





## **Abstract Guidelines**

All abstracts submitted must conform to these guidelines.

1. The abstract must be submitted in the body of an email message sent to Dr. Paul Harris <harris@aug.edu>.
2. Title: in upper and lower case letters; 10-word maximum; 14-point boldface type; centered.
3. Student name(s): center directly below title, 12-point type, include student's department.
4. Faculty sponsor(s): center directly below student's name, 12-point type, sponsor's name should include academic title and department.
5. Body: leave one blank line between heading and abstract; abstract should be left-justified; 12-point type; single-spaced; single space between sentences.
6. Length: do not exceed 200 words; do not include a bibliography or reference list; do not include charts, tables, or graphs.

## **Sample Abstract**

### **Failure to Find Fluoride-Induced Learning Deficits in Rats**

Terry S. Lovett, Aimee R. Lombard, Erica L. McKnight, and A. Rene Monfort, Psychology  
Faculty Sponsors: Dr. Stephen H. Hobbs, Psychology, and Dr. Gary M. Whitford, School of  
Dentistry, Medical College of Georgia

The practice of adding fluoride (F) to drinking water to reduce dental carries has enjoyed widespread acceptance in this country. An earlier study concluded that exposing rats to elevated F levels in their drinking water produced possibly toxic F accumulations in CNS tissue, accompanied by behavioral changes that might indicate learning deficits. The authors expressed concern about learning and cognitive impairments in children from municipalities with fluoridated water. The present research was undertaken as a systematic replication of that study. Thirty-two weanling female Spague-Dawley rats were randomly divided into 4 groups. Rats were fed a low-F food with varying doses of sodium fluoride (NaF) via their drinking water and given some learning and recall tasks. Experimental results were analyzed by parametric statistical tests. When checked at the termination of the study, rats in the High Dose F Group weighed significantly less than the Control Group or the Low Dose Group. There were no differences among the groups on the number of days taken to meet the criteria for the learning and recall tasks.

(This abstract is 173 words long.)