Throughout your academic career you will be asked to write term or research papers. The final product requires a careful synthesis of the sources to support a thesis. Yet the finished paper is much like an iceberg in that it represents only a small portion of the necessary work and skills. Moreover, many research situations do not require a formal term paper. You may only be interested in the address of a foundation or corporation, you may be tracing your family history, or you may be looking for supplemental materials as you study for an exam.

The vast resources of a library are often more overwhelming than helpful to the uninitiated. To find the most representative, most reputable, and most useful sources is not an easy task. Even with tools and strategies, creative search is time-consuming and frustrating. You must be prepared for blind alleys, misleading titles and unavailable materials. The annotated bibliography is both an important stage in any research project and a useful tool in itself.

OBJECTIVES

After completing this unit, you should be able to:

1. use a variety of indexes, catalogs and other library tools
2. employ various search strategies
3. organize your sources into a comprehensive bibliography
4. use correct bibliographic form
5. write concise abstracts that adequately describe each source
6. complete an annotated bibliography
THE PROCESS FOR WRITING AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Select topic to be researched, narrow, and submit for approval.

2. Read checklists and sample annotated bibliography

3. Read sources to be annotated, taking notes in response to the checklists. Most likely, you will take down more information than you can use in your final entry.

4. Write your annotation from your notes, taking care to represent the source accurately and thoroughly; if appropriate, “judge” the source by the criteria contained in the evaluation checklist.

5. If necessary, rewrite your annotation to range in length from 50-100 words. Remember: the annotation is an overview. Be thorough but concise.

6. Write the appropriate bibliographic entry form.

7. Type final draft and proofread.

CHECKLIST FOR NOTE-TAKING

1. Include all citation information (author, title, publisher or periodical, pages or city, volume and date).

2. What is the subject and position?

3. What are the major points, attitudes or opinions covered?

4. What types of evidence are cited to support these points?

5. What unique and/or interesting approaches or features does it contain?

6. Is the author particularly qualified to write on this subject?
CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION OF THE RESOURCE

1. Is the source clearly written? Readable? Vivid and logically organized?

2. Are its data or theories worthwhile?

3. Are its data or theories adequately and reasonably supported?

4. Are useful examples, illustrations, case studies employed?

5. Does the source provide useful suggestions for further study? (For example—a bibliography or references to the work of others.)

6. Can you recommend it as a valuable reference?

7. Does it provide useful background on the subject, or does it deal with recent developments?

8. Generally, does the author appear to be in touch with the real or pertinent issues of the subject?
SAMPLE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gebhardt, Richard C. “Writing Process Revision, and Rhetorical Problems: A Note on Three Recent Articles.” College Composition and Communications 34 (October 1983), 294-296.

Discussing briefly Flower and Hayes’ “A Cognitive Process Theory of writing,” Berkenkotter's “Understanding a Writer’s Awareness of Audience,” and Witte and Faigley’s “Analyzing Revision,” Gebhardt redefines the emphasis on revision as being a part of the writing process. The defining of a rhetorical problem seems to be an essential part of that revision stage. He, furthermore, notes that all the writers agree that revising is not an end to the process but that it is a complex step reflecting a variety of writing strategies.


Huff, in this article about the revision stage of the process, analyzes the movement from zero draft (a term coined by Peter Drucker in 1966) to final draft. Using twenty-two students for his study, he shows the importance of the student putting his prewriting ideas in a draft in which he is still exploring his topic. The second draft, the student has identified the major problems through a system of heuristic questions about audience, writer position, the relationship between audience writer, conceptualization of the topic, and organization of the text. The final draft begins to show the order that the final text will take. Huff is not saying that all writers must write three drafts; in fact, there may be more, but he is saying this movement from zero draft to problem solving draft to final draft is necessary and should be taught to composition students.


The co-authors of this article discuss the kind of help given to the various levels of writing students. They have divided students into levels according to their writing skills: advanced writers, middle level, and lower level. Advanced writers primarily need help in polishing their editing skills; middle level students have errors which need not only to be eliminated, but also they require systematic drilling; lower level students require help with many basic problems ranging from spelling to organization and need what the authors call draft-guiding. The authors advise writing workshops with drop-in customers to try this method of instruction.

Schwartz characterizes the many ways that writers revise in her report. She goes on to classify writers and their writing strategies. She concludes by saying these classifications help define and provide a set of terms for students to help them understand their own revision strategies, to help teachers individualize their writing instruction, and to reemphasize that the revision stage is not an isolated act but an important part of the creative process.

Witte, Stephen P. “Topical structure and Revision: An Exploratory Study.” College Composition and Communication 34 (October 1983), 313-341.

Witte’s study begins with a historical background of topical structure in extended texts listing the Prague School linguists as the leaders in modern research on topics in discourse. Terminology such as subtopics, sentence topics, and discourse topics are defined. Acting on the proposition that topical structure analysis would prove beneficial in the study of revision strategies, Witte set up his exploratory model. He concluded that although his methods might seem artificial and only explored one writing from students, it did suggest the relationship between reading and writing skills, help to identify problems in student writing, and suggest revisions help the writer to move closer to their audience and intended meaning.