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Exercise 4.2

Tabitha Cohen makes the transition from her research essay into her oped in many noticeable ways. First, she makes a drastic change in her tone and word choice. In the research essay it is obvious that the audience is a higher level of reader. In her oped, her audience as the general public is made clear. She includes more facts and figures and tones down her word choice so that her claim is easily understood. Instead of opening the paper with a long introduction and general narrowing of her claim she jumps immediately into her claim, that inmates deserve the right of a college education while in prison, and moves to support herself immediately. There are very similar passages found in both papers, and it is obvious that these were taken directly from her research paper because they best represented her claim, such as when she states “A large source of opposition to college-in-prison programs, and the reason public funding for it was cut in 1994, was that people took issue with the fact that inmates were receiving free college educations while hard-working, innocent citizens who couldn't afford college did not receive the same benefits. However, although the logic might be sound, the facts show that eligible applicants for Pell grants did not miss out because inmate educations were funded. Pell grants awarded on merit, and costs above the annual appropriations were covered in the following year's budget” (Cohen).