

Muhammad Khattak

Professor Jane

ENGL 21006

12 November 2019

Scientific Controversy Paper Reflection

This assignment assessed the limits of my writing capabilities. The scientific controversy paper was a test of my analysis skills in terms of largescale conflicts. I knew the content that had to be added to the final product; obviously, several changes were made to fit the descriptions of the JUUL controversy, as well as, address all the points of the given prompt. Firstly, the paper had to include the political, economic, and moral implications of scientific research. The draft was divided into three sections for the JUUL controversy to be examined, however the final showcased the *for* and *against* sides of the controversy. For this to occur, I had to provide concise background information regarding JUUL as a company and the health impacts of its products.

At this point, the sixth writing objective was complete, this was probably the most imperative step for it defined my writing throughout the paper. I researched the various genres and modes of expression like research papers, news articles, political cartoons, and social media posts. It was challenging to organize the paper since the first draft showed a lack of sophistication since it categorized JUUL into three categories only (political, economic, and moral). Nevertheless, analyzing the controversy was less difficult when the three categories were associated with the clashing sides of the debate. The final paper was divided into an introduction, the *for* section (with a subcategory of economic connotations), *against* section (with a subcategory of moral and political inferences), and a conclusion. I did not provide a personal statement because I am not an

expert healthcare professional nor does this issue affect me directly, so I felt an opinion would do a disservice to my ethos and overall paper.

To add on, deciding on a decent topic was extremely thought-provoking for my goal was to select a unique and nuanced controversy. Many writing pieces on global warming and other related scientific controversies exist, but the JUUL controversy relates to a target audience I am a part of, teens and young adults. Before I could even begin drafting the assignment, tremendous amounts of research were required; concrete and precise information was needed to guide me to a strong final draft. Course objective eight needed to be met before any information could be considered for the paper. I realized that my research provided overwhelming amounts of information about the JUUL controversy. This was a great means of practicing and strengthening my summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting, and analyzing skills. The most challenging aspect regarding research and information was deciphering the placement of the six sources into the for and against arguments.

Besides, to reach my desired final draft, my first one had to be “shitty.” I revise each assignment paragraph by paragraph; thus, the first draft was initially a page of quotes (from the cited sources) clumped into political, economic, and moral portions. Eventually, the paper developed into an informational analysis of the clashing sides and health crisis. During this process, peer reviews were extremely helpful since it allowed me to improve my first draft. The first course objective of cooperation not only improved my writing, but it also helped to achieve the second course objective. Peer reviews improved my approach to reading, drafting, revising, and editing. When reviewing CJ’s paper, it became abundantly clear to me that I cannot approach this assignment with the intent of rhetorically analyzing the sources of the controversy. Each source must be integrated into the “big picture,” which is presenting the scientific controversy.