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| **CONCLUSIONS:**  *"The hills are alive with the sound of music�."* Well, music may make Julie Andrew�s hills come alive, but not the cherry belle radishes in our experiment. After reviewing the graphs and data comparisons, we have concluded that certain types of energy frequencies emitted by music does not in fact have any effect on plant physiology and it�s metabolism.  To come to this conclusion, we used correlation, which is used when analyzing bivariate data. It is a mathematical measure to determine the strength of a relationship. If there were to be a strong relationship, the result of the correlation equation using the data would equal 1. A correlation of 0 would show no possible relationship at all. The relationships we used were between the Control Group and Group 1, the Control Group and Group 2, and Group 1 and Group 2. Correlation would help us determine whether the data from two groups were associated. If the correlation showed a strong association between the data, then that would indicate that the growing patterns of the plants were not significantly different. Thus, plants growing under separate and different energy frequencies as opposed to silence do not have any physiological effect on them.  In our data, we found that most of the correlations fell between .89 to as high as .95. After comparing the Group 1 plants, which were grown under the influence of the popular rock song "Last Resort" by Papa Roach, with the Control Group, we saw that the correlation in their root lengths were .94. For the leaf lengths and widths, the correlations were .94 and .92. The result in root length correlation between the Control Group and Group 2, which were exposed to Pachebel�s Cannon, was .90. The leaf length and width outcomes were both .95. Since these numbers are reasonably close to 1, we can conclude that the growing patterns of the plants subjected to the varied music types are not distinct and unusual from the control grown under silence. Therefore, hush or no hush, the plants grew at the same rate. Musical influences, in our experiment, did not show any sign of giving the radishes any metabolic advantages over one another. It did not encourage the plant to have greater photosynthetic ability or promote better and faster growth.  Music may not help a plant�s life, but it certainly still does play a great role in the daily lives of humans. There is the theory that playing classical music to a fetus and newborn babies may encourage greater intellectual strength, but let�s leave that to other experiments. There are so many variables that cause the variations in human metabolism and growth. The way we were brought up to eat, the sports we play, and even the laziness that has caused many buttocks to be implanted on a couch for hours on end. Almost every activity we take part in effects us emotionally and physically in some way, so it is near impossible to test the sole influence of music on an individual. The benefits of song and harmony benefit different individuals in unique ways, just not with plants. For that reason, the best promotion for better plant growth is the gardener�s own shadow.  ([Next to Recommendations](http://docs.google.com/recomendations.html))    [[Home](http://docs.google.com/home.html)][[Introduction](http://docs.google.com/introduction.html)][[Hypothesis](http://docs.google.com/hypothesis.html)][[Procedure](http://docs.google.com/procedure.html)][[Data](http://docs.google.com/data.html)][[Conclusions](http://docs.google.com/conclusions.html)][[Bilio/Links](http://docs.google.com/biblio.html)]  [[2001 Projects](http://docs.google.com/index.html)][[2000 Projects](http://docs.google.com/AP2000/index.html)][[1999 Projects](http://docs.google.com/AP99/index.html)][[1998 Projects](http://docs.google.com/AP98/index.html)] |