

6.5 Read an extended source and write an evaluative bibliography annotation

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ Total: 24 marks

KEY WORDS annotated bibliography 注释性参考书目 • annotation 注释 • locator 出处定位

Objective

Read an extended source and write an evaluative bibliography annotation. This is original GAC015-aligned practice, not an official assessment. All people, texts, records and instructions are fictional. This sheet’s word ranges and analytic points are local teaching conventions, not official assessment specifications. Sources supplied here are original fictional classroom material. Actual research coursework requires genuine retrieved sources, verified methods and references in the required style.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ **Key knowledge: summary, evaluation and intended use perform different jobs**

An **annotated bibliography** 注释性参考书目 pairs a reference with an **annotation** 注释 that summarises, evaluates and states an intended use. Read the relevant full source before selecting a claim; a title or abstract alone may omit important limitations.

A **locator** 出处定位 such as a page or numbered section identifies the evidence. Follow the required referencing style for real sources and missing details. This supplied report uses honest fictional label/section references; do not fabricate publication information.

■ **Source A: text or task brief**

Original fictional report C, Notice evaluation, §§1–3. Classroom source supplied in this sheet; no external author, journal or publication date is claimed.

§1: A student team compared two event-notice versions. The first used a long paragraph; the second used headings and shorter sentences. Twelve volunteers saw the first version on Monday and twelve different volunteers saw the second on Tuesday. Each answered four questions about place, date, booking and access. A response counted as correct only if all four details matched the notice. Both groups were scored with the same key.

§2: Eight first-group participants and ten second-group participants answered all four questions correctly. Only the combined outcome was recorded; individual missed details were not identified. Volunteers were available classmates rather than a randomly selected audience. Both layout and wording changed. Reading ability and one-week retention were not compared.

§3: The team recommends checking clarity before publication. It does not claim that

layout alone caused the difference or that results apply to every audience. A proposed follow-up would hold wording fixed, record errors by detail and include different reading experiences. Immediate classroom comprehension and actual event attendance are different outcomes; attendance was not measured.


Research question: What helps visitors understand event information? Use C’s label/title/sections as the local reference entry.

■ **Source B: response or review record**

Annotation draft: “C is a famous journal article proving that headings alone double attendance for everyone. Its follow-up experiment was already completed. I did not need to read §2 because the title sounded relevant.”

Bibliography brief: provide the honest source entry, a faithful summary, strengths and limits relevant to the question, and a precise intended use or exclusion. No source has to be praised or used for every claim.

■ **Worked example: the intended use must fit the measured outcome**



Known: C measures an immediate combined four-detail comprehension outcome. Why read all three sections? §2 identifies convenience groups and simultaneous changes; §3 distinguishes a proposed follow-up from actual results.

The same scoring key supports consistent scoring procedures, but it does not establish repeat-study reliability or isolate layout effects. C can illustrate evaluation design and source limits. It cannot prove a universal attendance improvement or a completed follow-up.

2 Practice

2.1 State what counted as a correct response and give the results with group sizes. [2]

2.2 State one procedural strength and one comparison limitation. [2]

2.3 Correct THREE claims in the draft annotation. [3]

2.4 Give the locator for the recorded result, one unmeasured outcome and one proposed follow-up feature. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Write an honest local reference entry and plan an annotation's summary, evaluation and use, with one precise locator. [6]

3.2 Write a 120–160 word annotation answering the research question. Start with the supplied source label, retain precise locators and explain what claim you would not use it to support. [8]

Solutions

2.1

All four details had to match; eight of twelve and ten of twelve.

2.2

Same answer key supports consistent scoring; different volunteers/days, convenience recruitment, changed wording/layout or absent baseline/retention comparison.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: fictional source not a famous journal article; layout alone not isolated; attendance unmeasured; result not a doubling or universal; follow-up merely proposed; §2 must be read for limits.

2.4

§2 result; attendance or later retention unmeasured; fixed wording, detail-specific errors or broader reading experiences proposed in §3.

3.1

Identifies fictional report C and title; supplied classroom source and §§1–3 without invented details; accurate method/result summary; relevant strength/limit evaluation; specific suitable use or excluded claim; correct §2/§3 locator for relevant clause.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: honest fictional C/title/section identification; accurate method and eight/twelve versus ten/twelve result with §2; combined four-detail outcome; procedural strength distinguished from causal/repeat reliability proof; relevant comparison and measurement limits; specific intended use and excluded universal/attendance claim; §3 proposal distinguished from completed follow-up; coherent truthful 120–160 word response. Example: “Fictional report C, Notice evaluation, §§1–3, is an original classroom source about immediate event-notice comprehension. Two different volunteer groups viewed different notice versions on consecutive days. Ten of twelve second-group readers answered all four details correctly, compared with eight of twelve first-group readers (§2). The shared key supports a consistent scoring procedure, but convenience recruitment, different days and simultaneous wording and layout changes limit the comparison. Individual missed details and later retention were not recorded.

For an essay on understanding event information, I would use C to illustrate an evaluation design and why its limitations matter. I would not use it to prove that headings alone increase attendance or benefit every audience. Its proposed follow-up holds wording fixed and records errors by detail (§3); this is a suggested improvement, not a completed experiment. The reference should retain the fictional label rather than invented journal details.”