WRITING AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

An annotated bibliography is a list of sources (books, articles, documents, etc.) about a particular topic. Each source in the list is followed by a brief paragraph of approximately 150 words. An annotated bibliography is useful for documenting your research, exploring varying viewpoints, and reviewing sources. The purpose of the annotation depends on the specific guidelines provided by your instructor, but may include a brief summary of the source and a discussion of the relevance, accuracy, and quality of the source.

There are two parts to every entry in an annotated bibliography: the citation and the annotation.

The Citation is the source’s entry on your Works Cited page (MLA) or Reference page (APA).

Sample MLA Works Cited entry:

Sample APA References entry:

The Annotation is a brief paragraph following the citation in which you include a summary and/or evaluation of the source. Depending on your project or the assignment, your annotations may do one or more of the following:

- describe the content of the source
- evaluate the credibility of the source
- describe the usefulness of the source
- discuss the writer’s background
- describe the intended audience
- describe your reaction

The length of an annotation depends upon the assignment. Shorter annotations will most likely summarize (cover only main points and themes); longer annotations may require a more in-depth description, discussion, or evaluation of the source. Consult the specific requirements for your assignment. You can also use a style guide such as The Writer’s Reference or the OWL at Purdue: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl for additional help.

Gilbert, Pam. “From Voice to Text: Reconsidering Writing and Reading in the English Classroom.” *English Education*, vol. 23, no. 4, Mar. 1991, pp. 195-211. Gilbert provides some insight into the concept of “voice” in textual interpretation, and points to a need to move away from the search for voice in reading. Her reasons stem from a growing danger of “social and critical illiteracy,” which might be better dealt with through a move toward different textual understandings. Gilbert suggests that theories of language as a social practice can be more useful in teaching.

Greene, Stuart. “Mining Texts in Reading to Write.” *Journal of Advanced Composition*, vol. 12, no. 1, Jan. 1992, pp. 151-67. This article works from the assumption that reading and writing inform each other, particularly in the matter of rhetorical constructs. Greene introduces the concept of “mining texts” for rhetorical situations when reading with a sense of authorship. Considerations for what can be mined include language, structure, and context, all of which can be useful depending upon the writer’s goals.

Murray, Donald M. *Read to Write: A Writing Process Reader*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1987. Murray’s book deals more specifically with the ways writers read other writers, particularly the ways in which writers read themselves. *Read to Write* provides a view of drafting and revising, focusing on the way a piece of writing evolves as an author takes the time to read and criticize his or her own work. Moreover, the book spotlights some excellent examples of professional writing and displays each writer’s own comments on their own creations, in effect allowing the student reader to learn (by reading) the art of rereading and rewriting as exemplified by famous authors.

Newell, George E. “The Effects of Between-Draft Responses on Students’ Writing and Reasoning About Literature.” *Written Communication*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1994, pp. 311-47. This study reflects the advantage of teacher responses on student papers. When reflected upon as “dialogue” questions to the student, these comments can lead to further interpretation and deeper understanding of a text. Newell found that responses which prompted students to work from their initial drafts brought about more final papers than teacher responses that led them away from their initial drafts with “directive” remarks.