INSTRUCTIONS FOR ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

1. Type the full APA-style reference citation at the top of the page
2. Give a brief justification (can be one sentence) of the goal/purpose of the study/chapter
3. State the major findings (for a research article)/conclusions or points (for a book chapter) as succinctly as possible
4. You do not need to describe the methodology unless it is necessary to understand the findings/results
5. Construct a brief conclusion; in other words, in the most basic terms possible, what did this study find/chapter describe?
6. If you can incorporate the findings into your conclusion (see second example annotated bibliography – the first sentence of the “conclusion” paragraph demonstrates how to integrate results and discussion), you do not need to have separate sections for results and discussion/conclusion
SAMPLE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES


Research has found relationships between peer rejection, aggression, and later externalizing problems. Most of the early research in this area focused on one type of emotion, namely anger. The goal of the current study was to not only examine relations between peer rejection and aggression and the emotional expression of anger, but also relations between peer rejection and aggression and the emotional expression of happiness and sadness. Further, the current study also examined sex differences in these emotional expressions.

Findings indicate that rejected children’s emotional expressions of anger are longer and more intense than average children (according to peer sociometric ratings) and that rejected children speak with an “angry tone of voice” more frequently than average children. Results also suggest that boys’ display emotional expressions of anger more frequently and intensely and display more angry nonverbal behaviors (e.g., damaging property, stomping feet) than girls. And finally, children’s emotional expressions of anger are longer and more intense and their verbal intonations are more angry when engaging in a game with a peer who was blatantly cheating than when engaging with a peer who was playing fairly. Further, results indicate that rejected and average children do not differ in emotional expressions of anger when engaged in a game with a noncheating peer; however, rejected children display more anger than average children when engaged in a game with a cheating peer. In terms of happiness, rejected children engaged in happy nonverbal behaviors (e.g., cheering, clapping hands, laughing) more frequently than average children. Children also displayed more happy facial expressions that lasted longer and were more intense and also spoke in a “happy tone of voice” more often when engaged in a game with a peer who was playing fairly than when engaged with a peer who was cheating. Because this finding was counter to expectations, the author examined displays of happiness in different contexts of the game (e.g., when the participant gained tokens, lost tokens, confederate gained tokens, and so on). Findings indicate that rejected children only display more happy nonverbal behaviors than average children when they gained tokens in the context of the game. In terms of sadness, results suggest that children display emotional expressions of sadness longer and more intensely and demonstrate more sad nonverbal behaviors (e.g., covering face, sighing, slumping) when interacting with a cheating peer than when interacting with a noncheating peer.

Because this study used a structured situation rather than naturalistic observations, it suggests that rejected children’s displays of anger are not simply a function of how other children treat them (i.e., whether other children provoke more angry displays in rejected children). This study also suggests that studying emotions other than anger is important in rejected children. Rejected children’s displays of happiness when gaining tokens in the game with a peer could be construed as “gloating” and thus, could serve to increase peers’ negative reactions/behaviors toward the rejected children. No differences were found between aggressive and nonaggressive children; the author suggests that limitations in the measure of aggression could have contributed to these nonfindings. The study also suggests that sex differences and contexts of interaction (e.g., cheating versus noncheating peers) play a role in emotional expressions.

The authors were interested in examining the face-to-face visual contact of 2-year-old children and their mothers and its relationship to other attachment behaviors (such as verbal behavior and physical proximity).

Mothers and their children were left in a playroom where children were free to explore and play with toys located in a far corner of the room. Each child encountered three conditions: (1) mom sitting 2m away facing the toys, (2) mom sitting 2m away with back to the toys, and (3) mom sitting behind a partition (fully occluded from toys). Thus, there were three degrees of face-to-face visual contact between mother and child.

One caveat of this study is that there were only 24 participants. With that in mind, results indicated that the mean distance between mother and child did not differ when mothers either faced the toys or were behind the partition. The mean distance in both of these conditions was greater than when the mother faced away from the toys. However, children spent more time (approximately half of their time) within 1 meter of the mothers when the mothers faced away from the toys or were behind the partition. Additionally, children spent about half of their time in their mothers’ visual field when the mother was facing away from the toys or behind the partition (as opposed to 100% of their time in her visual field when she was facing the toys). These findings together can be explained by the fact that because of the dimensions of the playroom, children were unable to stray more than about 1 meter from their mothers when she was facing away from the toys or behind the partition. Children physically moved around the room the most when mothers were behind the partition, a little less so when mothers faced away from the toys, and the least when mothers faced the toys. In terms of visual and verbal behavior of the children, children spent more time looking at than talking to mothers when the mother was behind the partition. When mothers faced the toys, children spent more time talking to mothers and less time looking at her.

Correlational analyses revealed that when in the mothers’ visual field, children moved farther from mothers when mothers faced the toys and stayed within 1 meter when mothers faced away from the toys or were behind the partition. Additionally, when in the mothers’ visual field, children looked at the mother more if she faced away from the toys or was behind the partition and children talked to the mother more when they were farther away from her if she was behind the partition.

Although the sample size for this repeated-measures study was quite small, it suggests that having the ability to make eye contact with the attachment figure is important (children spent half of the time in their mothers’ visual field rather than interacting with toy when mothers faced away from the toys or were behind the partition; children spent more time looking at mothers when they were behind the partition and more time talking to mothers when mothers faced the toys). Children may be more comfortable when they know their attachment figure is accessible and thus may not need to make eye contact, when their attachment figure is not as accessible visually, they seem compelled to establish visual contact. The potential for visual contact is
indeed important – several findings were similar for the conditions where the mothers were facing away from the toys and when they were behind the partition.

The results of this study also suggest that at least some attachment behaviors (e.g., talking, looking) are interchangeable. In other words, when children were unable to maintain visual contact with their mothers, they increased their verbal contact. Thus, using the attachment figure as a “secure base from which to explore” can take many meanings (e.g., proximity may be maintained visually or verbally), but it appears to be a necessary component for exploration.