

**HIS 558: Seminar in East Asia and the Modern World**  
Dr. Jonathan Skaff

**Book Review 3: *Artisans in Early Imperial China***

**Due: Mon., Feb. 20**

Electronic Copy due to D2L Digital Dropbox (Use Microsoft DOC or DOCX, WordPerfect, PostScript, PDF, HTML, RTF or Plain text format.)

Hard copy due in class with the grading sheet on the reverse attached

**Length: 800 words** (approximately 3 double-spaced pages in 12 point font)

**Topic:**

Write a book review of *Artisans in Early Imperial China* in a format suitable for publication in a scholarly journal, such as the *Journal of Asian Studies* or *American Historical Review*. This type of book review places more weight on the scholarly merits of a publication than its entertainment value. The intended audience of the review is professional historians and other scholars. The title of your paper should be the book's bibliographic citation in Chicago A (Turabian bibliography) format.

A good review should be concise and illuminating. The review should describe the author's research methodology (think about the types of sources), summarize the author's thesis and major arguments, and critique (positively or negatively) the book's thesis, main arguments, important evidence, methodology, or other pertinent aspects of the book. In some cases it may be relevant to evaluate the book's historiographical significance. The primary function of a good academic book review is to evaluate how effectively the author defends his/her thesis.

**Evaluation of Papers:**

80% of the grade will be based on content. Content grades of A will be awarded to papers that effectively summarize and critique of the book's methodology, thesis and major arguments.

The other 20% will be based upon grammar and word usage (4%), spelling, capitalization and punctuation (4%), organization (4%), readability (4%), and bibliographic citation of the book at the top of the first page in Chicago A format (4%).

## Grading sheet (attach to paper)

### I. Content (80%)

Summary of thesis; arguments/evidence; methodology:     \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Fair \_\_\_Poor

Critique of thesis; arguments/evidence; methodology:     \_\_\_Excellent \_\_\_Good \_\_\_Fair \_\_\_Poor

A=72-80, B=64-71, C=56-63, D=48-55, F=47 or lower     \_\_\_\_\_

### II. Writing mechanics (20%)

A=4, B=3.5, C=3, D=2.5, F=2 or lower

Grammar and word usage (4%)     \_\_\_\_\_

Spelling, capitalization, and punctuation (4%)     \_\_\_\_\_

Organization (4%)     \_\_\_\_\_

Readability (4%)     \_\_\_\_\_

Bibliographic citation (Chicago A) (4%)     \_\_\_\_\_

**Total**     \_\_\_\_\_

### Correction Symbols Used in Grading Paper

agr	wrong agreement (noun-verb or noun-noun)
awk	awkward sentence
cit	citation needed
frag	sentence fragment (usually a sentence that lacks a verb)
org	organization problems
redun	redundant (using different words to say the same thing more than once)
rep	repetitious use of the same word
run-on	run-on sentence
sp	wrong spelling
trans	poor transition (between sentences or paragraphs)
tn	wrong verb tense
unc	unclear phrase, sentence, or paragraph
wf	wrong grammatical form of word
ww	wrong word usage
¶	new paragraph needed