The Latino Threat; constructing immigrants, citizens and the nation book by Leo Chavez Academic Level : Bachelor Paper details Once you have made your observations and assessments of the work under review, carefully survey your notes and attempt to unify your impressions into a statement that will describe the purpose or thesis of your review. Then, outline the arguments that support your thesis. Your arguments should develop the thesis in a logical manner. That logic, unlike more standard academic writing, may initially emphasize the author’s argument while you develop your own in the course of the review. The relative emphasis depends on the nature of the review: if readers may be more interested in the work itself, you may want to make the work and the author more prominent; if you want the review to be about your perspective and opinions, then you may structure the review to privilege your observations over (but never separate from) those of the work under review. The following is just ONE way to organize a review: Introduction Since most reviews are brief, many writers begin with a catchy quip or anecdote that succinctly delivers their argument. In general, you should include: Identify the author’s thesis and explain it in your own words. How clearly and in what context is it stated and, subsequently developed? To what extent and how effectively is this thesis proven? Use examples to amplify your responses. If arguments or perspectives were missing, why do you think this might be? What are the author’s aims? How well have they been achieved especially with regard to the way the book is organized? Are these aims supported or justified? How closely does the organization follow the author’s aims? Are there places/ sections/ sentences/ actions in the book that evoke a strong response from you? What are those words or sentences? What is your reaction? Critique We'wha - Zuni Native American from New Mexico Here are a number of questions that may be addressed as part of the critique. Do not answer them all, but questions one and two are essential to any book critique, so those must be included. Absolutely do not answer these questions one after the other. Do not have one paragraph that answers one, and then the next paragraph that answers the next, etc. The answers should be part of a carefully constructed essay, complete with topic sentences and transitions. How are the author’s main points presented, explained, and supported? What assumptions lie behind these points? What would be the most effective way for you to compress and/or re-order the author’s scheme of presentation and argument? Identify the assumptions made by the author in both the approach to and the writing of the book. For example, what prior knowledge does the author expect readers to possess? How effectively are those assumptions worked into the overall presentation? What assumptions do you think should not have been made? Why? What new insights do you have as a result of reading this book? Has your world view changed? If so, why? If not, why not? Does the author’s presentation seem fair and accurate? Is the interpretation valid? Are you aware of a new way to understand history? What is it? Conclusion This should be brief, as analysis takes priority. In the course of making your assessment, you'll hopefully be backing up your assertions with concrete evidence from the book, so some summary will be dispersed throughout other parts of the review. What comments can you make about the over-all presentation of the subject of the book? What is your recommendation: do you think others would enjoy reading the book? What type of audience would you recommend this book to? Over-all, what did you gain by reading this book? What do you think that others who read the book will gain? If you have a negative opinion of the book, tell why you think others would not enjoy reading the book.