believe . . .

Example Abstract:

Abstract
Hydrophobic Soil Rehabilitation
Lorne Muir II

The purpose of this investigation was to test if earthworms were an effective way to cut through the ash and hydrophobic layer of soil caused by a forest fire. I hypothesized that if earthworms and mulch were placed on top of the hydrophobic layer created by wild fires, then the amount of time needed to rehabilitate the soil would decrease when compared to using each separately or applying nothing to the soil.

The experiment involved setting up eight large cinder blocks. Two cinder blocks were labeled with each of the following: “Control,” “Control-Mulch,” “Earthworms,” and “Earthworms-Mulch.” Natural wood coals were burned on top of the soil with a blow torch for 30 minutes. Four trials were performed for each group, and a base line permeability reading was measured. Earthworms and mulch were added if needed, and then the permeability rate of the soil was measured every three days for 12 days.

The data collected did not support my original hypothesis. For “Earthworms-Mulch” the average permeability rate *decreased* by 75.4%. The average permeability rate for “Earthworms” *decreased* the most at 84.5%. The “Control-Mulch” did the worst and *increased* by 67.3%.

These findings lead me to believe that if earthworms are placed on top of the hydrophobic layer created by wild fires, then the amount of time needed to rehabilitate the soil will decrease. The current method of placing mulch on top of the damage soil proved to be the least effective.