HS 330/410: Gender, Race, and Class in Modern Europe
Historiography Instructions
Professor Andrew Ross
Spring 2024

**Assignment Description:** A historiography (also called a literature review) provides an overview of thematically related scholarly works and assesses their relationship to one another. Literature reviews, in other words, analyzes the different historical interpretations offered by multiple authors. For this assignment, you will review at least three secondary sources (at least one book) related to your chosen digital exhibit topic in order to assess the state of the field in which you are working.

**Assignment Goals**: This assignment has three goals. First, you will expand your content knowledge of an area of research interest related to the course. Second, by thinking concretely about the work of other historians you will be able to better situate your own primary-source analysis for your research project. The ability to effectively gather information and interpret a source is invaluable to anyone with the need to do research. Third, by putting into dialog several different interpretations of a single theme, you will continue to practice assessing and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of an argument in order to better formulate your own. This assignment therefore contributes to Course Objectives 1-2 and possibly 5.

**Requirements:** A historiography, in general, follows one of two possible structures: thematic or by source. In the first, the review provides an overview of various themes common to the sources under discussion. In the second, the review presents each source in succession. In both cases, you should be relating the books to one another, not just stitching multiple book reviews together. In addition, follow the following specific requirements:

1) All books and articles must be legitimate, peer-reviewed sources. If in doubt, see me, but in general this means articles located through library databases or books published by university presses.
2) Length: 3-4 pages, double spaced, 1" margins all around
3) Font: 12-point, Times New Roman (or other standard font)
4) Header: Include your name, class, my name, and date in the upper left-hand corner, single spaced
5) Page numbers should appear in the upper right-hand corner
6) Include a title
7) Underneath the title, list the books under review using a complete bibliographic citations
8) Citations: Use parenthetical citations to make it easier to cite on the digital version.
9) Images: Do not include images for this draft of the historigraphy, but you may want to consider images to be used in your digital exhibit.

**Assessment:** Your historiography will be assessed on the basis of the grading rubric attached to this handout and available on Moodle. You will receive a grade and feedback on this version of the historiography. You should plan on revising the historiography prior to upload onto WordPress. Your final digital exhibit grade will take into account the quality of the revised historiography.

**Some Tips:**

1) The thesis statement should lay out a claim about the arguments the sources make (or disagree about, etc), not history itself.
2) The simpler way to structure a literature review is by source, but choose an organizational principle that makes sense for you. If you do proceed by source, chronological by publication date usually makes the most sense.
3) Because of limited space, you should not summarize the entirety of any source under discussion; focus exclusively on the argument of the source and how the author makes the argument, keeping in mind your own claim.
4) Because the goal of the historiography is to link the sources together, transitions between sources should read something to the effect of: "Unlike [AUTHOR], [NEXT SOURCE]…" In other words, draw the reader from source to source by completing a compare/contrast
5) The conclusion may want to say something about the state of the field as a whole and how it relates to your own project.

Rubric

| | Excellent (10) | Excellent/Good (9.5) | Good (8.5) | Satisfactory (7.5) | Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory (6.5) | Not Satisfactory (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Argument (30%) | Analysis features a clear and convincing thesis that addresses historiographical debate. | | Analysis features a thesis that addresses historiography, but the terms of debate may need to be further clarified. | Analysis attempts to lay out a thesis that addresses historiography, but the terms of debate may need to be reconstructed from the text. | | Analysis does not attempt to address historiography. |
| Analysis of Evidence (35%) | The analysis features well-chosen evidence drawn from the four sources that directly relates to the argument. Evidence is well-explained and its relevance is immediately clear. The argument of each source is extremely clear. | | Evidence is used to support the argument and effort is made to explain its importance, but may need greater clarification. The argument of each source is addressed, but may need further clarification. | Evidence from the sources are alluded to, but are not effectively used to support the argument. Reader may have to infer the relationship between evidence and the claim. The argument of one or more sources may remain unclear. | | Little or no evidence is presented. The arguments of each source is unaddressed. |
| Structure (20%) | Analysis has a clear introduction, body, and | | Analysis has an introduction, body, and conclusion, but | Analysis has an introduction, body, and conclusion, but one of these | | Analysis may lack an introduction or conclusion. May |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | conclusion. Body paragraphs logically follow one another and feature clear topic sentences and analysis. | | one of these may not be as effective as the others. Body paragraphs include topic sentences and analysis, but may not always logically flow. | may be incomplete. Body paragraphs may lack topic or concluding sentences, but analysis is still present. | | be hard to understand owing to lack of organization. |
| Mechanics (15%) | Analysis is well-written, with no typographical mistakes. Citations are correct and all instructions have been followed. | | The analysis is well-written, with few typographical mistakes. Citations are mostly correct and instructions have been followed. | The analysis has stylistic or mechanical errors that hinder its effectiveness. Typos are present. Citations are not correctly formatted. Instructions followed with errors. | | Paragraph difficult to understand owing to mechanical or stylistic errors. Citations missing and/or instructions not followed. |