# Statement of Academic Integrity

My signature below certifies that I have complied with the University of Pennsylvania's Code of Academic Integrity in completing this portfolio.

Name (printed): Maxx Yung

Signature/Date: Maxx Yung, 03/20/2024

**Statement of Academic Integrity** **1**
**Letter of Reflection** **3**
**White Paper (1st Recent Draft)** **4**
**White Paper (2nd Older Draft)** **5**
**Received Peer Reviews** **6**
**Draft 1 Revision Plan** **8**
**Draft 2 Revision Plan** **9**
**Peer Review of Colleague's Draft 1** **10**
**Peer Review of Colleague's Draft 2** **12**
**Copy of Draft 1 White Paper that I Peer Reviewed** **13**
**Book Summary** **14**
**Rhetorical Situation** **15**
**Book Outline of Research Text** **17**
**On-Demand Writing 1** **24**
**Writing Sample and Reflection** **25**

# Letter of Reflection

Dear Faculty Readers:

I'm studying Materials Science and Engineering (1 of 16 for the class of 2027!) with a minor in Computer Science and Engineering Entrepreneurship. I would say that I'm a very avid reader, attempting to read at least 2 hours a day - primarily through newsletters, books, and journal articles for my research. I enjoy writing both creative works and long analytical works, especially on new technologies or companies working on an interesting problems. In my free time, I enjoy reefing and playing badminton!

A challenge I've encountered this semester was identifying the structure of a particular article or reading. Throughout high school, I was taught to also be able to identify the thesis, reasons, and examples, but only in a pure academic essay setting. I tried to draw upon my previous knowledge of identifying these elements, but for a longer article such as the McKinsey book we read in class, it can be challenging at times to differentiate the premise and propositions, and frame the reasons logically and coherently relative to the proposition. I think I still struggle a little with this challenge, as I believe there is no objective way to frame the proposition of any articles and can differ depending on the chosen premises and reasons. The lesson I drew from this experience is that properly analyzing large bodies of work can be challenging to get exactly right, and that no texts can be analyzed in the objectively same way. Additionally, there are many other situations I might need to apply this lesson - whenever I would need to analyze large bodies of text (books, white papers, longer essays, research journals), I should identify what I believe to be the correct premises/propositions/reasons/examples and also understand that this might not be the correct assumptions. Although I believe this occurred in some of my McKinsey book chapter outlines, I have revised the outlines several times such that there should be no glaring mistakes: the premises make sense given the proposition, the proposition is properly written out (for example, not bifurcated), and that there are many examples for many reasons per the proposition.

Moving forward, I would want to get better at analyzing scholarly works, perhaps using a different framework or method to achieve this goal. A somewhat unrelated goal is to also begin writing more analytical-based scholarly works utilizing this premise-proposition-reason-example framework. I believe that would also help me in accomplishing my goal of better identifying these elements in other works and improve my writings as well. Finally, thank you for taking the time (and providing feedback) on my portfolio - I understand it could be quite long!

Sincerely,
Maxx Yung

# White Paper (1st Draft)

**Attached below.**