**Writing an annotated bibliography**

**1. Introduction**

This workshop will help you to understand the requirements for writing an annotated bibliography for part of your Assignment 1.

**2. Part 5 of Assessment 1**

Provide an annotated bibliography of core relevant articles and books that are potentially very relevant to the research problems / questions identified in the previous step (about 5 per research problem) containing:

1. a summary and evaluation of the content of the publication

2. how its content is relevant to the research problem/question(s)

**3. What is an annotated bibliography**

1. A list of citations organised as a normal reference list or bibliography.
2. Each source should be chosen with your purpose in mind.
3. After each citation, you need to provide an annotation (note about source).
4. An annotation consists of a concise summary, evaluation and reflection (relevance, accuracy, quality) of each source.
5. The annotation should be a single paragraph, approximately 150 to 200 words in length.

**Remember, an annotated bibliography is NOT a list of abstracts. You need to keep your purpose in mind.**

**4. why should i write an annotated bibliography?**

1. You will gain an overview of your topic area including debates/differences across the topic area.
2. You will identify what you think are the ‘core’ sources or key texts for your topic area.
3. You will begin to see connections between the various sources.
4. You will be able to clarify how these sources are relevant to your topic area/your research/ problems/ questions by
   * + stating what aspects are useful for your research
     + explaining how they are useful and why.
5. You will provide an overall evaluation of each source by commenting on strengths and weaknesses/ limitations.

**This will help you to write your literature review!!!**

**5. Moving from your synthesis grid to your annotated bibliography**

**Topic area: Digital systems to support research in the humanities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author/year** | **Aim/topic** | **Method** | **Outcomes** |
| Rimmer, J. et. al. 2008 | humanities scholars use of physical and digital information resources | interview | digital resources convenient but lose physical context |
| Warwick, C. et. al. 2009 | documentation practices for humanities digital resources | case study | documentation important for accessibility especially for novice users |
| Marcial, L. & Hemminger, B. 2010 | evaluative framework for scientific data repositories | web survey | institutional repositories could advance digital humanities |
| White, H. 2010 | scientists’ personal information management practices | field study | data stores need to be  tailored to disciplines |
| Juola, P. 2007 | projects for the digital humanities | literature survey | summary of possible research in the field of digital humanities |

Garnett, A., Siemens, R., Leitch, C. & Melone, J. (2012). Selected information management resources for implementing new knowledge environments: An annotated bibliography. *Scholarly and Research Communication*. 3(1), 1-34.

**6. Structure of an annotation**

**Example 1** (adapted from Garnett et. al.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (1) **J. Rimmer, C. Warwick, A. Blandford, J. Gow, and G. Buchanan, “An examination of the physical and the digital qualities of humanities research,” *Inf Process Manag.,* vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 1374–1392, Oct 2007.**  (2) The authors report on findings from interviews with humanities scholars on their use of physical and digital information resources.  (3) While virtually all respondents are in agreement about the convenience of digital resources, the loss of physical “context” seems to mean different things to different people, ranging from the purely aesthetic (e.g. the excitement of handling ancient texts) to the serendipitous (e.g. having one’s interest sparked by physically co-located or otherwise similar resources). The surveyed researchers also demonstrate an awareness of the changing demand for information literacy skills, with mixed opinions on the subject. (4) The tone the authors take is ultimately almost one of sentimentality, with their participants agreeing that digital resources are more reliable, presenting fewer difficulties in resource description and access, but in many cases less pleasurable to actually use. (5) This suggests that the humanities community is aware of the advantages of migrating away from physical resources, but will do so with some regret. | 1. citation 2. introduction, aim, method 3. summary of findings 4. summary of evaluation 5. relevance to research |

**ACTIVITY 1**

**Divide this student example of an annotation into its structural parts.**

**A close-up of a paper

Description automatically generated**

**Example 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Bonneau, J., Just, M. & Matthews, G. What’s in a name? evaluating statistical attacks on personal knowledge questions. in *Financial Cryptography and Data Security, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, R. Sion, Ed. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2010, vol. 6052, pp. 98-113.  The authors attempt to evaluate the risk to account security posed by attacks on personal knowledge questions used as a backup measure for password loss. Several types of attacks are identified. Mathematical models are constructed for describing the challenge-response structure of the personal knowledge questions as well as models for calculating the odds of an attacker correctly guessing an answer. Data sources for correctly guessing answers are identified, as well as other information that could reduce the set of likely answers. Combating the ease of guessing answers by rejecting those which are statistically probable is suggested as a counter-measure. However the issues this may pose for users, for example, providing a very small set of possible questions, are not addressed. Since this article provides not only an analysis of vulnerability in account security, but also methods to prevent it, it is useful for understanding methods of computer crime and tactics to prevent it. |  |

**Example 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Juola, P. (2007). Killer Applications in Digital Humanities. Literary and Linguistic Computing, 23(1), 73-83.  This article serves as a response to recent surveys of non-digital humanists who have proven unmoved by research into digital methods of analyses, and ignorant of what the digital humanities can do to expand their horizons to their disciplinary benefactors. The author begins with the troubling evidence of what he calls the “rock-bottom” (p.75) impact factor of *Computers and the Humanities*, the field’s longest-running journal. Although this metric hardly spells doom on its own (and the author notes this in a somewhat self-defeating fashion, worrying about the significance of participation in the digital humanities by prestigious research universities), it does indicate that digital humanities content is not often reused. The article then highlights several projects that the author believes may become “killer applications” (i.e., individual implementations, theories, or methodologies that drive the adoption of the entire field) for the digital humanities, selling the whole of the field single-handedly. While it is not at all clear that this “killer application” philosophy is suitable to academic research, nor to the digital humanities in particular, the article nevertheless provides an accurate summary of promising research avenues in this field. |  |

**7. Language of evaluation**

Effective writers use a number of resources for evaluating ideas, methods, research outcomes etc. The main strategies are shown in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Resource** | **Description** |
| **1. Evaluative Vocabulary** | Words that can be interpreted as positive or negative  ‘non-digital humanists ….. unmoved by research into digital methods of analyses, and ignorant of what the digital humanities can do to expand their horizons to their disciplinary benefactors’. |
| **2. Intensifiers** | Intensify the meaning of words, making the meaning stronger or weaker  ‘somewhat self-defeating’  ‘it is not completely clear…’ |
| **3. Modality** | Words which express degrees of certainty, frequency or obligation  ‘The article then highlights several projects that the author believes may become “killer applications’  ‘the issues this may pose for users’ |
| **4. Attribution** | Attributing or projecting claims to outside authorities in a specific or general way  The author begins with the troubling evidence of what he calls…’  'recent surveys of non-digital humanists’ |
| **5. Endorsement** | Attributing claims with more or less support or certainty  “The author begins with…”  “the author notes…”  “the author believes may become…”  “the article nevertheless provides…” |
| **6. Comparison** | Language to introduce similar ideas or results in order to support the writers evaluation  ‘Similar to other articles in the field, this article provides an analysis of vulnerability in account security. However, since it also provides methods to prevent it, it is useful ….’ |
| **7. Contrast** | Language to introduce contrasting ideas  ‘This article serves as a response ….. This article is in contrast to ….’ |
| **8. Concession** | Resources which allow the writer to acknowledge strengths as well as weaknesses  ‘While it is not at all clear that this “killer application” philosophy is suitable to academic research, nor to the digital humanities in particular, the article nevertheless provides an accurate summary of promising research avenues in this field’. |

**Ë Activity 2**

**What language resources are used to evaluate the highlighted section of this source?**

The authors attempt to evaluate the risk to account security posed by attacks on personal

knowledge questions used as a backup measure for password loss. Several types of

attacks are identified. Mathematical models are constructed for describing the

challenge-response structure of the personal knowledge questions as well as models for

calculating the odds of an attacker correctly guessing an answer. Data sources for

correctly guessing answers are identified, as well as other information that could reduce

the set of likely answers. Combating the ease of guessing answers by rejecting those which are statistically probable is suggested as a counter-measure.

However the issues this may pose for users, for example, providing a very small set of possible questions, are not addressed. Since this article provides not only an analysis of vulnerability in account security, but also methods to prevent it, it is useful for understanding methods of computer crime and tactics to prevent it.

**8. Language for section beginnings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **(1) The authors** attempt to evaluate the risk to account security posed by attacks on personal knowledge questions used as a backup measure for password loss. **(2) Several types of attacks are identified. (3)** **Mathematical models** are constructed for describing the challenge-response structure of the personal knowledge questions as well as models for calculating the odds of an attacker correctly guessing an answer. **Data sources** for correctly guessing answers are identified, as well as other information that could reduce the set of likely answers. **Combating the ease of guessing answers** by rejecting those which are statistically probable is suggested as a counter-measure. **(4)** **However the issues this may pose** for users, for example, providing a very small set of possible questions, **are not addressed.** Since this article provides not only an analysis of vulnerability in account security, but also methods to prevent it, **it is useful for understanding methods of computer crime and tactics to prevent it.** | **(1) Introduction**  This article reports on …  In this article, the authors ...  **(2) Summary (general)**  The article highlights several projects ..  While virtually all respondents ....  The author identifies key concepts ...  The research focuses on ...  The main ideas / arguments are ....  **(3) Summary (particular)**  The author begins....  These concepts include ....  Finally, the article concludes …  **(4) Evaluation/ relevance to research**  While it is not clear ... the article nevertheless provides an accurate ....  The main limitation ...  Although the article is useful for .... the limitations of its research base …  It is relevant to (research problem/ question) |

**9. Other Useful resources**

Academic phrase bank

<http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/>

Resources for writing an annotated bibliography

1. University of New South Wales

<https://student.unsw.edu.au/annotated-bibliography>

1. University of New England

<https://www.une.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/11132/WE_Writing-an-annotated-bibliography.pdf>

1. University of Melbourne

<http://services.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/706951/Writing-an-annotated-bibliography-100113.pdf>

Appendix: A short guide to support your reading of journal articles

Most journal articles in the sciences (formal, natural, applied, social) have a similar structure. Understanding the structure can assist you in extracting the information you want. You may, for example, only be looking for the experimental results of a study, so you would read the **Abstract,** **Results** and **Discussion** sections first to assess whether the article contained the information you were looking for. Usually a journal article will have the following sections and each section typically contains the following moves or stages (see dot points).

**Abstract**

This section provides an outline of the main sections of the paper:

* An opening statement that establishes the *background or context* of the research
* A summary of the *main ideas issues and/or research question/s or hypotheses*
* The research question may be worded as a statement e.g. ‘The study explored whether …’
* An indication of the *methods* used for the research
* A brief summary of the *results*
* Some *implications* of *the results/findings* and some *conclusions* the authors may have established.

**Introduction**

This section provides the context for the whole paper:

* Further *details the context /background /question/ topic* of the research article
* *Summarises previous research* that has been carried out on the topic and has provided a background for the current study
* Puts forward *the reasons for the research* and *a justification* for why the research was carried out
* Sets the *theoretical framework* of the research and/or the *parameters (limits)* of the research
* Identifies the research *aims/objectives*

**Method**

This section details how the author/s gathered and analysed their data:

* What they did (experimental procedure)
* What they did it with (materials)
* How the data were analysed

**Results/Findings**

This section shows what data the author/s found as a result of applying the method:

* Graphs, tables, pie charts
* Written description of results

**Discussion**

This section evaluates the present research by referring to published research:

* Usually *re-orients to*, or *repeats* the research question/s /problem
* Provides a *written interpretation* of the research results/findings
* Indicates *the importance* of the research results/findings and the *contribution* to the general research topic