

Technological  
Description  
\* subtle persuasion  
price should be included (compare)

Thesis statement  
"Lab # is the best  
written report  
of the three reviewed"

The Effects of Music on Physical Activity and Academic Performance Lab Report Analysis

Nicholas Christopher Durgadeen

The City College of New York, New York

✓ we discussed that the way I wrote my in-text citations  
in the introduction were acceptable

Questions:

- ① Did I make a clear identification of what lab report was the best?
- ② Did I use enough support?
- ③ How is my grammar?

EFFECTS OF MUSIC

Introduction

Abstract

Use all format for all headings

described

~~In this lab report analysis, I will be describing~~ the similarities and differences among three reports. The analysis approach ~~I chose~~ will compare and contrast each section of all lab reports separately. I will thoroughly examine each section, the organization of information, and whether any information was appropriately used. The subject ~~I chose~~ to research was music and its effect on the human body. ~~I found three lab reports, each individually explain their research in unique ways.~~ The following lab reports will be referenced throughout the analysis by their assigned numbers. Lab #1: *The effects of different music genres on physical performance* by Z. Belford, C. Neher, T. Pernsteiner, J. Stoffregen, and Z. Tariq was written at the University of Wisconsin in May of 2013. This lab report focuses on how different genres of music can affect the physiology of a person including heart rate, electrodermal arousal, and maximum grip strength. Lab #2: *The impact of music on the academic performance of undergraduate students* by P. Rajab and M. Pitman was written in the Spring of 2019. This lab report emphasizes on how music can affect a student's academic performance such as recollection and encoding new information. Lab #3: *Music and Memory: Effects of Listening to Music While Studying in College Students* was written by Lara Dodge, a student in the Honors College of the University of Wisconsin-Stout, alongside professor M. Mensink, Ph.D. This lab report has similar concepts tested in Lab #1 and Lab #2; the authors <sup>past tense</sup> ~~experiment the affects that music genres can have on the~~ ~~cognitive behavior of college students.~~ ~~I will break down the standard lab report format below~~

~~into sections with headings that explain how each report approached the same topic. I~~ ~~approached each analysis with an open mind, being ignorant to the subject at hand to remove any~~ ~~sense of bias or opinion.~~

-this part was really good

This is too long for an abstract - It's actually 1 pvr info.

7. (circled)

~~These could be used for points~~  
~~No first point~~  
~~Waltz~~



Abstract

*bold + centered.*

The abstract is a brief summary of the report. The author will typically present the objective of the experiment, provide short details about the procedures, and any key findings. In Lab #1, the authors chose to write their key words before the abstract. Also, the authors began the abstract by asserting the hypothesis and providing the results of the investigation for a clear clarification of the experiment. ~~This allows readers to have background knowledge of the report, they will not have to spend time reading the report to figure out what the lab is about.~~ (In addition, no

procedures about data collection were defined in the abstract but were mentioned in the method section.) Lab #2 doesn't have any abstract written in their lab report. The readers don't have a general understanding of the objective or any information about what they are about to read. This can confuse readers and can possibly lose their interest to read the lab report overall. However,

Lab #3 does have an abstract, but the hypothesis isn't provided. They explain one type of method used and its outcome. Unlike Lab #1 and #2, a brief description of the procedure is given which can allow readers to understand the setup of the experiment. I believe Lab #1 and #3 both have wholesome abstracts but has room for improvement. Lab #3 could've provided a brief

description of their procedure in the abstract. The authors of Lab #2 didn't write an abstract, so I don't have anything to analyze. Lab #1 had the best written abstract of the three reports.

*Analyze the effect of the lack of abstract on the quality of the lab report.*

Introduction

The introduction of the lab report should set up all the information that comes next. It's the beginning paragraph that sets the tone and path for the paper. The introduction should catch attention and hopefully encourage your reader to be enlightened to continue reading. Lab #1's

introduction is about a page long, very comprehensive. The authors relate back to the research

*Why does this matter? Explain/Analyze*

*Final a better word?*

*reword in another way*

*proper knowledge*

*they need to help the author digest the information, make it belong to the picture.*

*for when graphics are not explained.*

*is it needed*

*from*

*write the authors here*

*it's a well-developed analysis*

*could have*

*Say what you truly mean in 1 sentence.*



they did themselves when doing the lab report and talks about what the study aims to prove. All five authors explain each physiological component including what it is and how it will be tested in the experiment. For example, various measurements were taken to determine how music can influence your electrodermal arousal, the skin's electrical response to sweat secretion. Another measurement tested how the different tempos and rhythms can affect a subject's heart rate. Lastly, the final method was the conception that listening to certain types of music can activate feed-forward mechanisms, leading to increases in physical performance. In Lab #2, the introduction is one paragraph long that expresses the research they collected. The authors explain the history of music and how it has been used in many different ways throughout life. Furthermore, they explain how research has suggested music can be a distraction and become detrimental to cognitive performance, information that gets encoded is manipulated for later retrieval. In Lab #3, the introduction is an excruciating five pages long. The authors present the notion of how it is common for college students to listen to music while studying. The methods and procedures of how they collected their data were explained in the introduction, even though the report has a separate section for this information. Lab #3 did not do a good job in their introduction. The information in this section could've been placed in better parts of the paper. For example, the procedure and method are heavily described here. The authors should've provided a brief description in the abstract and removed all details left to be later used to explain their methods. The information in the introduction shouldn't give away the whole experiment, it should allow readers to understand the concepts behind the research. Lab #1 has the best written introduction. Lab #2 and Lab #3 need adjustments.

You are stating too many details of the labs and providing too little analysis <sup>about</sup> the quality of the info. Analyze, then use lab details as evidence to support your analysis.



Methods & Procedures

The method section of the lab report provides a clear and precise description of how an experiment was done, and the rationale for why specific experimental procedures were chosen. The reader should be able to read your procedure section and imitate the test/experiment exactly. In Lab #1, the authors specifically explain the subjects of the experiment. They provide the number of subjects used and their age ranges. In addition, the authors thoroughly explicate the procedure that takes place. The subjects sat in a relaxed position holding a pulse oximeter in their dominant hand and two EDA sensors in the other. While listening to the audio clips, heart rate and electrodermal activity ~~was~~<sup>were</sup> recorded. The audio clips were selected based on genre, rhythm, and tempo characteristics. Each subject listened to three different audio clips, one song represented the ambient genre, a white noise audio clip, and an instrumental clip with a 30 second gap between each clip to avoid any influence from the previous clip. The authors were so descriptive that anyone can reproduce the same experiment. Lab #2 doesn't deliver the same methodology format as Lab #1. The authors of Lab #2 don't indicate the number of subjects used nor their ages. In addition, they explain what the experiment was but don't provide specific details about their procedure. The assessment wasn't formally explained in writing but is visually illustrated through the figures. I couldn't understand what the assessment was until I looked at the figures. Even then, the authors were supposed to provide the explanation, readers shouldn't have to infer. In Lab #3, the authors provide the same information as Lab #1. The authors of Lab #3 provided the number of subjects used and their age ranges. Their explanation of the procedure was clear and concise. The participants were broken up into two groups, each group listened to a different style of music while taking an assessment test that asked you to read a passage, answer comprehension questions and some mathematical questions. Lab #1 and Lab #3 both did

Bob  
1/4  
what's now  
your  
of your  
presentation  
in this  
section?  
Bad?  
Bad?  
Name it!

You need Paragraphs.



excellent jobs in composing their method section of the lab report. Lab #2 has little to no explanation of the procedure which needs to be fixed.

Results & Figures

In this section, the author is to report the test's outcome(s). Here, the author is supposed to tell the readers what the test measured, including any calculations or equations. In Lab #1, the author doesn't seem to provide any valid results. The author just explains the figures they formulated using the research they calculated. There are eight figures that each have their own description below it. This allows readers to understand what they are looking at. In Lab #2, the author explains the results they got from the surveys the participants took in the beginning before their assessment. However, the authors do point out the outcome of the experiment. Lab #2 concluded that students performed worse on the assessment whilst listening to their own choice of music, with no significant differences in performance noted between either white noise or classical music conditions. The figures in Lab #2 do not have any details written about them so it is confusing when trying to understand the charts. Lab #3 also provides a clear explanation about their results from the experiment. Lab #3 concludes that participants assigned to read the test in the silence condition produced more correct answers than those in the music conditions group. There was no significance between listening to either pop or classical music, the students who took the assessment in silence performed superior than those listening to music. In addition, Lab #3 also provides figures with proper labeling and keys to for readers to understand the graphs like Lab #1. Lab #3 may not have any descriptions about the figures however with the correct labeling and notation, it is clear what the figure is about.

where in body of lab? caption?

Does or doesn't?

does or doesn't?



Discussion

In the conclusions, the author is to comment on the outcomes of the test. They might also speculate about the implications of the results. Lab #1<sup>space</sup> is about two pages long. All five authors explain their understanding of the outcomes of the experiment thoroughly. They've concluded that there is no difference between which music is being listened to and a physiological change of these variables due to the music. The authors try to explain that many other studies have proven otherwise. In addition, the authors try to describe any problems that could've affected their results. They believe that if the participant is given too much information about the experiment, the participant could anticipate their own physiological responses due to their own expectation. Another problem they talk about is the lack of controlling external stimuli of the participant. For example, the pulse oximeter was in the view of the participant meaning they could read their own heart rate and unknowingly influence their arousal and heart rate. I believe trying to find errors that could've influenced the results of the experiment are important in the process to avoid making the same mistakes when repeating the experiment. In Lab #2, the authors discussion section is quite short. The authors say the outcome of the experiment with very little support. They've concluded that students' working memory performance is significantly worse when they listen to their own choice of music. In Lab #3, the authors repeat their hypothesis and then provide details about the outcome of the experiment. This makes the most structural sense because it reminds the reader what the authors thought would happen. The outcome of the experiment was that the results suggest that the auditory environment has potentially limited influence on college student's ability to study. Similarly, to Lab #1, Lab #3 provides a variety of outside factors that may have swayed the results of the study. For example, it was possible that many participants were not motivated to participate in the experiment, or the

Concl. is too long. Perhaps some info sh  
be in the body. You sh not provide new analysis here.  
Or restate all of your analysis here - Summarize w/ your  
overall judgments



five minutes of reading time was not sufficient for full comprehension of the text. The authors of Lab #3 provide suggestions that they could follow that would reduce the amount of outlier influences. Lab #1 and #3 both provided sufficient discussion sections for the lab report however, Lab #2 needed more details and explanations.

*The citations are good just remove the capitalization of the titles.*

*\*recheck the citations using Purdue OWL*

References

Belford, Z., Neher, C., Pernsteiner, T., Stoffregen, J., & Tariq, Z. (2013, May 7). THE EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT MUSIC GENRES ON PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE AS MEASURED BY THE HEART RATE, ELECTRODERMAL AROUSAL, AND MAXIMUM GRIP STRENGTH.

Retrieved from [http://jass.neuro.wisc.edu/2013/01/Lab Report 602\\_5 final submission.pdf](http://jass.neuro.wisc.edu/2013/01/Lab Report 602_5 final submission.pdf)

Dodge, L., & Mensink, Ph.D, M. C. (n.d.). MUSIC AND MEMORY: EFFECTS OF LISTENING TO MUSIC WHILE STUDYING IN COLLEGE STUDENTS. Retrieved from

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3042/de1a944ac1084fe8cc52324ae7fdcf13e27.pdf>

Kallet, R. H. (2004, October). HOW TO WRITE THE METHODS SECTION OF A RESEARCH PAPER. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15447808>

Rajab, P., & Pitman, M. (2019). THE IMPACT OF MUSIC ON THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS. Retrieved from

[https://ptc.bps.org.uk/sites/ptc.bps.org.uk/files/adm/2019\\_11.1\\_web\\_selected\\_article\\_the\\_impact\\_of\\_music\\_on\\_the\\_academic\\_performance\\_of\\_undergraduate\\_students.pdf](https://ptc.bps.org.uk/sites/ptc.bps.org.uk/files/adm/2019_11.1_web_selected_article_the_impact_of_music_on_the_academic_performance_of_undergraduate_students.pdf)

*-Your analyses was very well written & you shouldn't change anything. You used a good amount of support, and clearly stated which lab was best.*

*Why the all capitalization of ~~titles~~ titles?*