

## Findings for the Polymer Lab Report

Upon initial inspection of the Report Abstract, I have noticed the following:

- The woman's abstract is much shorter and uses less technical language. Where she can, she states the information more succinctly than either of the men do. She mentions that the polymers were examined using 'quantitative observation,' which neither of the men mention.
- The woman also states in the abstract where error might have occurred and what might have been done to rectify the error.
- Both men's reports are justified, while the woman's report is not.
- I, personally had a much easier time understanding what the lab was about from the woman's report than from the men's.

Moving onto the Introduction, the following immediately jump out at me:

- The men's introductions are both nearly a page, while the woman's is only two paragraphs
- The men's introductions both include a diagram of the polymer that is being created
- With the introduction, the men both provide detailed background about polymers, while the woman describes polymers in relation to the lab that was done.

Looking at the Methods:

- Both men start their methods section with the list of materials, first by Part A followed immediately by Part B. The procedure then follows.
- The woman includes her list of materials and the apparatus she used for each part at the end of her procedure for the corresponding part.
- She also labels her Part A and Part B clearly, whereas the men leave it as simply 'Part A' and 'Part B'

Results:

- The woman again organizes her results by 'Part A. Phthalic anhydride-derived polyesters' and 'Part B. Preparation of Nylon-6,10.' Neither of the men include that level of distinction, instead organizing their information into a couple paragraphs or even just one paragraph.
- Again, the woman is very succinct, while the men included much more description in their results.

Discussion:

- Like with the introduction, the men included more information about polymers in general, while the woman focused more on the context of the lab.
- The men utilized diagrams and organized their discussion by the reactions that occurred. The woman gave more of an overview of what occurred.

Conclusion:

- The woman uses 'Unfortunately,' when discussing the human error factor in the research
- When suggesting improvements to the experiment, the woman uses phrases like 'this could (blank),' while the both the men used phrases like 'this *would* (blank)."

- Both men's reports were 8 pages long. The woman's report was 5 pages.



StYLUS  
a journal of first-year writing