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|  | As my experiment came to an end and I had all my 21 day old C. tentans larvae dead, dried, and ready to weigh, I pulled out Mr. Theilís electronic gram scale which he so kindly let me borrow (thank you very much Mr. Theil). I must point out that not all of the larvae from every bin did survive. I was still able to take an average weight of the surviving larvae from each bin. The amount of surviving larvae for each bin is shown in the data section under table 1.2. Once I weighed out the larvae from each bin I took an average weight by dividing the total weight by the number of weighed organisms. The average larval weight for each bin is recorded in table 1.3.  Now it is time to assess my data. As seen in table 1.3 of the data section, the larvae in the aquarium sand (the control) did grow the most out of the six samples. The larvae in the five sediment samples taken from the Arroyo Del Valle had relatively the same weights but did differ slightly.  The order of the weights within the sediments that I did predict were not very accurate as my data shows. The sites below are outlined in the hypothesis. The larvae with the greatest weight aside from the control came from site two and was significantly different from the other sites. The order of the other sites from greatest growth to least growth was sites four and five in a tie with .0357g/larvae, then came site four with .0353g/larvae, and the site with the least larval growth was site three with .0333g/larvae.  These results did not concur with my hypothesis. There could be several reasons why they did not. The main reason could be that my hypothesis was purely based on speculation by the location of the site and the appearance of the siteís water. Another explanation could be experimental. Something unknowingly could have gone wrong within the experiment. Although I attempted to control as many items as possible, something could still have easily gone wrong. The light given to the bins came from a pantry light. This light might not have been perfectly distributed to each of the bins. I did notice some fungal growth on the tops of the soils. This could have effectively stunted the growth of the larvae. The major player in the fact that the averages were so close together I believe was the sample size. Because my scale was only specific down to .05 grams, the small size of the larvae made it difficult to effectively compare the average weights. When comparing the weights of these larvae, sample size needs to be much bigger than that which I used in order to compare more effectively. If my sample size was bigger I could have clearer and more concrete results which might then have been similar to my hypothesis.  What my results tell me is the compared sediment pollution levels among the sites I tested within the Arroyo Del Valle. Because my results were so similar and my sample size was not large enough, I cannot call my results conclusive. To prove or test my hypothesis more effectively, more trials with sediment from the sites that I have chosen need to be carried out with a greater sample size. |
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