Language is a form of science, and writing is its technology, though not in the traditional sense; there *is* a science to language. Language requires syntax and structure and is studied and practiced like other sciences. Like any other form of science, we must study language to learn more, become skilled, and better articulate ourselves through writing. This class has allowed me to appreciate language as a science. Before, I saw language as a tool solely for expression, but it is much more than that. Language is the nuts and bolts of all communication, it is the foundation for new ideas, and language allows us to articulate and communicate those ideas better. Language and, by extension, writing are the building blocks that have built and shaped society into what it is today. As a writer, I have learned to use my writing as more than just a way to express emotion. I have learned how writing can relay information a broad audience can quickly and concisely understand. I have learned the art of writing in the scope of engineering.

My old understanding of writing was that writing is primarily a form of expression; through writing, we mainly share emotion, and that was that. Writing to me before was mostly in the scope of creative expression, like poems, theater, and novels. My writing habits had always leaned on emotion and connection with the reader. One piece that I wrote that best showcases this is my *Who Am I* Essay. In this piece, I expressed a lot of emotion, showing what drives me and why I want to become an engineer, which, up to this point, was the type of writing I was most accustomed to. Breaking it down, you could tell that I poured a lot of emotion, with a big emphasis made on my background and what that means to me. In that piece, I tried to connect with the reader and make them feel my feelings so they can better understand how that has influenced who I've become. Looking at this piece from a technical writer's perspective, this was a very roundabout way of saying my family was poor, hardworking, and came to this country in search of better lives.

My methods in writing evolved, and I slowly started to move away from this. Two of the readings in this class which helped me move closer to this goal of becoming a better technical writer are "How to Build an Artificial Heart" (Rothman, 2018) and "The One-Traffic-Light Town with Some of The Fastest Internet In The U.S." (Halpern, 2019). These two pieces influenced me because they were some of my first time reading technical writing. These two authors implemented many strategies into their papers, influencing me to make certain decisions in my work. Some of these good features are outstanding citations of pictures, a clear and concise introduction to the problem, and the background information needed to understand the proceeding material. Another influence that helped me discover my new writing style was my peers' feedback and advice. In this class, we had a lot of opportunities to engage in the collaborative and social aspects of writing processes.

The most important lesson I could have learned in this class is that perspective matters. Who your audience is and their needs should contribute to how you write. A major turning point for me in this class has to have been the Rhetorical Analysis research paper because it directly conflicted with the style of writing I was used to. The rhetorical analysis essay forced me to step away from my comfort zone. The unfamiliarity of the content wasn't what made it so hard for me; instead, it was the practice of rhetorically analyzing something that did not have much rhetorical content. One thing I noticed was shared among all three reports was that they didn't leave much room for misunderstandings or reader interpretations. Until this point, I understood rhetorical analysis to be the deconstruction of an author's hidden motive, but there is no such thing in technical writing. With my rhetorical analysis of these lab reports, I learned the features most important in technical writing, which served as the foundation for my technical description. With the new strategies I learned from the analysis, I was able to make a technical description I was proud of.

My theory of writing is that writing is a science; you must do trials, you must fail, and you can learn from other scientists, in this case, other authors. I was able to learn from the work of others and apply those skills in my own way, and I was able to improve my methods and deliver writing I could be proud of.