Position Description:
The Writing Program is accepting applications from second- and third-year students in the College for the position of Peer Writing Tutor.

In individual tutorial meetings like those offered by College Core Writing Tutors, Peer Writing Tutors provide writing support to undergraduate students enrolled in Common Core courses. Peer Writing Tutors are not copyeditors or proofreaders; instead, they help writers improve their skills in analyzing and revising academic writing.

Peer Writing Tutors work one, two or three 4-hour shifts (as they choose), for example, Sundays and Wednesdays 6:00-10:00pm.

Training:
Successful applicants will be awarded a seat in our quarter-long, credit-bearing training course: a dedicated Peer Writing Tutor section of ENGL 13000: Academic and Professional Writing (Little Red Schoolhouse) in Spring 2024. Successful completion of the training course is required in order to begin working in Autumn 2024.

Supervision:
In the first quarter of work, Peer Writing Tutors will be supervised by a Writing Program Assistant Director and mentored by an advanced Writing Tutor. At the end of their first quarter, each Peer Writing Tutor will create and submit a teaching portfolio that includes student evaluations and a personal statement in which they reflect on their pedagogical practices.

Compensation:
Peer Writing Tutors are compensated at $15.80 per hour ($600-$1,200 per quarter).

Term of Appointment:
Peer Writing Tutors train in Spring 2024, begin working in Autumn 2024, and upon satisfactory performance, they can continue working in Winter 2025 and beyond.
Application Components and Procedure

The Peer Writing Tutor Application has two components.

A. Submit at least one letter of recommendation from a University of Chicago faculty member, instructor, or Writing Specialist.

The letter of recommendation should be from someone who is familiar with your writing at UChicago and how you communicate in the classroom. Please ask your letter writer to send their recommendation via email to writing-program@uchicago.edu by the application deadline (Wednesday, January 31st at 2:00pm CST).

B. Prepare the six materials below. Then, submit them on the Writing Program website by the application deadline. All six materials must be submitted at the same time.

1. Unofficial copy of transcript

2. Personal statement
   In 1 page (single-spaced), please let us know about your writing and revision experiences, your approach to writing, and/or anything else you think relevant.

3. Personal statement cover sheet (included in this packet)

4. Writing sample
   4-7 page paper (double-spaced) from one of your courses at UChicago. You are welcome to submit a portion of a longer paper.
   Do not put your name on the writing sample.

5. Writing sample cover sheet
   Included in this packet. Do not put your name on the cover sheet.

6. Comment on sample student paper
   A sample student paper is included in this packet. Copy the sample student paper into a separate Word file, comment upon it (further directions are found in the sample paper), and submit it with the rest of your application on our website. Do not put your name on this document. If Microsoft Word automatically inserts your name anywhere on the file, rest assured that we will take care to anonymize it.

When these six items are assembled, submit them here:
https://writing-program.uchicago.edu/jobs/pwtapplication/

Forms for Application Materials
Cover Sheet One: Personal Statement Cover Sheet

Please create a copy of this cover sheet as a separate Word file and submit it with your other application materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your first name:</th>
<th>Your last name:</th>
<th>Your email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommender's name and email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Statement**

In 1 page (single-spaced), let us know about your writing and revision experiences, your approach to writing, and/or anything else you think relevant. You may paste your statement below or include it in a separate document.
Cover Sheet Two: Cover Sheet for Writing Sample

Office Use Only: Application number

Please paste this cover sheet to the beginning of your writing sample. To allow us to judge this portion of your application anonymously, please do not include your name on this cover sheet or the writing sample itself.

1. Is your submission (part of) a:
   - paper for coursework
   - thesis
   - journal article
   - conference paper
   - other: ____________________________________________

2. Please provide a brief synopsis of the piece you have submitted: what is your overall argument, and/or what are the main points that you’re trying to communicate to your readers?

3. Is this an excerpt of a larger project? If so, how does it fit into the larger project?

4. Who are your intended readers? What disciplines are you writing for, and what might your imagined audiences care about? [For example: perhaps you’re writing for a Sociology audience, but also for a more interdisciplinary audience of scholars interested in urban studies.]

5. What about the piece are you most happy with?

6. Few writers believe their writing is perfect. You may feel that a central concept eluded description, or that a key paragraph escaped all bounds of rational structure, or that a sensitive issue might not have been framed in the best possible way. In a paragraph or less, please tell us what about this piece gave you the most difficulty as a writer.
Sample Student Paper for Commenting

To submit your comments, you'll need to copy this sample student paper into a separate Word file and submit it with the rest of your application on our web site. Please make sure all of your comments are included. Do not put your name on this document.

Put yourself in this situation: You told this student (“Jamie”) that you would read and comment on their paper and e-mail it back to them. As you respond, limit yourself to 60 minutes.

We ask that you offer feedback that stands on its own (as opposed to deferring your remarks to a hypothetical meeting by saying “let’s talk about this”). Don’t feel that you need to demonstrate to us everything you know about writing; likewise, this is not a copyediting test. We’re more interested in what you would do to support this student’s growth as a writer. Respond as fully as you wish, but remember, you have only 60 minutes.

Jamie
Paper 2

As much as *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* is a suspense story, it is also a philosophical look into identity and accountability. Any reading of it will inevitably raise the question of the degree to which Jekyll and Hyde are the same person. Is Hyde a separate entity from Jekyll, or simply an excuse to himself and the world for Jekyll to act out his dark wishes. There is no clear answer to this question, but due to Jekyll and Hyde’s shared consciousness and the uncertain nature of Jekyll’s rejection of Hyde’s actions, it is more likely that they are the same person than not. So, while arguments that Jekyll and Hyde are the same or different person both can appeal to Locke’s definition of personal identity, due to the the strong evidence of their shared conscience and Jekyll’s accountability for Hyde’s actions, as well as Locke’s allowance for a person to share two bodies, it is more plausible that they are the same.

There are several indications in the final chapter of Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, in which Jekyll provides a narration of his experiment, that suggest that Jekyll feels he and Hyde are the same person, implying that, according to Locke’s theory, they are in fact the same person. One early indication is that for much of his narration, he describes both Jekyll’s and Hyde’s experiences in the first person. This indicates that at the very least, Jekyll feels that he shares an identity with Hyde. In addition, the fact that Jekyll leaves all of his belongings to Hyde in his will is strong evidence that he feels he will be able to continue to enjoy these belongings in
the body of Hyde, suggesting that he feels he continues to be himself even when he appears as Hyde. According to Locke’s definition of person, the fact that Jekyll feels as though he and Hyde are the same person is evidence that they are the same person. Locke describes the concept of person as “a thinking intelligent Being, that… can consider it self as it self, the same thinking thing in different times and places…” To Locke, a person is a thinking substance that can consider it self the same self at different points in time. The fact that Jekyll consistently treats Hyde as himself indicates that he considers himself to be the same person as Hyde, which, according to Locke, indicates they are the same person.

Admittedly, Jekyll does after a point describe the actions of Hyde in the third person, which may, to Locke’s theory of self, suggest that they cease to be the same at this point. However, throughout the entire chapter he still demonstrates that he is conscious of all of Hyde’s actions. Because Jekyll cannot be present at any of the events he describes regarding Hyde, Jekyll’s consciousness of these events must come from Hyde’s consciousness of the events, so they must be the same consciousness. This shared consciousness of events, according to Locke, is still indicative of a connection of personal identity. Locke writes, “Whatever has the consciousness of present and past actions is the same Person to whom they both belong.” Jekyll is conscious of his present action of writing his narrative and has consciousness of the past actions of Hyde. So, because of this connection of consciousness, Jekyll and Hyde are the same person.

Even so, there is a key piece of evidence in Jekyll’s narration that supports the notion that he and Hyde are in fact not the same person. Jekyll goes to great lengths to separate himself from the actions of Hyde. He claims, on Hyde’s misdeeds, that “It was Hyde, after all, and Hyde alone, that was guilty. Jekyll was no worse; he woke again to his good qualities seemingly unimpaired; he would even make haste, where it was possible, to undo the evil done by Hyde.” Jekyll here clearly demonstrates that he does not hold himself accountable for the actions of Hyde. According to Locke’s concept of personal identity, this is evidence that Jekyll and Hyde are in fact not the same person. He argues that “whatever past Actions [a person] cannot reconcile or appropriate to that present self by consciousness, it can be no more concerned in, then if they had never been done…” The fact that Jekyll does not attribute Hyde’s actions to his own present consciousness indicates that those actions are not a reflection of that present consciousness, though they are a reflection of Hyde, suggesting that Jekyll and Hyde are the
same person. Despite their shared consciousness, this difference in accountability suggests that they are two different persons.

However, Jekyll’s protestations can be viewed in a different light, suggesting he may not be telling the truth. It is clear throughout Jekyll’s narration that he is concerned with demonstrating his innocence. Not only does he try to establish that he is not accountable for Hyde’s actions, he also attempts to portray himself as a victim, claiming “no one has ever suffered such torments” as he has. Because of Jekyll’s motive to show his innocence, and his history of lying in hiding the truth about Hyde, it is likely that he would be willing to lie about his accountability for Hyde’s actions in order to support his goal. So, any claim by Jekyll that he does not feel accountable for Hyde’s actions should not be wholly trusted. In fact, there is self admitted evidence that he has felt accountable for the things Hyde has done. He recounts that when transforming back to Jekyll after Hyde had killed Carew, “The pangs of transformation had not done tearing him, before Henry Jekyll, streaming tears of gratitude and remorse, had fallen upon his knees and lifted his clasped hands to God.” This admission of remorse is evidence that Jekyll feels to accountable to some degree for the murder.

The nature of Hyde’s existence is also evidence that Jekyll in fact does own the actions taken by Hyde. Jekyll begins his narration by describing his struggle with reconciling the upright and less upright parts of his mind, coming to the conclusion that “man is not truly one, but truly two.” This struggle is what inspires his experiment. He writes, “If each [part of the mind],… could but be housed in separate identities, life would be relieved of all that was unbearable; the unjust might go his way, delivered from the aspirations and remorse of his more upright twin; and the just could walk steadfastly and securely on his upward path.” So, in this light, Hyde is born entirely out of Jekyll’s malicious thoughts and tendencies, meaning that all of Hyde’s tendencies and actions to some degree come from Jekyll. However, despite his success in generating Hyde, Jekyll notes that he himself remains his initial blend of good and bad, and not a likewise wholly good person, writing the he “was still the old Henry Jekyll, that incongruous compound of whose reformation and improvement I had already learned to despair”. Jekyll still maintains all of the aspects of Hyde he had tried to separate. So, all of Hyde’s thoughts and inclinations still come from suppressed thoughts and inclinations of Jekyll’s, meaning any actions taken by Hyde must to some degree emerge from a desire on the part of Jekyll. Jekyll’s desire to remove these tendencies indicate that he owned these tendencies at the time, and the
fact that the experiment does not change him suggests he continues to own them. So, although
Jekyll may not admit it, it is likely that he feels accountable for Hyde’s actions, as they are
inspired by his own malicious tendencies. So, as Jekyll and Hyde clearly share a consciousness,
and likely share accountability for their actions, it is most likely that they are the same person,
according to Locke’s concept of self.

Locke’s theory also allows reconciliation between the concept of Jekyll and Hyde being
the same person but having two different figures. It is widely agreed by all who meet Hyde that
his appearance is different from that of Jekyll; he said to be a short man with a distinctively evil
countenance. One could argue that according to Locke, Jekyll and Hyde are different “men” due
to their difference in figure. He writes, “Identity of the same Man consists in nothing but a
participation of the same continued Life, by constantly fleeting Particles of Matter, in succession
vitaly united to the same organized body.” Because the particles that make up Hyde are
organized into a different form than Jekyll, it could be argued that the two do not fit Locke’s idea
of the same man. Nonetheless, even this potential contradiction is not a problem in questioning if
they are the same person. In fact, Locke devotes a section to the thought experiment of the same
consciousness existing in two different bodies. He writes, “should the soul of a Prince, carrying
with it the consciousness of the Prince’s past Life, enter and inform the Body of a Cobler,… he
would be the same person as the prince.” According to Locke, if the same consciousness is
transferred from one physical body to another, the person inhabiting the two bodies would be the
same. So, although Jekyll and Hyde have drastically different figures, (which according to Locke
makes them different “men”), they are still the the same person.

There are quality arguments to make on both sides of the question, and even this
conclusion is not a certain one; it is only that one argument is better than the other. It is clear
from Jekyll’s clear memory of Hyde’s experiences that they share a consciousness, and although
Jekyll does not admit it, there is evidence that he does own accountability for Hyde’s actions.
Therefore, although there is some evidence to the contrary, it is certainly more likely that Jeykll
and Hyde are the same person than not.
Contacts and Further Information

Your writing sample and feedback on the sample student paper will be scored by two Writing Program staff who will know you only by your assigned number.

If any portion of our application is not accessible for you, please let us know.

Questions? Contact us:

writing-program@uchicago.edu

Deputy Director, Kathy Cochran
Senior Associate Director, Tracy Weiner
Associate Director, Ashley Lyons
Assistant Director, Sarah Bonanno
Assistant Director, Crystal Holmes
Assistant Director, T Lacy
Program Coordinator, Ryan Oliveira

Interested in hearing more about these teaching opportunities?

Have questions about the application?

Eager for details about the pedagogical training and support that Peer Writing Tutors receive?

We welcome you to stop by our Open House!

**In-Person Open House: Monday, January 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 3:30-4:30pm in Stuart Hall 330**

(Located in the North Reading Room, which is accessible via the 3\textsuperscript{rd} floor of Harper Memorial Library, east of the Harper Café.)