Scottish Scientist Article Annotations

1. You will need to find and print <u>two</u> articles during the course to use for this assignment:
   - The first -- due Friday 6 November -- must be about a scientist of your choice.
   - The second – due Friday 20 November -- must help you contextualize the life of your scientist.
2. Articles must be at least 12 pages in length (not counting references), and should be from an academic journal found via J-STOR. If you have any difficulty locating an article, set up a time with Dr. Myers for help.
3. On the cover page provided by J-STOR, comment on each of the following:
   a. What can you tell about the overall purpose <u>*of the journal*</u> from its title?
   b. What presumptions do you have about what you will read based on the title <u>*of the article*</u>?
   c. How recent is the reading? Do you expect it to feature up-to-date, cutting-edge research? If not, do you have any concerns about what you will find in it before you begin reading?
4. Locate the thesis statement and highlight/underline it. Comment next to it about your initial impressions. Does it seem reasonable? Is it an appropriately-sized task for the length of the reading?

   Proceed through the reading marking any points the author makes that you find interesting, any evidence that stands out to you, or any places where you are confused because the explanation is unclear/the evidence is weak. For each you should make a note in the margin about why you have highlighted/underlined the passage. These can be your own shorthand, if you like, just make sure the first time you use a symbol that you let me know what it means. *You should have comments on every page of the reading, even if it is just asking a question.*
5. When you reach the end re-read the thesis statement and give it additional thought.
6. Somewhere near the end of the article, comment on the following (writing at least two sentences on each question):
   a. Did the author(s) accomplish what they set out to in their thesis statement or not?
   b. Did you notice any particular bias on the part of the author(s)?
   c. What did you think of the evidence used by the author(s)? How was the balance between primary and secondary materials? Would you have preferred more of one type of source or another? Explain your reasoning.
   d. How does this reading help your understanding of the textbook?
   e. For your second annotation, how does this reading improve your understanding of your chosen scientist?

Note: We will be using the 2nd article you read as the basis of class discussion the day it is due to be handed in, but you are expected to come to class with all of these tasks already completed.