

Danny Weng

Ms. Stephanie Jean-Stern

English 21007, Section G

April 1st, 2019

Lab 2 and Lab 3

Salman Rushdie, a British Indian novelist and essayist said, “the only people who see the whole picture are the ones who step outside the frame” (Rushdie, 1999, p. 20). Those who sees the whole picture can point out the flaws. And so, after reading, analyzing and seeing the whole picture of lab 2 and 3, there were some flaws with both labs. Lab 2 is about how researchers are evaluating a vibration analysis tools to predict the integrities of structures. Lab 3 is about designing a temperature measuring system. Then sending a message back to the PC if the temperature is higher than the stated limit using a microcontroller from Motorola. Although both labs had good research, they lacked some minor details that made it difficult for the reader to interpret the information. Making the both labs inefficient, by having no abstract and their methods can be organized in a more effective way.

The first criterion that both is the lack of an abstract. An abstract is a brief technical summary of the report. It addresses the readers that are familiar with the subject and allows the reader to decide whether if they want to read the report or not. Which they both labs lack. The lack of abstract forces the reader to continue reading the report without giving them an opportunity to choose if they want to read the report in the first place. For example, for lab 2 although the writers provide and summary and introduction. However, it would been much easier for to us as readers to know where to draw the line when the abstract is done and the beginning

of the introduction. It also makes the writing look more cluttered. While lab 3 doesn't even have an abstract and only starts at the introduction. Without it the readers won't be able to know the key findings, the significance and major conclusions. An abstract is also including the recommendations which again both labs lacked. For example, for lab 3, providing an alternative for those who cannot get their hands on a 68HC11 Microcontroller or can the experiment be replicated with a similar microcontroller but different model. And Lab 2 only stating "As you requested in your memo" (Lalime, 2001, p.1). That would have been clearer if they state the comments made on the memo.

The second criterion is both their methods for their procedures were cluttered and could have been organized by just using bullet points to show each part of the process. Also, in lab 2 it was really annoying to have one procedure about the strain gage and indicator on page 2 and another method about signal analyzer. This was an example of block style technical writing which is often utilized for shorter assignments, essays, and papers. In this method, all the information about Point A is written about in the first half of the paper. Then continue for as many points the writer may have. This method used for this paper that are 3 pages because the reader may forget what they wrote before and clearing this lab report is not 3 pages. Making this lab report annoying to read. The reader might have to go back and forth looking for information which is not an effective way for the lab report.

It can be concluded, the two labs that were analyzed were lab 2 and lab 3. Both labs had good and interesting research but the way that they were giving the information was confusing each on their own way. Both papers were transparent and were not trying to hide anything. However, in the end they both lack minor details to a lab report to be considered effective overall. The significance of some minor details to both labs can make it that much harder to

interpret the information. They both had no abstract, a 100-200-word paragraph giving a detailed summary of the own paper. Also, gives an opportunity if the reader wants to continue reading the paper or not. It also and their methods can be organized in a more effective way.

Reference (APA)

Rushdie, S. (1999). *The Ground Beneath Her Feet*. United Kingdom: Jonathan Cape