Reflective Annotated Bibliography

|  |
| --- |
| **Name:** |

**Part 1: Bibliographic Entry**

This section gives the publication information: author, date, title, book or journal, vol., page

numbers, print or web.

**Sample: [DO THIS]**

Fitzgerald, Jill. “Research on Revision in Writing” Review of Educational Research. 57.4

(Winter 1987): 481-506.

|  |
| --- |
| **Bibliographic Entry:** |

**Part 2: Background and Credibility of Author & Source**

List the author’s name and the publication venue where the article or piece was published.

Describe both briefly and why they would be credible to your audience [appeals to ethos].3

The Writer: Google the writer and include all of the following you can find, as relevant and

available:

• affiliations (university, government, industry/company)

• political leanings if you can determine

• relevant background information such as other publications, topics s/he has written

about in the past

The Source: Google the source and include the following as available and relevant to your

source:

• Indicate either “popular” or “academic” source and the genre4

Reason for choosing this source:

• For example: seems provocative/informative/interesting/kairotic/widely cited and

influential/will hold weight for my audience because [x]

|  |
| --- |
| Author and Source Info: |

3 **Sample**: **[DO THIS]**

Dr. Jill Fitzgerald: influential researcher in the field of education, affiliated with the University of North

Carolina at Chapel Hill, recently retired after 32 years; served as senior associate dean and provost,

director of graduate studies, published more than 100 articles

“Research on Revision in Writing” Review of Educational Research. 57.4 (Winter 1987): 481-506.

academic; peer-reviewed journal article; Fitzgerald seems like a credible writer, and although this source is

a bit outdated it’s cited by 3 of my other sources and therefore must be important; her ethos could held

lend weight and credibility to my argument.

4 A popular source is directed to the public (Common genres: news article, film/documentary, book

published by a non-academic press—i.e. the publisher is not a university press, website, magazine,

newspaper, etc. Not peer-reviewed.) A peer-reviewed, academic source is primarily read by researchers

in various fields of study (Common genres: academic journal articles (e.g. Present Tense: A Journal of

Rhetoric in Society); books published by an academic press (usually the term “university” will be the name

of the publisher). Peer-reviewed and therefore held to higher scrutiny before publication.)

**Part 3: Précis/Summary**

This section articulates an objective summary of the reading. It should only convey exactly what

the author states in the article without including your opinions. (1) It should state the author’s

primary claim and, maybe sub-claims. What argument does the author want to assert? (2) It

should acknowledge the types of evidence the author uses to support this claim. What

data/facts/evidence does the author use to justify the claims of the article? (3) It should reveal

the interpretations that this author arrives at through the claims and evidence. What point or

conclusion does the author surmise?  **[DO THIS]**

**Sample**: From a two-decade period, this author compiles research studies, perspectives, and redefinitions

about revision and its role in the improvement of writing. According to the author,

these last twenty years of revision studies have reshaped the definition of meaningful revision to

move beyond editorial actions. As the author states, “This paper presents a brief historical

perspective on the development of the meaning of revision, presents findings from research on

revision, and, finally, discusses limitations of the research” (481). Moreover, this survey of

revision research considers various aspects of revision decision-making, including age, gradelevel,

expertise, and instructional response (aka, response to drafts). After summarizing and

analyzing the revision studies and limitations, the author suggests further research studies that

future composition/rhetoric researchers should pursue.

|  |
| --- |
| Précis/Summary: |

**Part 4: Reflection/Rhetorical Analysis**

This section reveals your opinion about what the author has stated. Do you agree or disagree?

What speculations do you want to make about this author’s methods of research? What

questions do you have? What don’t you understand? See if you can “read like a writer” and analyze the rhetorical moves that the author makes, the strategies s/he uses. Ethos/Pathos/Logos? Are they effective in making their claims? What other information do you need to look up to better understand this article? This unconventional section puts forward *your* ideas, not just summarizing.

**Sample: [DO THIS]**

This article provides an historical viewpoint for my articles albeit one which needs updating since

1987. Along with articles from 1987 to the present, this information provides a framework to

discuss revision and the types of assessment systems in which productive revision—beyond

editorial actions (aka: surface characteristics such as spelling, punctuation, and sentence

correction)—can take place. The point accrual system that I suggest offers students a course

policy system in which they can take control of their earned grade and see the value in

revisionary efforts. By reviewing these methodologies of tracking revision habits, I can make a

better argument for the types of classroom policies we might put in place to encourage, even

instigate, revision. If American public schools ask students to do little revision (and most of my

students come from public schools) then incoming first-year students must be “unlearned” of the

counter-productive habits that they were taught about revising in high school. If conditioned for

twelve years not to revise, the freshman year composition course must place some reconditioning

structures in place to induce students to alter their normativized habits of textual-.

|  |
| --- |
| Reflection: |

**Part 5: Quotables.**

This section directly quotes one to three statements that the author made in the article that you

feel really exemplify its claims or interpretations. Or, choose sentences that you feel the author

expressed exceptionally well. IMPORTANT: Include page number(s) where you find the quote.

Place quotation marks around the chosen phrase and make sure you cite the phrase verbatim.

**Sample: [DO THIS]**

“[T]heory has not always mirrored the practitioner’s belief that revision has a central role in

writing. Early views of revision were theoretically dry and uninteresting” (481).

“Revision means making any changes at any point in the writing process. It involves identifying

discrepancies between intended and instantiated text, deciding what could or should be changed

in the text and how to make desired changes, and operating, that is, making the desired

changes” (484).

“Expert professional writers made one meaning-related revision for every two surface changes;

advanced college student writers made one for every three; and inexperienced college student

writers made one for every seven” (492).

|  |
| --- |
| Quotables: |

**Using the Reflective Annotated Bibliography to Formulate a Paragraph—a Sample**

Below I’ve color coded one of the entries from my reflective annotated bibliography into its five

parts:

Bibliographic entry

Background on Author & Source

Précis

Reflection

Quotables

In the sample paragraph following the RefAnnBib entry, I’ve used various sections of my entry to

compose a unit of meaning (aka, paragraph) that includes a claim, pieces of evidence, and a

number of related warrants.

Sample Paragraph Drawn From RefAnnBib

According to Jill Fitzgerald (1987) in “Research on Revision in Writing,” these last twenty years of

revision studies have reshaped the definition of meaningful revision to move beyond editorial

actions. By reviewing articles pertaining to revision from 1987 to the present, her research

provides a framework to discuss revision and the types of assessment systems in which

productive revision can take place; she moves us beyond the editorial activities of surface

characteristics such as spelling, punctuation, and sentence correction. If as she claims that

American public schools ask students to do little revision then incoming freshmen must be

“unlearned” of the counter-productive habits that high schools conditioned them to do as they

proceeded through the writing process. Fitzgerald states:

Over the last decade, particularly during the last few years, methods of revealing

individuals’ knowledge of revision, as well as actual revision made on paper,

proliferated. The development of methodology mirrored the 1970s’ and 1980s’

reconceptualization of revision as potentially major and significant in nature, not just

editorial, as both process and product, and as a subprocess that could occur at any point

in the writing process. (484-485)

Fitzgerald’s survey of revision research—ranging from process-tracing methods to error-detection

methods--reinforces instructors’ beliefs in the process of writing but, even if we make

students aware of the processes and sub-processes of revision, we still need to offer them

evaluation systems that incentivize them and induce them to apply these revisionary strategies