## Peer Writing Tutor Guide for Writing Across the Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>SHOULD (PWTs)</th>
<th>SHOULD NOT (PWTs)</th>
<th>DUKE WRITING STUDIO</th>
<th>SPECIFIC CONCERNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AMST (American Studies) | ~use past tense for historical events and present tense for historians' arguments  
~define key terms  
~state your critical perspective in relation to others | ~mix tenses (check with professor for preferred tense)  
~use personal voice | [http://uwp.duke.edu/wstudio/resources/disciplines.html](http://uwp.duke.edu/wstudio/resources/disciplines.html) | ~see HIST and SOAN |
| CLAS (Classics) | ~concentrate on literary analysis  
~deemphasize personal ideas  
~maintain consistent perspective and tense  
~cite heavily from primary text |   |   | ~see HIST and ENAM  
~pay attention to the influence of the audience's or reader's perspective in interpreting the piece (drama, etc.) |
| CrW (Creative Writing) | ~show, don't tell (ex: try to reveal characters' personalities through their actions)  
~use concrete, specific, vivid details  
~guide piece with one overarching idea/theme/intention  
~keep audience in mind  
~describe setting in context | ~be predictable  
~rely on inner monologues to reveal characters' feelings  
~include inside jokes  
~rely on clichés  
~overuse ornate, philosophical, or flowery language | ~maintain a specific, cohesive point of view  
~be aware of tone (playful, somber, serious, casual, formal, ironic) and symbols  
~blend dialogue and imagery  
~have a central conflict  
~beware of creating character "types" with no dimension | ~very flexible, subjective, and personal |
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| **ECON** (Economics) | ~be direct and objective  
~have a strong structure that follows a clear, creative thesis rigidly (support argument with a logical flow of ideas)  
~root argument in theoretical basis and back it up with data or case studies  
~treat the counter-argument, explicitly or implicitly  
~use headings and subheadings  
~paraphrase, when possible  
~expand upon and analyze sources | ~use flowery language  
~assume certain ideas/arguments are "obvious"  
~overuse quotations  
~rely on limited or homogenous sources  
~generalize | ~"two kinds of economics papers: empirical papers, which run data through a model; and theoretical papers, which begin with a model based on certain premises and then prove certain outcomes"  
~use abstracts, subheadings  
~empirical sections include: introduction, literature review, data, methodology, results, conclusion  
~theoretical sections include: introduction, basic model, subsections extending basic model, proofs | ~citation format varies, but generally uses footnotes/endnotes  
~using first person is rare in ECON but the strictness of this stand varies by professor |
| **ENAM/LITS** (English & American Literatures /Literary Studies) | ~use present tense  
~integrate quotes in a variety of ways, balancing evidence and analysis  
~state clear thesis (1-3 sentences) at the end of intro  
~use this structure: a specific introduction leads to a dynamic conclusion that broadens the original question  
~relate every paragraph to thesis statement  
~make smooth transitions and be concise | ~use passive voice  
~use first person (this can vary based on professor and paper type)  
~repeat similar sentence structures  
~summarize the plot  
~have an overly broad introduction  
~overuse rhetorical questions | ~have a debatable thesis statement with no self-evident or vague claims  
~introduce, explain, and show how each quote or paraphrase relates to the thesis  
~focus on primary sources and your thoughts more than secondary information  
~for writing about literature: give evidence from the novel, analyze it, and paraphrase a supporting argument from another text | MLA |
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| **ENVS** (Environmental Studies) | ~consider papers a blend between a scientific report and an ENAM paper, weaving strong textual analysis with research into what others in the field are saying  
~use and define specific terminology | ~make generalizations about "nature" or what is "natural" without specific scientific qualifications | ~places importance on external research and support |  
| **FMMC** (Film & Media Culture) | ~use present tense  
~analyse scenes as if they were literary passages  
~consider mise-en-scène: shot, length, tone, angle, lighting, music  
~make an argument FOR SCREENPLAYS:  
~show, don't tell  
~keep scenes short: approx 6 pages/minutes  
~have characters serve more than one purpose  
~write in visual terms so the language implies cinematic instruction | ~review the film (unless that is the assignment, of course)  
~write what happened in the film without incorporating your own analysis  
~cite minute and second (give context and describe scene instead!)  
~misuse terminology or include awkward phrases | ~"explain how/why visual images communicate meaning" (move from formal description using film-specific terminology to explanation of how traits create meaning)  
~consider: image (mise-en-scène and framing), movement (continuous and discontinuous), sound (dialogue, sound effects, music)  
~consider own reactions to film but ultimately focus on the why rather than the what | ~not necessary to cite specific scenes  
~format screenplays according to guidelines  
~be aware of specific film terminology |
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<tr>
<td><strong>FOREIGN LITERATURES</strong></td>
<td>跟随建议，同时意识到语言和具体学科的结构和格式的差异。~使作品在适当的语境中（历史、文化等）。</td>
<td>使用华丽的语言（华丽的词句可能会很复杂，尤其是在刚开始学习一个语言时）。</td>
<td></td>
<td>~解释&quot;明显&quot;的论点。~欧洲的论文通常不简单地回溯到论点本身，而是问更广泛的问题。如：论点、反论点和综合。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HARC</strong> (History of Art &amp; Architecture)</td>
<td>~使用艺术具体术语。~包含对艺术背景（时间、风格）的讨论。~分析所有作品，注意构图的正式品质。~运用个人和原创见解作为工具来理解作品的共同解释。</td>
<td>维持单个时态的使用：当描述一件作品时，使用现在时；当讨论一位艺术家或一个运动时，使用过去时。</td>
<td></td>
<td>~可以是一个缓慢的过程；观察物体的时间。~可以偶尔进行跨学科的。~使用芝加哥引文与脚注进行引用，识别和额外的非主题信息。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIST</strong> (History)</td>
<td>~为历史事件使用过去时，为历史学家的论点使用现在时。~在你的批评视角中位置到其他次级资源。~定义重要术语。</td>
<td>~编辑化。~将历史理论化为事实（事实&gt;意见）。~依赖次级资源（也使用初级资源！）</td>
<td></td>
<td>~解释风格期（例如：印象派，文艺复兴）~图标学（具体元素对艺术史学家的特定意义以及如何使用）~编辑化。~将历史理论化为事实（事实&gt;意见）。~依赖次级资源（也使用初级资源！）</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td><strong>LAB REPORTS</strong></td>
<td>~be detail specific</td>
<td>~use the word &quot;prove&quot;</td>
<td>~stress results over processes</td>
<td>~list the specific equipment used and where the information was analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~strictly-defined sections with stress on drawing conclusions from analysis</td>
<td>~generalize</td>
<td>~be specific enough that reader could replicate the experiment</td>
<td>~always cite author and year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~include statistics and error analysis</td>
<td>~use flowery language</td>
<td>~format: abstract, intro, procedures(methods), results and discussion, conclusions, appendices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstracts:</td>
<td>~abstract should include motivation, question, hypothesis, method, and major conclusions&quot; and be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~short, usually 150-200 words</td>
<td>~use flowery, grandiose, or &quot;fluffy&quot; language</td>
<td>~stress results over processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~summarize main findings</td>
<td>~begin sentences with symbols</td>
<td>~be specific enough that reader could replicate the experiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATH</strong> (Mathematics)</td>
<td>~focus on truth-value (irrefutable knowledge) rather than opinion</td>
<td>~use flowery, grandiose, or &quot;fluffy&quot; language</td>
<td>~stress results over processes</td>
<td>~use symbols or abbreviations instead of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~have proper ratio of words to symbols</td>
<td>~begin fluffy language</td>
<td>~be specific enough that reader could replicate the experiment</td>
<td>~first person--often first person plural--is accepted and encouraged (as opposed to first person singular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~emphasize rigorous, logical explanations and arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~no formal citation format; use LaTeX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~have very high word: information ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~use figures or diagrams where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~use specific, technical language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td><strong>MUSC</strong> (Music)</td>
<td>~address differences in terms of genre: jazz, classical, rock, etc. ~form follows content and is thus often subjective ~synthesize contextual history, secondary analysis, personal insight, and methods of performance ~use subject-specific</td>
<td>~use past tense (except, of course, when discussing musicians' lives) ~let personal bias influence argument</td>
<td>~&quot;explain and synthesize your observations about the music&quot; ~&quot;avoid 'blow-by-blow' analysis whenever possible&quot; ~music is not self-explanatory: do in-depth study of a few, well-chosen details ~include measure #s when referring to specific points in</td>
<td>~consider the record label, the lyricist, and the director in addition to the performer when citing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHIL</strong> (Philosophy)</td>
<td>~work within a theoretical framework ~use your introduction as a &quot;roadmap&quot; ~include flexible analysis and interpretations ~be concise, yet fully explain your argument</td>
<td>~use florid language ~include any undefined terminology (consider audience!)</td>
<td>~thesis should be a reasoned defense of a modest claim ~don't be overly ambitious or over-estimate the strength of your position ~make your structure obvious ~use many examples/definitions</td>
<td>~first person singular tense often acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSCI</strong> (Political Science)</td>
<td>~be direct and objective ~have a strong structure that follows a clear, creative thesis rigidly (support argument with a logical flow of ideas) ~root argument in theoretical basis and back it up with data or case studies ~treat the counter-argument, explicitly or implicitly ~use headings and subheadings</td>
<td>~use flowery language ~assume certain ideas/arguments are &quot;obvious&quot; ~overuse quotations ~rely on limited or homogenous sources ~generalize ~overquote (paraphrase when possible!)</td>
<td>~define key terms (operationalizing): &quot;define what something is in terms that can be measured or observed&quot; ~argue that an independent variable causes something to happen (dependent variable is caused by something) ~be objective; emphasize clear and logically presented arguments; consider possible counter-arguments</td>
<td>~citation format varies, but generally uses footnotes/endnotes ~can be both theoretical and mechanical or more interdisciplinary depending on the professor and course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| PSYC (Psychology) | ~deemphasize personal opinion  
~focus on research  
~support argument with data, evidence and/or case studies  
~define key terms  
~paraphrase rather than quote  
~use primary sources | ~use the word "prove"  
~generalize  
~use flowery language  
~rely on limited or homogenous sources | ~follow basic format of: title, introduction, methods, results, discussion, references  
~write as if reader is scholar  
~mention basic issues of research tradition in question  
~explain why your approach is an improvement on past | ~include charts  
~have descriptive titles  
~APA citation format |
| RELI (Religion) | ~rely on evidence  
~use third person  
~maintain objectivity (while being aware of and often stating personal bias)  
~define key terms (even if they seem basic like "god") | ~assume prior subject knowledge  
~use adjectives implying personal moral judgment | ~"approach religious texts through the lenses of other disciplines"  
~place your argument in specific period, movement, or event  
~be sure to give specific | ~often interdisciplinary: can incorporate literature, sociology, art, philosophy, and music  
~religious texts often require specific citation methods (e.g. book, |
| SCI (Basic Scientific Writing) | ~focus on truth-value (irrefutable knowledge) rather than opinions  
~acknowledge limitations and alternate interpretations of data: key phrase = "these data suggest..."  
~be concise  
~use headings and subheadings  
~anticipate and address readers' objections  
~rely on credible sources  
~vary sentence structure  
~place good, concise abstract before introduction | ~use flowery prose or be ambiguous  
~claim that evidence "proves" when it really "suggests"  
~use first person (typically write in third person plural) | ~"favor active voice"  
~"use present tense for established fact and past tense for the work and findings you are presenting"  
~follow in-depth IMRD format: abstract (synopsis), introduction (research motivation), materials and methods (summary of technical info), results, discussion/conclusions (do results support hypothesis?), works cited | ~citations deemphasized (no room for interpretation)  
~cite results of proofs or derivations rather than writing out equations  
~check lab report format with individual professor  
~passive voice accepted  
~many professors allow the writing style suggested in A Guide to Writing About Biology or A Guide to Writing About Chemistry, available in the CTLR |
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| **SOAN**  (Sociology/Anthropology) | ~use specific terminology; direct, decisive language  
~weave in theory  
~distinguish between questions that do and do not belong in the discipline | ~contain arguments that separate individuals' decisions from their societal contexts  
~label any behavior as "normal" or "natural" | ~value evidence (=fact or observation clearly connected to an argument) over basic "logic"  
~define theories, use case studies, and analyze using | ~typically uses third person, although first is sometimes acceptable  
~range of genres  
~tense is flexible  
~ASA, MLA, or APA |
| **THEA**  (Theatre) | For PLAYWRITING:  
~give context for character before he/she is introduced  
~break down scene into objectives and actions  
~balance theoretical research and personal reactions  
~consider effects scene will have on audience/reader | ~summarize  
~give too much stage direction  
~ignore visual aspects | ~be careful of confusing terms: *plays* (written) are staged in a series of *performances* called a *production* (consider its venue, costumes, set, lighting, and its overall "concept" or "idea")  
~analyze how language | ~remember historical and artistic contexts |
| **WAGS**  (Women's & Gender Studies) | ~use specific terminology; direct, decisive language  
~weave in theory (such as found in SOAN courses)  
~define key terms and be careful with gender-specific terminology (e.g. "female" v. "feminine") | ~generalize about "typical" gendered behavior without citing societal/historical contexts  
~imply that there is an irrefutable "normal" | ~"an opinion does not constitute a position" (substantiate argument with material)  
~"don't be afraid to use 'I'" (reveal how feel about a particular author's theory)  
~"don't take terms for granted" (there are no single, "correct" definitions for terms such as "identity," "gender," or "experience," so be clear about your argument | ~MLA or APA citations |