

4/7-8

1. Be honest: How much time do you generally leave for the editing process? Think about yourself for a second: What has your general opinion on editing been? Is it something you put a lot of energy into? Do you think of it as a central part of your writing process, or is it something like a luxury? And why do you feel this way? (no judgment either way)

2. Have you ever felt "first draft pressure?" If so, what's it been like? If no, what's your process typically like?

3. Any questions about the CAC Site Creation Homework?

1. Editing is something I spend a lot of time on to ensure that my writing makes sense and stays on topic. It is a valuable tool that allows for better comprehension not only in terms of grammar but also in terms of structure and flow. It is a central part of my writing because I will constantly double check my work when I have not yet finished even if I had already planned out the paper. It stems from my insecurity about my writing skills as I consider it a subject that I'm not good in.

2. I have felt "first draft pressure" due to my previous experiences in English classes. Most of my teachers expected the first drafts to be well-written and to include all of the requirements. Due to this expectation, I felt the need to write my first draft as if it is my final draft in order to avoid being called out for submitting insufficient work. This was also done because of the lack of time in between due dates, so trying to perfect my first draft would save time when correcting mistakes pointed out by my teachers, allotting me more time to focus on other schoolwork and tasks.

4/29

What are our general opinions about public facing science, or science advocacy? Have we experienced much of it in our daily lives? Should there be more, or more effective kinds? What would that look like?

Science advocacy has been becoming more prevalent in modern day society due to the Internet. Nowadays, people rely on the web as a source of information. However, scientific language can be hard to comprehend, so many look at people's responses or posts regarding the subject. This can lead to the spread of misinformation by people finding posts that misunderstand the scientific article or those that alter the article's original intentions to fit their own narrative. By having the Internet at people's fingertips, people are able to Google their symptoms and assume the worst case scenario, which can cause distrust in doctors when told that their symptoms aren't that severe. The lack of trust in the medical field alongside access to unmoderated Internet posts can also lead to conspiracies, hence the influx of "antivaxxers" and "flat-earthers".

To improve science advocacy, we should implement stricter rules on what should be put out on news outlets. Many news sources are biased and sometimes will spread misinformation or “fake news”, which contributes to the distrust in science. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic is opening the people’s eyes to these news outlets’ lack of credibility when many were initially under the idea that these sources are trustworthy and reliable. By ensuring that all the information broadcasted by news outlets are backed up by credible sources, it can increase the people’s trust in the information provided by the government, which will hopefully stop people from believing in these Internet “experts” that feed on their distrust in the government.