SURF Abstract Guidelines

Please follow the outlined instructions for abstract preparation. All submissions must be followed precisely. Any abstract that does not conform to the guidelines will not be accepted. Example abstracts in the correct format can be found at the end of this document and in the SURF 2019 Program and Abstract Book on the SURF website (https://www.elon.edu/u/academics/undergraduate-research/surf).

All abstracts MUST:
• Have been reviewed by two Elon faculty members other than your mentor
• Be the revised version, having taken into account the reviewers’ comments
• Be submitted with prior approval by your faculty mentor
• Be less than 350 words
• Not include the presentation title or the author information
• Spell out Greek letters and avoid special symbols and characters as much as you can (They would not work with the online submission system.)

What to include in the abstracts?
• Background/rationale for your scholarship
  o What is the essential question addressed by your research?
  o Why is the question important, what are the implications of your research or how is the question situated in a given academic discipline?
• Methods/processes employed in your scholarship
  o How did you seek an answer to the question (methodology or approach)?
• Findings/results and discussion
  o What did your scholarship find?
  o What is the major conclusion of your research?
• Any citations within the abstract should follow APA style

We understand that disciplines vary with respect to the above questions and that abstracts for creative work may well be quite different from those for scientific studies, but within those disciplinary differences the fundamental questions posed above can still be addressed. The Undergraduate Research Program requests that you make every effort to include sufficient information so that they are understood by a general audience. When possible, avoid technical language or provide explanations of appropriate terminology. Only submit abstracts that have been approved by your mentor and by two other Elon faculty with disciplinary expertise.
Example 1:

Research conducted in preschool settings has shown that when young children practice predicting and evaluating difficult mathematical concepts, they are more likely to have increased numeracy performance by evaluating their own predictions in the future (Gelman & Brenneman, 2004; Gelman, 2006). However, no known research has examined this in the context of numeracy activities at home. There is also very little research examining parent guidance of preschoolers’ math learning in virtual and physical games. Therefore, this study investigated the effect of training parents to employ a predicting and evaluating method of guidance on children’s numeracy abilities; the influence of parent-child engagement in experiences related to the mathematical skills over a one-month period; and the nature of the activities (physical versus virtual). It was expected that with parent guidance for predicting and evaluating math skills, children would be more likely to spontaneously evaluate their predictions and demonstrate increased accuracy. Furthermore, it was expected that parents across all conditions would be more likely to guide numeracy during physical games in comparison to virtual games. Twenty-eight families with a 4- or 5-year-old (11 girls, 23 mothers, 2 fathers, 3 families with mothers and fathers) were randomly assigned to a guidance or control group. After a short assessment of the child’s mathematical abilities, families in both conditions were left with games and other activities to do together over a four-week period. After four weeks, a post-test was conducted where families in both conditions played a new set of physical and virtual games focused on counting, fractions and measurement, and the math assessment was repeated. Preliminary results suggest that parents provided more guidance in physical activity contexts as opposed to virtual contexts. Parents who received training were more likely to ask their children to make and evaluate predictions, but this varied across activity contexts. Further analyses are in progress. Results of this project will provide evidence of the importance of the social environment for young children’s learning, particularly regarding the support parents provide as they engage in various activities with their preschoolers.
Example 2:

This study explores the ways in which dance students demonstrate rhetorical agency when verbally articulating their experiences in a university dance program. Rhetorical agency is a process by which individuals create meanings through engaging with the world and adapting, learning, and developing in response to the consequences of their actions (Cooper, 2011); in this study, rhetorical agency served as a previously-untapped theoretical framework for conceiving dancers as responsive, active agents. Importantly, this research brought dancers’ discussions of their own agency to the center of the study. This approach emphasizes the ways in which dancers talk about the experiences of dancing and learning to dance. Such a focus directs academic attention to dancers’ perceptions of their pedagogical, artistic, and developmental practices. Thus, this research projects the dance students’ voices into academic conversations about dance education, performance studies, and the scholarship of teaching and learning. In order to investigate how dance students describe themselves as agents, this study employed a series of extracurricular dance labs for a group of six first- and second-year BFA Dance Performance & Choreography majors. Over the course of two semesters, the student researcher worked with the participants on movement-based prompts and debriefs designed to emphasize the dancers’ agency and engagement with dance situations. Throughout the academic year, each student participated in four individual interviews, and the content of these interviews was then analyzed using qualitative coding. As a deeply exploratory process, this research has yielded a breadth of insights that can motivate future research. Such insights concern how dancers situate themselves within the dance field, how meaning and power are negotiated in class and choreographic processes, and how dancers learn and change, set goals, and engage with challenges. The overarching conclusion to this study is that when dance students talk about their experiences, they may navigate between describing themselves as active agents, describing a diffuse system of intersubjective agency, and assigning agency to discrete others – such as choreographers, music, or even their own bodies. This conclusion sheds light on what it means to be a dancer and what it means to talk like a dancer.