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PIG 2015: Annotated Bibliography

**Annotated Bibliography**

A **bibliography** is a list of sources (books, journals, Web sites, periodicals, etc.) one has used for researching a topic. Bibliographies are sometimes called "References" or "Works Cited" depending on the style format you are using. A bibliography usually just includes the bibliographic information (i.e., the author, title, publisher, etc.).

An **annotation** is a summary and/or evaluation. Therefore, an **annotated bibliography** includes a summary and evaluation of each of the sources.

~https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/

1. You should have 4 articles to support your statement – which means 4 bibliographies with summaries.
2. Give the title of the article
3. Provide the citation – in the database articles this can be found at the bottom of the article!
4. In a short paragraph (150 words or less) summarize, assess and reflect on the article. You do not need to answer all of the questions below in your annotation, but you should consider some of them and be sure to cover all three headings in some way.
   1. **Summarize**: What are the main arguments? What is the point of this book or article? What topics are covered? If someone asked what this article/book is about, what would you say? ~https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/
   2. **Assess**: Is it a useful source? How does it compare with other sources in your bibliography? Is the information reliable? Is this source biased or objective? What is the goal of this source? ~https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/
   3. **Reflect**: Ask how this source fits into your research. Was this source helpful to you? How does it help you shape your argument? How can you use this source in your research project? Has it changed how you think about your topic? ~https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/

**EXAMPLE**

**The Department of Justice's Marijuana Memo Is a Disappointment for Federalism**

Kaiser, Matt. “The Department of Justice’s Marijuana Memo is a Disappointment for Federalism.” *The Huffington Post*. HPMG News, 19 Sept. 2013. Web. 17 Oct. 2104.

This article makes the argument that the Department of Justice is infringing on States Rights by releasing a memo which states that they can still prosecute individuals using and selling marijuana legally in states where it is legal. The author suggests that this is a loss for federalism which should allow for states to make laws that best meet the needs of their people. The author provides a good summary of the DOJ memo, and makes an interesting argument about federalism; however, he does not provide the other side of the argument, nor any facts to suggest that priorities that the DOJ outlined in their memo are being met by Washington and Colorado states. The article is really an assessment and the authors opinion on the memo rather than a factual accounting. The argument the author makes has led to questions that will help focus my research:

* Can the idea of Federalism go too far? Should states make laws that challenge federal law?

However, given that this article is a blog post, it would not serve to be sited in my research paper.