



Annotated Bibliographies

Short and to the Point

An annotated bibliography is a list of sources with brief descriptions of each source. An annotation can be as brief as a phrase or as long as a two or three fully developed paragraphs. Each annotation begins with the full citation of the annotated work. That citation follows the bibliographic style required by the instructor, department, or field (e.g., APA, MLA, Turabian, *Chicago Manual of Style*, etc.). If the work is a book, indicate the number of pages in the book at the end of the bibliographic citation.

The length depends partially on the length of the original and on the degree of specificity of the annotation—and partially on what your teacher requires. The shorter kind may only give the gist of the original—the briefest sort of summary containing only the basic information in the book or article.

The longer type might be an evaluative summary, which usually indicates the major points made by the author and also assesses the quality or utility of the work. It may include such elements as the perspective or major argument of the writer, the purpose of the work, its special characteristics that help to strengthen or weaken it, and its utility for researchers in that field. If you are making an annotated bibliography list for a class, find out what kind your teacher expects, and about how long each should be.

The difficulty in writing an annotated bibliography is the need to be both specific yet succinct—a difficult task in any kind of writing. Below we provide examples, some not-so-good and some better. The citation format used here follows MLA style.

American Association of University Professors. “Statement on Teaching Evaluation.” *AAUP Bulletin*, 1975, 61, 200-02.

Both of these examples evaluate, but the first skimps on basic information.

The statement provides guidelines for measuring teaching effectiveness. It is a helpful resource for those developing campus policies to evaluate teaching.

Better: This version tells how evaluations might be used and gives specific information on what measures might be relevant.

This statement sets forth AAUP guidelines on “proper teaching evaluation methods and their appropriate use in personnel decisions.” According to the statement, evaluation should include a description of what one does as a teacher, measures of effectiveness, and consideration of the relationship between those efforts and the expectations and needs of the organization. Pertinent data on teaching effectiveness might include information about student learning, reports of classroom visits, student perceptions, self-evaluation, and outside opinions. This statement is a helpful and credible resource for those developing campus policies and procedures to evaluate teaching.

Not so good: "Weak relationship" suggests there is nearly none, and it is difficult to tell what kind of bias the author referred to.

Better: Points out an important limitation: the age of the study, and gives the more complex possible reasons for better evaluations.

Not so good: "etc." is vague. Does "them" in the last sentence refer to adults or techniques?

Not so good (even though longer): This version contains more jargon than the version below does; the preparer may have borrowed too heavily from the researcher's language rather than explaining (i.e., interpreting) when appropriate.

Feldman, Kenneth A. "Grades and College Students' Evaluations of Their Courses and Teachers." *Research in Higher Education*, 1976, 4, 69-111.

This article reviews some of the evidence about whether students' course grades influence the evaluations they give of courses and instructors. The review finds a weak relationship between grades and evaluations. However, the researcher cannot come to a conclusion about whether positive evaluations are a result of a bias about expected grade.

Do students' actual or anticipated course grades influence their evaluations of courses and teachers? This review, although limited in coverage up to the mid 1970s, suggests a "small but not unimportant" relationship between grades and evaluations. The author draws no conclusion about whether more positive evaluations are due to greater learning and motivation or to a bias induced by expectations of a higher grade.

Lewis, Linda H. (ed.) *Experiential and Simulation Techniques for Teaching Adults. New Directions for Continuing Education*, no. 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986. 111 pages.

This book consists of several different articles by different authors. They describe various techniques to use to teach adults, like computer simulations, cases, work placements, etc. It covers many ways of teaching them all in one volume.

Chapters in this source book describe several techniques by which simulations can be used with adult learners. The authors discuss and illustrate such techniques as video, computer simulations, cases, work simulations, work placements, travel, and theater. A final essay discusses each approach in terms of Kolb's experiential learning model. This one volume discusses a variety of techniques that are usually covered only in disparate sources.

Tyler, Andrea. "The Co-Construction of Cross-Cultural Miscommunication: Conflicts in Perception, Negotiation, and Enactment of Participant Role and Status." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1995, 17(2), 129-52.

This paper examines the sources of miscommunication in a videotaped tutoring session involving a native speaker of Korean and a native speaker of U.S. English. Analysis revealed an initial non-mutual interpretation of participant role and status. These divergent interpretations appear to have resulted from the Korean tutor's transfer of a Korean conversational routine, which he defined as involving polite speaker modesty, to the U.S. English context. The initial conflicting interpretations were maintained and solidified by additional mismatches in discourse management strategies, schemata and contextualization cues. The cumulative effect of these mismatches was the judgement on the part of each of the interlocutors that the other was uncooperative.

This paper examines the sources of miscommunication in a videotaped tutoring session in English involving a native speaker of Korean (as tutor) and a native speaker of U.S. English. Analysis showed a misunderstanding of each person's role and status, with each initially believing that the other was being uncooperative. The misunderstanding appears to have resulted from the Korean's inappropriate transfer of a Korean politeness routine in conversation to the English context accompanied by mismatches in discourse strategies, conversational expectations, and contextualization cues.

Woken