Ellenby organizes her article into five distinct sections, the introduction, the problem and solution, the benefit to them, the benefits to others, and how she’s changed. Her arguments lie within the middle three paragraphs. In these three paragraphs she offers some solutions to a problem she has identified, argues that her solutions benefit people in her situation, and finally argues that it is also beneficial to those implementing them.

The introduction is simply a short story about the issue at hand, namely the lack of autism friendly venues. The introduction ends by highlighting the fact that not all disabilities are the same and how there just has not been much done to help those in her son’s position before transitioning to the second section.

The second section, the problem and solution, is her arguing her stance that autistic people deserve “sensory-friendly opportunities” because it is a right granted to them by the Americans With Disabilities Act. As she argues her stance, she offers some simple solutions and blames business owners for not applying these simple solutions.

The third section, the benefit to them, is her pointing to the possibility that through “repeated exposure” autistic people could adapt enough to join everyone else and not be excluded while also allowing those who are unable to still enjoy these events. This can be seen when she says, “Separate adapted events are the means by which even severely autistic people may eventually mainstream. … But those who cannot still have the same opportunities everyone else enjoys”.

The fourth section, the benefit to others, argues that the business owners who are not implementing this really ought to. She argues that by being friendly to autistic people instead of excluding them is good to business. This can be seen when she gives an example in Regal Cinemas and says, “Regal Cinemas in Rockville, now proudly host their own sensory-friendly events and enjoy a large turnout.”

In her final section, how she’s changed, she merely states how she now acts – or rather does not act – when someone immediately has an issue with how her son acts, contrasting it to how she acted in her first story. She concludes with a call to action by restating that none of this would be an issue if the solutions she proposed were simply implemented and encouraging others to join her in pushing for such change.

Her main audience is parents with autistic children. This can be seen as early as in the title of the article, with the title being “My son has autism. He deserves separate sensory-friendly opportunities.” Her title would appeal to parents of autistic children who may agree with the sentiment of the title and draw them to read the article. Her target audience being parents of autistic children can be further seen when she says, “I responded to the recreational void in my town by organizing private events for families with autism, and an intriguing pattern emerged. [Businesses saw that lots of people were happy to get to go to their businesses] … Regal Cinemas in Rockville, now proudly host their own sensory-friendly events”. This section of the article shows said parents that they too can enact such a change in their community. The article is also prepared for readers other than their main audience as the last sentence is a call to action to everyone else to enact these changes if for no reason other than so they will not be disturbed by an autistic person when out at these venues.