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Self-Reflective Essay

**Core Value I: Understand that Writing is a Practice that involves a Multi-Stage, Recursive, and Social Process**

Writing does not mean to just spread some words on a page rather it is an art and skill that can never be learned and applied if the writer is not matured by ample practice. It is what I learned from my course studies under Core Value-I and I applied this rule to myself while learning to be a writer. I chose a topic and studied it intensively before I intended to write on the subject. My topic was “Income Inequality” and I defined it before starting my arguments on the subject. My article states that “Income Inequality” is unequal pay scales of citizens that lead to inequality and frustration in society. I described two kinds of arguments on the topic that one group of scholars condemn this phenomenon whereas the other group justifies it. I learned in the course that biasness while arguing about a subject can mislead our analysis therefore I did not comment on any scholar's argument without logical reasoning. I used scholarly articles for argumentation instead of personal statements and sentiments of people.

**Core Value II: Understand that Close and Critical reading/analysis is Necessary for Argumentation**

My course taught me that a writer would write useless if he/she does not give a close reading to the subject and analyze it with logical reasoning. I studied my topic "Income Inequality" from every perspective before I argued about it. An article published on the *Hoover Institution* website was my first study on the topic. The article was written by D.R. Henderson with the title “Income Inequality Isn’t a Problem” where Henderson claimed that income inequality motivates people to work hard. I further explored the topic and found that the argument was supported by the philosophy of Adam Smith. I studied the subject by approaching the article "Income Inequality and Income Segregation” co-authored by S.F. Reardon and K. Bischoff; and the article “Attitudes towards Income Inequality: ‘Winners’ versus ‘Losers’ of the Perceived Meritocracy” co-authored by Roex, Huijts, and Sieben. This detailed study helped me to pursue my logical arguments which were against income inequality.

**Core Value III: Understand that Writing is shaped by Audience, Purpose, Genre, and Context**

My course taught me that it might look simple but it is a very important factor that is ignored by new writers that since writing is a kind of communication that can be passive or active, the writer should not write without having a clear picture of his/her audience in mind. Since my articles were academic shreds of literature, I used formal language and manipulated my arguments with research-based discussion. My intended audiences were the US citizens and policymakers that is why I referred typically to the context of the USA. My purpose was to convince my audiences that income inequality is an unjustifiable phenomenon and our country cannot move forward without fixing these fundamental flaws.

**Core Value IV: Understand that Information Literacy is essential to the Practice of Writing**

I learned during the course that one cannot write a credible piece of writing without defamiliarizing his/her emotions from the arguments. A research-based and logical argument is critical for successful writing and one cannot make a logical argument without in-depth knowledge of the topic he/she is writing about. I did not rely solely upon the above-mentioned articles rather I studied Simon Kuznets, Thomas Piketty, and Emmanuel Saez’s research on the subject. They presented a research study that uses tax data of the citizens to determine how much wealth the top one percent lost or gained in the last nine decades. The study reveals that they were the possessors of 25% global wealth in 1928 that rose to 33.34% by 2012. I used this research study to support my argument that unequal distribution of wealth does not produce a collective benefit of the society as claims Adam Smith rather it keeps the pressure on the have-nots who keep multiplying in number. I quoted Henderson who attempts to justify income inequality by saying that if a person is competent and hardworking enough to pursue his/her dreams and goals, lower-income would be able to hinder him/her from doing so. Moreover, his/her extra work and creative strategies to achieve his/her goals would enrich society with new ideas and products. I countered his argument by saying that how can two equally smart, competent, and hardworking persons grow equally if they are provided with different opportunities like a standard of education, health, training, and capital (wealth). I supported my argument with a quote from a scholarly article: “It takes time for a person who started in a poor background to accumulate the same wealth with someone who has a better social class” (Roex, Huijts, & Sieben 2019).

**Core Value V: Understand that Writing has Power and it comes with Ethical Responsibilities**

Core Value-V teaches a writer to write everything ethically fair and for good purposes as a few or more audiences are influenced by every piece of literature. I adopted one argument in all three articles and proved that income inequality cannot bring prosperity and collective good to society. Moreover, I pursued a humanitarian approach and argued that justifying income inequality can give happiness to one percent "haves" of the world, but it is horrible for all the others. As I knew while writing that majority of my audiences would be Christians, I quoted Christianity to averse the sentiment that income inequality is a good thing and it motivates the members of a society to work hard. I concluded my argument with the following words: “From Christianity, God created a fully equal society characterized by a high degree of neighborly love, philanthropy, and charity. Therefore, income inequality is not morally appropriate because it makes the poor poorer and promotes selfishness”.