

## The How and Why of Annotating (Part 1)

---

**JOSH MUNSON:** Welcome everyone to tonight's webinar, "The How and Why of Annotating." My name is Josh and I'm the program coordinator here with Global Connections. I'm super stoked to be able to introduce to you Lorena, who will be presenting on tonight's topic. If you're experiencing any audio issues, don't forget to try and check out the audio wizard tool, or just type in help into the chat box and we'll try to figure something out for you. If you have any questions-- we want this to be as interactive as possible-- so do try to use the chat box throughout the webinar and ask Lorena some questions. She'd be happy to answer them right back. So without further ado, here she is.

**LORENA O'ENGLISH:** Hi everyone, I'm Lorena O'English, and you can see that my presentation is on the how and why of annotating, part one. And I'll be back here on the 22nd of September to talk about some other issues, some taking this to the next step. And my contact information is on the screen. If you have questions, you're welcome to send me an email message. Or you're welcome to send me a tweet if you'd like to ask an question in 140 annotated and in short term.

So let's go ahead and get started. But before we do, I want to go ahead and introduce myself a little bit more beyond just my name. And you can see that I like water coloring, and reading, and travel, and sleeping, and a bunch of other things. And you can really tell that I like comics and I like my dog, Heidi. So I'm hoping that you all will introduce yourselves and tell us where you're from and something or some things that you like.

Great, looks like Josh is from Yakima. Josh, what do you like? What's something that you like, something you enjoy doing? Aha, excellent. [INAUDIBLE] and dance and travel. Those are all good things. Anyone else?

Ha, another dog person, Carrie. My dog's a bit of a mutt, but I've known some Cavalier King Charles Spaniels. They're lovely dogs. Lots of hair. Anyone else? I've give people a few more seconds to go ahead and type something, to see in the-- Ah! Kari, gotcha.

OK. And Jaya here in Seattle. Oh, you're on vacation and you're coming into this? That's pretty cool. You're a diehard. I applaud that. Oh, I love Victoria, too. I always wanted to go to tea at that lovely hotel there. Someday.

All right, so we're going to go ahead and get started. And let's go ahead and look a little bit at

the order of the day. And so what I'm going to be doing is, I was kind of thinking about how to organize this. And I don't know about you all, but whenever I'm doing a talk or writing a paper, I spend a lot of time just going crazy until I figure out my hook. And then once I have my hook, then everything kind of fall into place. And then I realized this time, my hook was the notion of conversation.

But before I talk about that, I just want to talk about limiting factors. We've only got 30 minutes, so what I'm going to be talking about is-- by virtue of that-- going to be a very fast style, not very detailed, and very abbreviated, and a little bit vague. And part of that actually is always going to happen, because annotation is something that's very personal. The way we take notes. The way we engage with the text. It's very personal things, so we all-- the more we do it, we figure out a structure that works for us.

So because of that, what I'm going to be focusing on today is marginalia. We're going to be thinking about actually the kind of notes, the kind of annotations that we actually do on the text. The act of writing. And I want to segue a little bit and talk about that because literally, the act of writing is a muscle memory thing. And research shows that, when you actually take notes by writing rather than say, typing, sometimes you're more likely to remember them. So it's a fun way to think about maybe engaging with our information in a little bit more of a very tactile, kinetic fashion.

But the next session that we do on the 22nd is going to go a little bit beyond all this and look at annotations in a broader way, and actually talk a little bit about digital annotation.

So the goal of annotation a text is to read and interact with the text. And so that's why I came up with this framework of conversation, because we're going to have a conversation. You and the text interact with each other. And you think, how can I interact with the text? I'm a person, it's a flat piece of paper. But it actually turns out that it talks to you as you read through it.

So we're going to look through six dimensions. We're going to talk about conventions, comprehending, contextualizing, classifying, critiquing, and connecting. And we'll go ahead and talk about each of these. And all of these are within the frame or the context of conversation.

So let's go ahead and talk about conventions. And conventions are basically procedures that you internalize over time. And you're not going to start off with a lot of conventions, unless

you've been annotating things and have processes, the way you do things. One of the things is how do you actually write your annotations?

It's sort of like if y'all do crossword puzzles. Does anybody here do crossword puzzles with a pen? I do, because every so often I just think it's cool, and then I make a big mess. So anyone do crossword puzzles with a pen? Or do crossword puzzles with a pencil? I'll let you guys think about that. Because just like when you're doing a crossword puzzle, and sometimes you realize that you've actually wrote in the wrong letters.

Sometimes when you annotate, especially when you annotate and go back and look at something again, you realize that you didn't get something that you get now. Or you're asking a question that's been answered later on. So sometimes it's helpful to actually use the pencil, or maybe one of the pens that has multiple colors, to do your annotations. Come up with a consistent way so you're always thinking in about it at the same time.

Something that's really important to me is to think about using, creating conventions that help me avoid plagiarism. And so one of the things that I'm going to do is, anytime I'm writing something on the side that's a quotation, I'm going to put in quotation marks. And if it's something that's on another page, I'm going to put the page number next to it, so I know that this is a quotation.

If I paraphrase, you'll notice that what I do here is I'm kind of adopting a little bit from HTML. And so I'm going to use these little brackets, and I'm even going to write a note to myself. Para-P, colon, this is a paraphrase created by me. So if I see the brackets, and I see P-A-R-P or some diminution of that, I know that this is something that I wrote rather than something that the author wrote or somebody else wrote. And that's really important later on, when I might be actually using some of this in actually writing a paper.

So another convention that I tend to use is basically commands to myself, things that I want to remember to do in the future. So for example, if I see a term that I'm unfamiliar with, then I'm going to put in define, colon, and then the name of the term. And I may put it in a box so that later on I can come back and define it if I don't want to break out of the text at that moment and get a definition.

So I might do other things as well. I'm a librarian, so one of the things as a librarian that I do, is I'm always looking for key words. I'm always looking for terms that I might plug into a library database or a catalog or a search engine. So I may actually also do keyword, colon, and then

indicate a term that I'm going to extract later on and incorporate maybe into searching. So I'm always trying to think ahead to how I might do this.

Kind of along the notion of plagiarism is making sure that I keep my own voice. So I do this when I'm annotating a text and I do this when I'm taking notes for a talk, as well. I'm writing notes and I'm annotating and I'm synthesizing or explaining what this means in my own words. If I have an editorial comment, I'm always going to put it in brackets. So I know that anything in brackets is something that I thought at the time. And these are going to be things like, what does she mean here? I disagree. Why isn't it population freshman [INAUDIBLE] These are editorial comments that are the start of my sort of critiquing aspect of it. So I'm going to always do that as one of my own conventions. And I do that all the time now. Anytime I see a bracket, I know that it's something that I thought at that time, coming from my head.

Finally, there's also the idea of consistent use of techniques. Creating conventions so that you're always going to underline the same sort of words, you're going to highlight in the same way, you're going to use bullets and shapes, boxes, circles, et cetera, to draw attention to yourself. For example, any time I see something in an article and I want to remember that I want to do something with it, I'll usually put in a little circle, and I'll make that circle really, really dark. And that's so later on, my eye is going to look for the circle and then when I take care of it, when I do it, I'm going to check it off so I know that it's taken care of. So I want to use these sorts of consistent tools to help me out.

And I want to take a step back a little bit and talk a little bit about underlining and highlighting. One of the things about underlining and highlighting when you're working with a text is that they are essentially passive. You're not really engaging with the text, you're highlighting something and you're not necessarily processing it. So actually, I tend to not do a lot of highlighting or a lot of underlining, except for very specific things that I might then call out and annotate on the side.

Because I really believe that the power of annotation, the power of marking up an article or a book chapter or whatever it is, is actually how I engage, the things that I write down, rather than the underlining thing. And also sometimes what happens is once you start underlining or highlighting, you go crazy and there's just too much of it. And so it becomes something becomes useless, because it has lost its purpose, which is to basically call something out for you. So just something to consider.

So I'll stop now and see if anybody has any questions, if they have particular conventions that they use, or anything about any of this that I've talked about so far. OK. So I'm not hearing any questions, but if you do have some, if you think of something later on, of course, feel free to write it in the box and our wonderful moderators will make sure that I see that and we'll try to answer them. And then we'll also, of course, have some time to actually ask questions and respond and maybe discuss at the end of this content.

So I'm going to move to my next C. We're going to talk a little bit about comprehending. And I strongly believe that a large part of the notion of annotating a text is understanding the text, comprehending it. And before you actually can annotate, you have to read the text for understanding. So what I'm looking at here is an example of the format of a research article. And you can see the link is down at the bottom of the slide, and I've also got a resource list that will include this link as well.

This is a very good synopsis of how a research article is constructed, and this particular example is a social science research article. This format is also often used for articles in the sciences and more or less in the humanities, but the humanities are different because oftentimes they do different sorts of research-- more theoretical, more text-based rather than necessarily experiment-based or postulate-based-- so it might be a little bit different.

So what we're going to do is we're going to look at it, and the context that people use is they often talk about the something called I-M-R-D, or IMRD or pronounced in some ways. So let's take a look and work through that. You can see that our article is divided into a number of aspects. The first thing we're going to have is the title and the abstract, the introduction and the literature review. And these four things compose the I in IMRD, that's the introduction.

And these are really important things, and in fact, when you're reading an article, one of the things that I oftentimes recommend doing is that you actually read an article three times. And the first time you're going to read it is you're just going to focus on the title, because there's a lot of cues in the title for what the article is about. You're going to read the abstract, which is a summary of what the article is about. And you might read the introduction, because the introduction is making the case for why this needs to be done. And then what we do is we skip everything in the middle and we go all the way down and we actually look at the discussion and the conclusion at the very end. So that's the first cycle of actually reading it.

The second way I'm going to read it is I'm going to skim, again starting from the top. I'm going

to look at the title, I'm going to look at the abstract, I'm going to look at the introduction, I'm going to look at the literature review. And the literature review is really important because that's where they're saying, hey look, people have done literature on my topic, but they've never actually looked at my topic the way I'm going to look at it. So sometimes I want to really interrogate that a little bit, because I want to see, are they throwing out the names of studies and just basically saying who they are so that maybe I have to go look them up? Or are they telling me a little bit more specifically about what a study did?

And I just want to add that, sometimes, really carefully looking at the literature review can be a really important part of annotation. You actually may want to separately annotate the studies that they do. I'll give you an example. I wrote an article on graphic novels in academic libraries, and they cited a particular article that actually drew a connection between reading graphic novels and boys expanding their ability to read. And so I saw this mentioned in a number of other articles, and then I actually tracked down the article. And the article basically said that there was a correlation, but the way they expressed the correlation, it was a much smaller correlation than it was when people had been writing about it in their literature review. So sometimes actually tracing down the original sources can be really valuable, because it's a better way to do it, to see what people are actually seeing. And that is something that you might think about when you're actually looking at the text.

So the next section is our methods and data. And our methods is where we look and see, how are they going to do what they say they're going to do? What strategies are they going to use? What research methodology are they going to use? Then the results-- this is we did this, this is what happened-- the discussion, and then the references.

So this structure is a really important structure, and being aware of it-- it may not always be signposted with literature review and methods, but social science and science articles are usually, by default, within this aspect. So I really want to be aware of the structure, because as I'm annotating I can get an idea of what to expect as I look further along this. And I'm really thinking about the process of reading. Like I said, you can't annotate, you can't make notes, you can't extract, you can't synthesize, until you have an understanding of what the text actually is involved.

And I want to also-- as a librarian-- point out that the reference list is also something really important. You'd want to look and see, who are they citing? Are there names and publications that you recognize, that may indicate that something has a larger sense of importance?

OK, any questions about this? Ah, thank you, thank you Carrie, for putting the link in that. We'll also see it at the very end.

I want to actually step back and tell you a story. I actually got my undergraduate degree, and then I went and did other things for a long time, and then went back to graduate school to become a librarian. And when I went back to graduate school, I actually had completely forgotten how to read a scholarly article. And I actually struggled really the first couple of weeks-- in fact, really the first semester-- because reading scholarly research was something that was so alien to what I'd been doing for the last 10 years.

And I didn't really know all of this. I didn't understand that scholarly article had a structure. And if I had an awareness of this structure-- if I knew what it was and what it tells me, my third column-- then I would've actually had a better idea of it. And you really want to focus on what the column tells you, because this is stuff that become important when you're critiquing it. How well does it actually do what they're saying they're going to do?

All right. So we're going to go over to our next slide, and we're going to talk about contextualization. And I'm going to say this again, but research is not written in a vacuum. Everything sort of has to be contextualized. And one of the things that I want to actually start off with is this notion that the author has some significance. I mentioned that you might want to look at the reference list and see if you can see names that start becoming familiar after you've been reading on a topic for awhile.

So some of the things you might want to do is get a sense of the author's expertise. You may want to do a Google search. Do they have a Wikipedia page? Does it give some information that gives you a sense of their expertise, their credentials, for writing on a particular topic. If you are working with a library database or Google or Google Scholar, you can also actually do a search on the author. In a library database, usually the author is hotlinked. I can click on that and see all of the other books and articles by that particular author in my database, which is giving me a sense of the author's-- within the context of this whole area-- what sort of work are they doing?

I want to think about discipline when I read something. I actually yesterday taught a for sociology students, and we were talking about the distinction between articles that situated a topic in the discipline of sociology versus articles that situated in a more general area or within something different, like psychology or medicine or something else. Articles are different

based upon the discipline in which they're written, just like my annotations are. If I'm annotating something in sociology, I may annotate it in a different way than something that is medically-related.

I want to think about the intended audience. Is the intended audience students? Is it people who have expertise? Is it a general audience? And how is the language used to appeal to that particular audience?

A really important thing to me is information type. Let's look at some examples. At the very top, you can see-- if you can look at it a little bit-- you can get some cues from this, that this may not be scholarly research. They're saying the Supreme Court has done things for sheer incoherence. And if you look a little bit further at this article, you discover that this is actually an opinion article in an opinion journal-- a journal that makes no pretense whatsoever to be non-partisan. The whole point is to situate a view within a particular perspective.

Now if we look at the article underneath it, we can see that they're actually describing their methods, and you can see that they're telling you what they're going to do and they even say the study received approval from the Human Research Review. So I'm getting a sense that this is scholarly research.

My bottom text here, I can see that this is also research, but this is a different sort of research. This is humanities research, where instead of essentially creating a research design and doing it, they're doing their research by interrogating the text.

Now let's look at my final example. And this is a popular magazine, this is from *Entertainment Weekly*. So you're like, oh my gosh, why would I ever read a popular magazine for scholarly work, let alone actually annotate what it says? But let's say I'm writing about Jane Austen, and I'm writing about how Jane Austen has been appropriated by popular culture. I might really want to look at how the movie *Clueless*, 20 years after it was made, actually still has significance and still resonates, both as a young adult movie and as an Austen movie.

I want to think about all these things, and I want to make note of that in my annotation. What kind of publication is it? Is my publication theoretical or is it research-based? Is it bench research, is it social science research, what kind of methodology are they doing? Are they doing survey research? Are they doing focus groups? Are they creating big economic models and working with data in a very esoteric way? So I want to think about all of these things which

help me contextualize the article and how I might use it, and some of the things that might actually be things that I'll think about when I'm actually getting ready to do my critique.

Any questions about this? Has anybody here seen the movie *Clueless*? Or I should say not seen the movie *Clueless*? If you like Jane Austen or you like fun '80s fashions, this is actually a great film to watch. It's wickedly funny, and it has dialogue that is quoted even today. Aha, I see other people loving *Clueless*. Absolutely, me too.

OK, so I just want to actually-- I'm a librarian, I'm always looking to push a little bit of librarian content, regardless of what I'm doing-- and one of the things I want to say here is, don't not read something because it's popular. Popular publications have something to say in scholarly research. Oftentimes they can be really good for giving you examples or anecdotes that might make your paper more interesting. So that might be something that I would annotate. I might extract a particular thing and use it as an anecdote or a good introduction that's engaging to my paper.

OK, so let's look at that classifying. And this is where we really do the real hard work of annotation, because what we're going to do is we're going to be reading this paper. We've thought about the structure of the paper, we've contextualized it with these other things, and now we're actually reading it and making our notes.

And one of the things we really want to do is we want to make notes of the bones of the paper-- the significant part of the paper or the chapter or whatever. I'm not so interested in facts. I'm interested in things like ideas, concepts, evidence, not light things. I'm not interested in the skin or the flesh, I want the bones. I want the outline of the tree. So again, I'm saying that you want to emphasize taking notes-- looking at something, re-formulating it in your own words, writing in questions-- actually writing them in your own handwriting, not underlining or highlighting.

And you want to keep both content and process in mind. Content is where you're actually looking at what is it that they're saying. Process is how are they saying it? Is this actually, do you think of a good methodology? Do you like the way they structured this? Did they ask the question in an interesting way? Those are some things you might want to keep in mind.

So these are the things that you're looking for. You're going to try to make sure you can actually pull apart and find the thesis statement. What is the research question? What are the broad themes that you're looking at, the major ideas, any theories that are being used or

being proven or disproven? What kind of evidence are they using? Again, methods, conclusions. Who was studied? Who's our population? When would the research take place? Who funded it? All of these are important things to make note of in some way, even if it's only in a couple of words. You want to pull it out from all the other verbiage here.

And so what you're doing as you do this is you're commenting, you're questioning, you're interrogating what's there. You're asking questions, you're interacting with it. This is not one-sided, the article's speaking to you. And what you want to do is, as you go, you want to summarize each section based upon your specific notes from your marginalia. So you write your notes as you go and then summarize them at the very end. And you might end up having to have a separate piece of paper for all of this, or you might get into the habit of actually spending a little bit more money and copying-- singled-sided, so you have the back to write on-- instead of double-sided that you're looking at something.

So let's go ahead and take a look at something, a sample annotation. I thought about doing one myself, but I really like this one a lot and I like the format. So you notice, here's my paper, and the annotation's over here on the right have to do with the content. They're extracting information dealing with the content. So that's our content side. The annotations over here on the left are process sorts of comments. They're pulling out, this is an introduction, this is providing historical perspective, here's a description. This is where I would probably also start putting in my own little comments in brackets, that have to do my editorializing, et cetera.

So this is a good strategy, but you can see this is also a paper that has lots of space. So you get into the habit of writing a little bit smaller, or really using abbreviations. But this is a good way to think about it. Look at some of the questions that they're asking. Look at how they're extracting the meaning from it.

I would probably say this might be a little bit over-annotated, actually. I would maybe not necessarily annotate every single paragraph, because I would be looking, again, for this notion of the bones of the paper, the things that really make it significant. Any questions?

So let's move on our Cs, and now we're talk about critiquing. So we have been focusing a little bit on our annotations, really just writing down the essential points of what the author or authors are saying. But that's really not enough, because in addition to commenting on what they're saying, you're also always reading with the intent of actually critiquing. Again, you'd want to make sure that you're ready to interrogate what the author is saying.

And I'll give you an example of this. Once I was reading a really interesting paper that was talking about cheating, and what it was is it was talking about attitudes of cheating in athletics-- cheating in sports-- versus attitudes about cheating in classrooms. And I was really intrigued by this, but as I read, one of the things that I noticed when I looked at it-- when I looked at the population that they chose-- was they only looked at guys, and they only looked at freshmen.

And I thought, this is really interesting but I would actually like a much further picture of this. Because freshmen college students-- male freshmen college students-- maybe it's like my old joke. And my joke is, what's the difference between high school and college? Three months. So you might be dealing with students who are three months out of a high school situation, and they may have-- developmentally, people are not always ready to think about some of the concepts that they get inculcated with as they work their way through college.

So it was an interesting article and it was valuable, but my critique was, I would really like to see this research done with men and women, and people who are not just freshmen. So it's something to think about.

It's really crucial to critique as you read and annotate, to go along as you do it. Don't worry about whether or not the author's actually going to respond to this on the next page. Don't worry about not understanding. Those are things that you want to do. If the author responds, you make a little note. If you never actually get it, that's something that you might want to talk to your professor about in class or out of class. Nothing is beyond critique, there is always something to say.

I don't have a link to this, but if you go ahead and Google something called Retraction Watch, it's really interesting because Retraction Watch is a website that looks at articles, that went through the peer review process, they were published in scholarly journals-- legitimate journals-- that actually turned out to be wrong. They turned out to falsify or plagiarize or do other bad things, and actually had to be retracted by the journal, the authors, et cetera. And there have been some notable cases about that. So everything is worthy of critique.

And critique doesn't mean negative comments. Critique is not critical. At least it's not critical in the sense of, you're bad. It's your chance to evaluate the article and critique it for the things that you see are fine, and the things that really don't work for you. You look at arguments, you look at evidence, methods, theories, ideas-- what works for you, what doesn't work for you, and what's missing? What are the things that they're not telling you? What are the gaps?

There's always going to be something. Again, what's the population? What are the dates, geography, funding, et cetera?

And a note about methods. I meant to actually mention this when I was talking about reading a journal article. If you remember how I said that when you start off, you start off, you read the title, and you read the abstract, and you read the introduction, and then you work your way down to the discussion. As you learn more about your discipline, as you learn more about methodology, you're going to start finding that you're going to get more and more comprehension towards the middle. You're going to understand more and more about the methods part, you're going to understand more and more about the results part. About reading tables, which is worthy of its own webinar right there. So it's something to think about as you're critiquing.

Don't be afraid of the methods session. Look at it and see what makes sense. Because sometimes people actually just write things in and they use words like might and may and correlate, and that doesn't mean do and is and cause. So you always want to be looking for those sorts of terms. And if you have anything, if you have questions, if you're unsure about something, write them down and talk to your professor about them or bring them up in class or-- in your case-- post them on the thread or discussion or the class website and go from there.

And a really good way to think about critiquing is to review that article that I showed earlier, that looked at the structure of an article. Because in addition to showing the structure, remember the third comment-- the third column, actually-- talked about what the article is supposed to do. And you'd be looking to see whether it actually did these sorts of things. Any questions?

OK. So let's look at our final C, which is connecting, and again, this notion of research not being in a vacuum, reading not being in a vacuum. You are never reading in a vacuum. You're not reading an article just because the professor thought it would be good for you to actually have something to do on Friday night. You're reading it because it is related to the material in the class, the content of the class, the point of the class. You're reading it for a point.

You're reading it from the perspective of your own experience and knowledge. You bring that to your reading it. You're reading it within the context of class content and your professor's lectures, and any cues that a professor might have given you that might connect the article or

the book chapter or whatever to class content and other online readings. And you're also reading this within everything that you read before-- other classes that you've taken, other things that you're reading-- and you're building up in your mind a formulation of a discipline, a body of scholarly knowledge that you're becoming aware of. And so you find yourself in class-- if you take your notes, and if you bring your notes with you-- saying, oh yeah, Albertson. That article that we read two months ago, Albertson actually said this, and you can bring everything together.

So you are creating new knowledge, or new to you. You're distilling things, and so you're always remembering that an article doesn't exist in a vacuum, that you want to connect it. You want to connect it to the topic of the class, you want to connect it into what your professor said, you want to connect it to things that you've said or other classmates said. So you want to always think about connecting the dots. And if you can't connect the dots, then isn't that an interesting critique right there? Professor, why did we read this? How does this connect to what we're talking about in class? And that might actually be a really interesting discussion.

So I have been focused on this notion of marginalia, annotating on the article. But I wanted to talk very briefly about some alternative ways to annotate, to look at things from a graphic mode. And sometimes people find that it's easier for them to understand things when they're in graphic mode, than when they're in the text mode. So one example is a really bad mind map that I did. Mind mapping is not something that I'm really amazing at, but my colleague, Holly, actually did a webinar for Global Campus recently on mind mapping. And so the video for that should be up at some point, and if you didn't go watch that, you might want to watch it.

Because you see that what I'm doing here is I'm annotating in a different way. The point of my annotation is I am separating the knowledge and I'm finding connections and I'm highlighting things, and I've got this box over here with my critique. This was an article that I wrote, and I said, this is an example of why you always need to critique. I co-wrote this article on graphic novels in libraries, and I've always been ashamed of the fact that we didn't actually study anyone. We didn't actually do a survey. It was a very theoretical article, and how come I didn't do that? It would've made this article so much stronger. So you can see that's a very profound critique.

The other thing I wanted to mention is the notion of sketch noting. And I'm not sure if you are familiar with this, but sketch noting-- and if you actually do an internet search for sketch noting, you'll find wonderful things. You can see that this is a sketch note of a chapter in a textbook,

and the person basically read the chapter and they read it for comprehension, and then they rewrote it in this sketch form, where they're mixing together text and images and organizing so that they're, again, extracting the bones-- extracting the important part, pulling out the topic sentence-- but doing it in a graphical way. That's really exciting, actually.

I was actually on a long plane ride once with a college student who was confessing to me how difficult she found actually reading things, because everything was text. That was just too much for her. So I said hey, have you ever heard of sketch noting, and showed her some because I had a book with some sketch notes. She was really excited about it because different modes fit different people. She was not a text person, she was a graphics person. So this idea of actually taking notes in a graphical format was really exciting for her. And that was something that she was going to actually go implement herself.

Yes, thank you, Carrie. You can see a sketch note I made right over there. There are [? flipper ?] sites for sketch notes. People sketch note talks a lot, lectures, talks, books, all sorts of things, and it's really a fun way to think about it. And the thing is, you don't have to be good at art. Now this person is actually pretty good-- that's a pretty good face-- but you can do sketch noting with shapes and stick figures or smiley faces or negative faces. Anything you can want.

It's an exciting way to think about presenting information, because think about it. In order to sketch note this chapter, I had to have read it, I had to have really understood it, and I had to have organized it in a way that makes sense. So in the process of creating a sketch note, I really internalized it, and I can go back and look at this to refresh myself at any point.

So these are some resources for more information. This doesn't include the sketch note link, so thank you for putting that in, Carrie. And I also didn't include that website that I mentioned to you, Retraction Watch. And I would go take a look at Retraction Watch because it really is this very, very powerful reminder that nothing, nothing, nothing is completely free of problems. Peer-reviewed research-- the gold standard of research-- there are people out there doing crappy stuff, and we don't always find out about it. So you want to be aware of this and learn how people misuse information so that you can watch out for it.

So I, at this point, am going to go ahead and ask all of you for some questions. But before I do that, I want to give you a teaser for the session that I'll be doing on the 22nd. This is going to be "The How and Why of Annotating, Part 2-- Putting It All Together." And what I'll be doing then is talking a little bit more about why we annotate, what you do with these annotations, and

we'll talk a little bit about annotated bibliographies.

We'll talk about capturing annotations for the long haul. So that when you annotate something, it's not something ephemeral that lives on a piece of paper, but it's something that you can go back to and refer to over the course of your academic career and afterward.

And we'll talk a little bit about digital annotation. Instead of annotation with your pen on a piece of paper, we'll talk about using some electronic means.

And if you are interested, I have a tiny little homework assignment for you. And I've done this in classes and it's kind of fun. What I want everyone to do-- if you're going to come back, and you don't have to do this. If you want to, you might find it amusing. I want everybody to go either read the story of *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*, or try to remember it. Then what I want you to do is I want you to write a summary of it. And I want you to think about things the same way you'd write a summary of an article. I want you to think about themes and highlights and arguments and evidence, analysis and critique. All of those things based around the story of *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*.

And we'll hopefully-- if you get a chance, I'll certainly be doing that-- and then maybe when we meet again on the 22nd-- if you do-- we can talk about it. And if you don't, perhaps you'll watch my video afterward and maybe think about this a little bit more.

So any questions? I actually would always say any questions, and then I would wait five seconds, and then I'd be like, OK. So now I actually force myself to sit here and smile and actually let people think about things. But if you don't have questions now, please-- hopefully I'll see you again on the 22nd, you may have some questions if you've started to pursue some of these strategies. You're welcome to send me an email, you're welcome to tweet me-- anything like that-- and I'll be happy to try to respond. Because this is really something that I've started to get interested in, in a lot of ways. It meshes very well with some of the other things that I'm doing.

So I will ask again if anyone has any questions. And if not, I'm going to go ahead and turn this back over to Josh.

**JOSH MUNSON:** Thank you, Lorena. That was a really interesting webinar, and I know I learned a lot about it. I hope you guys did, too. I am sending over a Qualtrics link right now for you guys to click on, and just take one to two minutes to fill out a survey about this webinar. And yeah, have a great

night. We hope to see you next Wednesday for our Town Hall with Dave Cillay, and then the week after that with Annotating Part 2. Thank you.