**Reflective Annotated Bibliography Directions**

**(Please put all entries in Garamond font, size 11)**

**The reflective annotated bibliography works as a research device, having been adapted from the traditional academic document called an annotated bibliography. While the conventional form only includes a bibliographic entry and a précis, this adapted annotated bibliography adds a terminology/key word list, a reflection component, and a quotables section. These additional sections help you as a writer differentiate between “objective” reporting of the author’s ideas from your “subjective” editorial remarks about the reading (aka, your opinions, speculations, counter-arguments, questions). It also acts as a mnemonic device to help your retain terminologies, key terms and phrases, and an author’s memorable quotes. While this reflective annotated bibliography could conceivably help you review for exams or store information for future pieces of research scholarship, you can also use it to help you formulate paragraphs for an essay. See accompanying handout Using RefAnnBiB to Formulate a Paragraph—A Sample.**

**Part 1: Bibliographic Entry: This section gives the publication information: author, date, title, book or journal, vol., page numbers, print or web. (Please put in Garamond, 11, Bold.)**

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

**Part 2: Terminology/Key Words: This section lists key words that the author uses that indicate a relationship to a disciplinary discourse community. You may also use this section to list unfamiliar vocabulary. (Notice the differentiation that I make between “vocabulary” (general words) and terminology/key terms (vocabulary used within a particular, sometimes specialized discourse community.))**

**Coding System**

**Cognitive Theory**

**Error-Detection Method**

**Linear Model**

**Participant-Observer Method**

**Problem-Solving View**

**Process**

**Process-Tracing Method**

**Recursiveness**

**Revision**

**Simulation-by-Intervention Method**

**Stage Model**

**Subprocess**

Part 3: Précis: 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? (Please put in regular Garamond, 11)

From a two decade period, his 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 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 limitiations, the author suggests further research studies that future composition/rhetoric researchers should pursue.

*Part 4: Reflection: This sections 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? What other information do you need to look up to better understand this article? This unconventional section puts forward your ideas. (Please put in italics Garamond 11)*

*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 re-conditioning 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. Fallowing?*

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, you will choose a sentence that you feel the author expressed exceptionally well. Include page number(s) where you find the quote. Place quotation marks around the chosen phrase and make sure you cite the phrase verbatim. (Put in regular Garamond, 11)

[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)

Most recently, Scardamalia and Bereiter (1986) coined the term “reprocessing” to refer to the metnal aspects of revision […] Reprocessing “spans everything from editing for mistakes to reformulating goals. Revision is a special case of reprocessing, applied to actual texts” (790)

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 dsired changes, and operating, that is, making the desired changes. Changes may or may not affect meaning of the text, and they may be major or minor. Also, changes may be made in the writer’s mind before being instantiated in written text, at the teim text is first written, and/or after text is first written [list of authors contributing to this definition]. (484)

Over the last decade, particularly during the last [484] 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. Five clusters of research methods emerged: coding systems for categorizing revisions; process-tracing methods, including think-aloud techniques, questionnaires, interviews and taped self-evaluations; a particpant-observer method; a simulation by intervention method; and an error detection method. (484-485)

Research on cognitive aspects of the problem-solving view of revision has focused on reasons for breakdowns. Several reasons are plausible. First, one break-down may occur if a writer does not clearly establish intentions for text. (489)

Intentions may be for content or for form or presentation so writers may have difficulty establishing intentions because of lack of knowledge about what to say (i.e., about content-related goals) and/or because of lack of knowledge about how to say it (i.e., about presentation-related goals such as structure, style, format, etc.). On the other hand, writers may actually have the requisite knowledge, but may have difficulty recalling and/or representing the knowledge. (489)

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)

As a preface to a synthesis of findings of intervention research, it is perhaps useful to note that some research indicates that little emphasis is placed on revision in writing in American public schools. [article offers statistics about this claim]

Research on revision in writing is at a pivotal point. A view of revision that bgins to capture its potential complexity is developing. Research has documented the recursive and problem-solving nature of revision and has described how much writers revise, when they revise, and what kinds of revision operations they make. However, work on the cognitive aspects of the revision process is scant. Issues of how and when writers learn through revision remain virtually unexplored. . Little is known about the circumstances under which the reiviosn process is related to judgements of quality of writing, and intervention studies are just beginning to provide insight into ways of nurturing the development of revision knowledge and abilities. (497)

A crucial design factor is likely to be the extent to which new research examines revision in a broader context than it has in the past. […] The inescapable conclusion is that more research might be shaped to enlighten our knowledge about writers’ revisions in relation to “what’s needed,” rather than merely describing revision operations that are done. (497)

Below you fill find what one entry of the reflective annotated bibliographic entry would look like without my color-coding or interstitial directions:

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

**Terminology/Key Words:**

**Participant-Observer Method**

**Problem-Solving View**

**Process**

**Process-Tracing Method**

**Recursiveness**

**Revision**

**Simulation-by-Intervention Method**

**Stage Model**

**Subprocess**

From a two decade period, his 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 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 limitiations, the author suggests further research studies that future composition/rhetoric researchers should pursue.

*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 re-conditioning 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. Fallowing?*

Quotables:

[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)

Most recently, Scardamalia and Bereiter (1986) coined the term “reprocessing” to refer to the metnal aspects of revision […] Reprocessing “spans everything from editing for mistakes to reformulating goals. Revision is a special case of reprocessing, applied to actual texts” (790)

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 dsired changes, and operating, that is, making the desired changes. Changes may or may not affect meaning of the text, and they may be major or minor. Also, changes may be made in the writer’s mind before being instantiated in written text, at the teim text is first written, and/or after text is first written [list of authors contributing to this definition]. (484)

Over the last decade, particularly during the last [484] 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. Five clusters of research methods emerged: coding systems for categorizing revisions; process-tracing methods, including think-aloud techniques, questionnaires, interviews and taped self-evaluations; a particpant-observer method; a simulation by intervention method; and an error detection method. (484-485)

Research on cognitive aspects of the problem-solving view of revision has focused on reasons for breakdowns. Several reasons are plausible. First, one break-down may occur if a writer does not clearly establish intentions for text. (489)

Intentions may be for content or for form or presentation so writers may have difficulty establishing intentions because of lack of knowledge about what to say (i.e., about content-related goals) and/or because of lack of knowledge about how to say it (i.e., about presentation-related goals such as structure, style, format, etc.). On the other hand, writers may actually have the requisite knowledge, but may have difficulty recalling and/or representing the knowledge. (489)

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)

As a preface to a synthesis of findings of intervention research, it is perhaps useful to note that some research indicates that little emphasis is placed on revision in writing in American public schools. [article offers statistics about this claim]

Research on revision in writing is at a pivotal point. A view of revision that bgins to capture its potential complexity is developing. Research has documented the recursive and problem-solving nature of revision and has described how much writers revise, when they revise, and what kinds of revision operations they make. However, work on the cognitive aspects of the revision process is scant. Issues of how and when writers learn through revision remain virtually unexplored. . Little is known about the circumstances under which the reiviosn process is related to judgements of quality of writing, and intervention studies are just beginning to provide insight into ways of nurturing the development of revision knowledge and abilities. (497)

A crucial design factor is likely to be the extent to which new research examines revision in a broader context than it has in the past. […] The inescapable conclusion is that more research might be shaped to enlighten our knowledge about writers’ revisions in relation to “what’s needed,” rather than merely describing revision operations that are done. (497)

**Example of Conventional Annotated Bibliography: Here you will find an example of entries from a convention annotated bibliography. Some instructors may not want the extra sections that the reflective annotated bibliography includes (i.e., terminology/key words; reflection; quotables)**

**Ellis, M., & Wright, R. (2005). Assimilation and differences between the settlement patterns of individual immigrants and immigrant households. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *102*(43), 15325- 15330. Retrieved from JSTOR database.**

Ellis and Wright focus on immigrant settlement patterns. It looks at the different types of household they may have which include Immigrant only household, immigrant/second generation household, immigrant/ third generation-plus household, , immigrant/second generation/ third generation-plus household, second generation only household, , second generation/ third generation-plus household, and third generation only household. The research compares the household immigrants to individual immigrants. They conclude that household processes are part of the assimilation immigrants go through. In this paper, what natives see of immigrants was important for my paper.

**Vigdor, J. L., (2009). *From immigrants to Americans*. Laham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.**

Vigdor discusses about immigrants and how they affect America as a whole. Vigdor brings in economics, sociology, and the linguistics. With each chapter, a new kind of assimilation is brought in from economics, to linguistics, and officially meaning becoming a citizen. For my paper, it was important for me to look at the different types of assimilation.

**Zhou, M., (1997). Growing up American: the challenge confronting immigrant children and children of immigrants  *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 63-95. Retrieved from JSTOR database.**

Zhou analyzes the assimilation done by the children of immigrants and immigrant children. He realizes that there is a greater difference in the way the children assimilate and their parents do. The children are more prone to assimilate than their parents. This is because they want to be American. Despite being born in another country they do not have a great connection with their motherland like their parents due. So they try to assimilate and make something of their own in America. By doing this they may lose the part of them that is immigrant, something their parents fear. Zhou also looks at all the types of assimilation: cultural/behavioral, structural, identificational, attitude-receptional, behavior-receptional, and civic assimilation. This study was important for my paper because of its separation of all the generation of immigrants and how they assimilate.