

## **Sample RefAnnBib**

Adapted from Dr. Mark McBeth, Associate Professor of English,  
CUNY Graduate Center and John Jay College of Criminal Justice

### **Part 1: Bibliographic Entry**

Fitzgerald, Jill. "Research on Revision in Writing" Review of Educational Research. 57.4 (Winter 1987): 481-506.

### **Part 2: Tipsheet**

Writer: Jill Fitzgerald is a noted literacy scholar. Her writing has appeared in various journals, and for many years she was based out of University of North Carolina, Durham.

Source: Review of Educational Research. Peer reviewed journal, quarterly, begun in 1931. This publishes reviews of research literature and education. Such reviews should include conceptualizations, interpretations, and syntheses of literature and scholarly work in a field broadly relevant to education and educational research. RER encourages the submission of research relevant to education from any discipline, such as reviews of research in psychology, sociology, history, philosophy, political science, economics, computer science, statistics, anthropology, and biology, provided that the review bears on educational issues. RER does not publish original empirical research unless it is incorporated in a broader integrative review.

Purpose: Argument. I plan to use this source to support my argument about revision to show how revision can factor into students decision making process.

### **Part 3: Précis**

From a two decade period, this author compiles research studies, perspectives, and re-definitions 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 consider 3 various aspects of revision decision-making, including age, grade-level, expertise, and instructional response (aka, response to drafts). After summarizing and analyzing the revision studies an limitations, the author suggests further research studies that future composition/rhetoric researchers should pursue.

#### **Part 4: Reflection**

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 freshmen 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-stagnation (Note to self: What would be the opposite term for revising in terms of writing? Textual stagnating/textual complacency/textual satisfying/ stifling/ impairing / ossifying/idling/constipating/fossilizing. I’ll need to figure out this specialized antonym for revising/revision. Following?