Annotated Bibliography Samples

Please note that the APA style on these samples are not necessarily 100% perfect. You should still check the APA 5th edition style manual for the correct formatting on your own papers. There also may be more or less information that you want to include on your own papers (for example, the first & third pages of the samples do not specifically address the definitions of the concepts).

As an additional reminder, make sure that your papers only contain information from the article. In other words, you will NOT be including information from your textbook or other sources in this assignment.

This article explores the variables that affect learning in traditional classrooms and in distance learning classrooms. The article asserts that teacher immediacy behaviors can be verbal (use of humor, verbal praise, willingness to talk outside the classroom, etc.) or nonverbal (signals of availability, warmth, etc.). The research questions are: 1) “will state motivation vary based on lecture delivery type (live, Powerpoint, and video)?”, 2) will perceived teacher immediacy vary based on lecture delivery type (live, Powerpoint, and video)?”, 3) “will a student’s perceived learning vary based on lecture delivery type (live, Powerpoint, and video)?”, 4) “will a student’s actual learning vary based on lecture delivery type (live, Powerpoint, and video)?”, and 5) “will a student’s learning (perceived and/or actual) vary based on the interaction of lecture delivery type (live, Powerpoint, and video) and student cognitive style?” (p. 232) The study methods involved giving 120 first year communication course students one of three different classroom treatments (a traditional classroom, a video simulcast lecture, or a Powerpoint presentation with an audio simulcast) and then the students were given surveys employing Gregorc Cognitive Style Indicator, Andersen’s Generalized Immediacy Scale, Christophel’s State Motivation Scale and Bloom’s Taxanomy. A second study was conducted that mirrored the first. Data variations for RQs 1, 3, 4, and 5 were not statistically significant. Data variations for RQ2 showed that immediacy perceptions varied widely across the situations. This article is useful because of the focus on immediacy on delivery type and then delivery type on learning. The results of RQ2 are of particular interest.

This article addresses students’ learning approaches and how this affects their reactions to computer technology. They define learning strategies as “combinations of cognitive skills implemented when a situation is perceived as a learning situation,” (p. 42) and approaches as being “exhibited when students adapt their learning to suit either their preferences or the situation in which they are engaged.” The research questions were “(D)o students’ learning approaches influence their perception of the learning experience in the Virtual Seminar series? (D)o student learning approaches impact on the perception of C&IT? (D)oes prior experience of using C&IT affect students’ perceptions of the learning situation?” (p. 43) The participants of in this study were 95 psychology students at a university in the United Kingdom. Students first completed questionnaires concerning their experience with computer technology, then participated in a Virtual Seminar series. After the seminar series, the students completed another questionnaire that included the Approaches and Study Skills Inventory for Students (ASSIST) (Tait & Entwistle, 1996). No significant results were found from the ASSIST survey. Students who were “Deep” learners were found to desire more C&IT, “Surface Apathetic” learners did not desire more C&IT, and “Strategic” learners did not have a clear preference. The main limitation of this study is this low number of students who could be clearly identified as adopting one learning approach, thus limiting the ability to interpret and generalize the results. (p. 48)

The utility of this article lies in the discussion of why and how teachers use computer-mediated communication in the classroom and the affect that has on student learning. The limitations of the study also provide a reminder about the potential difficulties of this type of research.

This article explores student and faculty out-of-class communication (OCC) and how this affects immediacy, trust, and student motivation. The research questions are: 1) “what is the nature of OCC in terms of frequency, length, content, and student satisfaction?”, 2) “are student perceptions of instructor verbal and nonverbal immediacy positively correlated to OCC?”, 3) “are student perceptions of instructor trust positively correlated to OCC?”, and 4) “what is the relationship between student motivation in the course and OCC?” (p. 42) Two hundred seventy-four students at two universities participated in the study. Measures of verbal and nonverbal immediacy, trust, student motivation, and frequency, length, content, and satisfaction with the OCC were measured using survey methods. The authors found that the frequency of informal OCC contact related to immediacy, trust, and student motivation. The limitations of this study include the possibility that the sheer number of items (over 60) may have caused respondent fatigue. Also, the fact that the items were retrospective (students were asked to respond based upon the class they had prior to the one in which the survey was taken) may be a limitation. This is interesting due to the differentiation between formal and informal OCC contact and the way in which that relates to immediacy and motivation.