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| [Homepage](http://docs.google.com/homepage.htm)  [Abstract](http://docs.google.com/abstract.htm)  [Introduction](http://docs.google.com/introduction.htm)  [Review of the Literature](http://docs.google.com/research.htm)  [Statement of the Problem](http://docs.google.com/problem.htm)  [Hypothesis](http://docs.google.com/hypothesis.htm)  [Materials](http://docs.google.com/materials.htm)  [Procedure](http://docs.google.com/procedure.htm)  [Results](http://docs.google.com/results.htm)  [Recommendations](http://docs.google.com/recommendations.htm)  [Acknowledgments](http://docs.google.com/acknowledgements.htm)  [Daily Log](http://docs.google.com/biolog.htm)  [Images](http://docs.google.com/images.htm)  [Works Cited](http://docs.google.com/workscited.htm) | The results from this experiment are quite interesting. There is no clear cut answer, only more questions to address. Contrary to the research performed at the University of California, Irvine, the classical music did not stimulate the grass. The study does state that only Mozart has an effect, but the music played to the grass was composed by Mozart, so that can't be the reason. In Dorothy Retallack's experiment's her plants leaned toward the classical music coming out of the stereo. The evidence here clearly shows classical as having the greatest negative impact on the grass' metabolism, however . There were only fifty five total blades in a 4 inch by 4 inch square. The greatest number of blades was at the height 7 centimeters, which is hardly growing past the cut stage. There were taller blades, but they were few and far between. The chlorophyll absorbency was not very good, but it again wasn't the worst. Perhaps the sound waves stimulated the blades to make more chlorophyll, or the plants naturally made more chlorophyll to make up for the lack of blades. Perhaps the music stunted the growth of the grass, but didn't affect the production of chlorophyll.  The grass that didn't hear any music was the best is no real surprise. The grass that didn't hear any music was the densest, even though it wasn't in the tested area, and was a deep dark green. The fact that the grass without music was the healthiest suggests that all music has a negative impact on plants.  Since the intensity of the sound vibration changes with frequency, it could have been assumed that the rap and the hard rock grass would have been close to equal health wise. The wave patterns and frequency patterns of both clips of music are very similar, so it is surprising that the grass would be healthy in one tray and unhealthy in the other. Perhaps there is something more than just frequencies and wave patterns affecting the grass that is indistinguishable in this experiment.  Most of the grass trays stayed fairly constant in their rankings. The one exception would be the Hawaiian music. It ranked first in the number of blades in the selected area, although the control tray actually had more, and ranked last in the chlorophyll absorbency. The grass could have been stimulated into a growth spurt, and not have made the choroplasts yet. It could be that the age of the choroplasts have something to do with their absorbency. Or it could be that the Hawaiian music prevented the correct number of chloroplasts from being made.  The grass that did not have any music played to it was best overall. The other grasses separated out distinctly, with Rap second, Jazz third, Hawaiian fourth, Hard Rock fifth, and Classical sixth. This distinct separation leads to the belief that sound negatively impact the grasses metabolism. |