

What is Annotation?

Annotation is summing up information in a text or article by writing brief key points in the margins. It is an active reading strategy that improves comprehension and is the beginning of the learning and remembering processes. It requires that the student take time to understand what he or she is reading and then put it into his or her own words.

Students who annotate their texts read to make meaning rather than read just to complete the assignment. Annotation forces the students to think about what they are reading because they know they have to put it in their own words. Though annotation takes more time than the passive activity of highlighting, students actually spend less time studying because they are actually learning the material while they are annotating. There are many benefits for annotation.

- Provides a purpose for reading
- Improves comprehension
- Offers an immediate test of understanding
- Increases concentration
- Seldom necessitates a reread of the material
- Creates a study tool

How to Annotate

1. **Read everything at least twice:** The **first time**, read quickly to get a sense of what the text is about. Look for important ideas, structural or content divisions. Think about the author's message, motivation, and intended audience. The **second time**, read carefully. Mark concepts, definitions, examples, details, or lists that you think are
 - inconsistent,
 - interesting, or
 - important.

2. Pick up a pen, pencil, or post-it note.
 - sum up important ideas in your own words
 - note relationships between concepts (cause & effect, comparison, contrast)
 - add your own examples
 - circle confusing or unknown words or phrases to look up later
 - note passages that you don't understand with a ?
 - write questions you have for your instructor or to investigate later
 - note passages that seem inconsistent
 - note passages that generate a strong positive or negative response
 - mark repetitions or any other signals
 - mark potential test questions with a **TQ**

Devise and refine a marking system that works for you.

Gender and Personality

Personality traits give us reasonable ways to describe people and to express differences we observe among them. We can note Kathy's assertiveness and Juan's sociability. We can say that Chuck is friendlier than Steve or that Melissa is more impulsive than Jesse. An issue that intrigues personality psychologists is the extent to which personality traits can be used to characterize groups of people. The two groups that have been studied most closely in this regard are men and women. We have already acknowledged that intelligence, or cognitive ability, is a major component of a person's personality. We also have already seen that with regard to intelligence, there are very few specific differences in intellectual abilities, and none at all in intelligence overall. What about other personality traits?

What do you think about the following statements? Boys have higher self-esteem than girls. Girls are more social than boys. Men are more analytical than women. Men are better at rote learning, but women are more creative. Women are more open to suggestion and influence than are men.

These assertions might sound sensible to most Americans, but there is no research evidence to support any of them. According to Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin, there simply are no gender differences in self-esteem, sociability, analytic skills, rote learning, creativity, or suggestiveness. These were the findings of the first large-scale exploration of gender differences, reported by Maccoby and Jacklin in 1974. This work was not the first to ask whether there are differences between males and females (there was a meta-analysis of data that existed at the time). It did, however, stimulate others to join in the search for ways in which gender could be used to predict how an individual might behave in a range of situations. That search has turned up little. Gender differences tend to be insignificant and inconsistent (Huston, 1985; Hyde, 1984, 1986; Maccoby, 1990). "There appear to be relatively few basic psychological differences between the sexes, although members of the two sexes are socialized to behave in different ways" (Feshbach, et al.: 1996).

There is one glaring exception, and that is overt, physical aggression, which has consistently been found more commonly in males than in females (Eagly, 1987; Hyde, 1986; Maccoby, 1990). For example, the ratio of male to female murderers in the United States is about ten to one. The difference in aggression found between males and females seems to be there (to varying degrees) at all ages and in all cultural settings (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Ashmore, 1990; Rushton, et al., 1986). Further, across many cultures, males are more likely to engage in direct aggression, whereas females prefer indirect, non-physical, aggression (Oesterman, et al., 1998). Although we may claim that males are more physically aggressive than females, please recall a caution we have made before: This is a generality made "on the average" for groups of persons.

Any one female might be significantly more aggressive in all regards than any one male. (passage from Psychology: An Introduction by Josh Gerow and Kenneth Borden)

Does this mean the same as aggressive?

There are psychologists who study only personality?

Some of these I think are true!

There are relatively few basic differences in personality traits between male & female. However we are socialized to behave differently.

One exception: overt physical aggression is more common in males and this seems true across cultures.

Does this mean hitting?

Didn't I read in sociology that aggressive females are increasing?