Scientific Literacy for Master Gardeners

<u>Seminar roadmap</u>

- Sources of information
- Evaluating information
- Assessment examples: products, practices, and phenomena
- Good and not-so-good science

Sources of information

- Scientific peer reviewed, academic audience
- Gray not peer reviewed, professional audience
- Popular not peer reviewed, general audience

Assessment of products and practices

- No supporting science (no research; inconsistent or negative results; poor quality research or reporting)
- Misapplied science (agricultural products and practices applied to nonagricultural settings)
- Overextrapolated science (products and practices with limited efficacy outdoors, and perceived phenomena with no landscape-level evidence)

Evaluating information using the CRAP test

- Credibility of the source
 - Author's credentials and qualifications?
 - Publisher?
 - Website urls?
- <u>R</u>elevance to managed landscapes
 - Crop production or urban landscapes?
 - Geographic or other constraints on usability?
- <u>A</u>ccuracy
 - Science-based?
 - Øbjective?
 - Current?
 - 🖉 Well-written?
- Purpose
 - Educational or commercial?
 - Political, ideological, cultural, religious, or personal biases?
 - When in doubt, consult with <u>relevant</u> discipline experts

No consistent, reliable supporting science

- Products
 - Balanced fertilizers
 - Compost tea
 - Conditioners
 - Kelp products
 - Organic superiority
 - Vitamin B-1 transplant fertilizer
 - Wound dressings

- Practices
 - Biodynamics
 - Companion planting
 - Fertilizer injections
 - Hot weather watering
 - 🖉 Hügelkultur
 - 🖉 Lasagna mulching
 - Leaving rootballs intact
 - Native plant superiority
 - Retrenchment pruning

Because none of these products or practices are supported with sufficient scientific evidence, they should not be used or recommended.

2. Misapplied science

Practices

- 🖉 Products
 - Antitranspirants
 - Epsom salts
 - 🥖 Gypsum
 - Hydrogels ("water crystals")
 - Phosphate fertilizer

3. Overextrapolated science Phenomena

- Products
 - Corn gluten meal (CGM)
 - 🖉 Harpin
 - Mycorrhizal/probiotic inoculants

Science-based alternatives:

- Avoid automatic applications of pesticides, fertilizers, or any other chemical before thoroughly diagnosing landscape problems
- Test soils before adding any amendments
- Add organic material as "slow food" after planting
- Use coarse woody mulches
 - Control weeds
 - Add nutrients slowly
 - Do not restrict water and gas movement
 - Protect and enhance soil health
 - Support native populations of beneficial microbes
- Rely on science-based evidence for making recommendations

Good and not-so-good science

1. Good quality research but poor reporting

- Often due to researcher bias
- Selective highlighting of results (often with statistical errors) in the abstract or summary
- Downplaying or omitting other results

2. Poor quality research

- Common with authors with no expertise in field
- Conflating correlation with causation
 - A correlation between two variables does not mean that one causes the other
 - Controlled studies can determine causation but not always feasible
 - Correlations can be valuable, but only if examined rigorously and eliminating other possible causes of the observed phenomenon

Look at the body of research. If a paper is at odds with most other papers, it must withstand increased scrutiny.

Dr. Linda Chalker-Scott, WSU Professor and Extension Urban Horticulturist URL: <u>http://www.theinformedgardener.com</u> (white papers on many of these myths) Blog: <u>http//www.gardenprofessors.com</u> Books: <u>http//www.sustainablelandscapesandgardens.com</u> Facebook page: <u>http://www.facebook.com/TheGardenProfessors</u> Facebook group: <u>http://www.facebook.com/TheGardenProfessors</u>

Facebook group: <u>https://www.facebook.com/groups/GardenProfessors/</u>

Publications: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Linda_Chalker-Scott/publications

Amending soil before planting

Allelopathy and black walnuts

🖉 Foliar fertilizers

Humus formation