Source Reflection toolkit

A Useful Resource for Crafting Annotated Bibliographies

# Summary

What is the name of the source and who are the author(s)/researcher(s)?

What was the aim of this source? What did they attempt to inform their audience about or how did they attempt to influence their audience?

How did the source achieve this goal?

1. What were their main points or major topics?
2. How did they present information? What was the organization like?
3. How much information did they use?
4. What type of information did they use?
5. How was it organized?
6. What was their conclusion/findings?

Is the source successful in achieving its goal? Why or why not?

# Who?

Who is the author and what are their credentials?

How do they build their ethos or establish trust with the reader through their writing?

Who is the publisher?

1. What do they typically publish?
2. Who is their target audience?
3. What is their reputation?

Who reviewed the source for publication? Editors? Experts in the field? A review board? No one?

# What?

What type of source is this? Is it primary, secondary, or tertiary? How removed is the author from the data?

What type of literature is this? Is it scholarly, trade literature, a news source, or other publication? How did the type of literature impact it’s credibility?

What is the purpose of this source? What implicit bias might it have?

Are you using this source for its information or its perspective? What makes it relevant for how you plan to use it?

# When?

When was this source published?

What was occurring when this source was published that made it relevant at the time of publication?

Why is this source still relevant to your topic?

# Where?

Where does the source’s information come from?

Is it always clear which information comes from the author and/or which information comes from each source used?

What type of sources do they cite? How credible are those sources?

How many references do they have?

Can you easily follow-up on the source’s research?

# How?

How did you find this source?

1. What databases did you use?
2. What filters did you use?
3. What keywords and keyword combinations did you use?
4. How many hits did you get and how did you narrow your hits?

How do you know your research process was effective?

# Why?

Why did you choose to use this source?

What information will you take from this source to use in your paper?

How did this source confirm or counter your own views on this topic?

Where do your own views on this topic come from?

Has this source caused you to change or develop any of your current views on this topic? If so, how?

How would respond to this author? What would you want them to know? What would you praise about their work and what would you criticize?

How does it compare to other sources you explored in terms of . . .

1. Relevance (or relation to your topic)
2. Credibility (or what makes this information high-quality)
3. Accuracy (where does the information come from? How do you know it’s good information?)
4. Authority (Who is the writer? What are their credentials on this topic?)
5. Purpose (What is the writer’s goal? What is their level of bias)

# Helpful Sentence Templates

**Discussing the Author’s Argument**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * X acknowledges that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X agrees that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X argues that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X believes that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X denies/does not deny that \_\_\_\_\_. * X claims that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X complains that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X concedes that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X demonstrates that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X concludes that \_\_\_\_\_\_ * X asserts that \_\_\_\_\_\_ * X implies that \_\_\_\_\_\_ | * X explains the fact that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X emphasizes that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X insists that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X observes that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X questions that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X refuses the claim that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X reminds us that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X suggests that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X urges us to consider \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X presents evidence that\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X attempts to persuade the audience to believe\_\_\_\_\_. |

**Responding to the Author’s Argument**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agreeing with the Author:**   * These conclusions, which X discusses in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, add weight to the argument about \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X presents compelling evidence on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, which causes one to consider \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * I strongly agree with X due to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. | |
| **Disagreeing with the Author:**   * I think X is mistaken because she overlooks \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X’s claim that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ rests upon the questionable assumption that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is true. * I disagree with X’s view that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ because, as recent research has shown, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X contradicts himself. On the one hand, he argues \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. However, on the other   hand, he also says \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.   * By focusing on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, X overlooks the deeper problem of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X claims \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, but we don’t need him to tell us that. Anyone familiar with   \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ has long known that. | **Agreeing with concession with the Author:**   * X’s idea that\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is extremely useful because it sheds insight on the   difficult problem of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.   * I agree that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is a point that needs emphasizing since so many people   believe \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.   * Those unfamiliar with this school of thought may be interested to know that it   basically boils down to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.   * If group X is right that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, as I think they are, then we need to reassess   the popular assumption that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.   * X overlooks what I consider an important point about \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * My own view is that what X insists is a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is in fact a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. |
| **Agreeing and Disagreeing with the Author’s Argument:**  Although I agree with X up to a point, I cannot accept his overall conclusion that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ since \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.  Although I disagree with much that X says, I fully endorse his final conclusion that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.  Though I concede that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, I still insist that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.  Whereas X provides ample evidence that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Y and Z’s research on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ convinces me that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ instead.  X is right that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, but she seems on more dubious ground when she claims that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.  While X is probably wrong when she claims that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, she is right that\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.  I’m torn regarding X’s claim that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. On the one hand, I agree that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. On the other hand, I’m not sure if \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.  My feelings on the issue are mixed. I do support X’s position that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, but\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.  I find Y’s argument about \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and Z’s research on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to be equally persuasive. | |

**Evaluating and Comparing Sources**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criticizing Sources:**   * One weakness of this source is that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * This source is less credible due to the fact that\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * Readers of this source should be skeptical because\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * The target audience of this source should still consider\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * Due to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, one needs to cautiously consider the information presented in this source. * \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_would make this a more trustworthy source. * This source is less relevant in relation to my topic because\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * Despite bias of this source, it will still be useful to my research project to show that\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. | **Acknowledging the merits of source:**   * This is a useful source because\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * Readers can trust the information presented in this source since \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ makes this source ideal for my research topic because\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ * I chose this source specifically because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ increases its credibility. * I know this source contains high quality information due to the fact that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * This author is reliable because\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ makes them knowledgeable in this field. * I know this publication is trustworthy, considering it \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. |
| **Comparing/Ranking Sources:**   * Although X and Y offer similar perspectives, X is a more relevant/credible source for my topic because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * While source X claims\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and source Y claims\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ both are useful to my research process because they share \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * Y source is like X source because it also \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * This source is unique compared to my other sources because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_is my least credible source, but I will use it with sources X and Y to show \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X is the best source for my project considering that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. * X is less credible than Y source but more credible than Z source because\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. | |