

Addison's: "Two Years Are Better Than Four."

In the article written by Liz Addison, she argues that community colleges deserve more praise than they get. Addison emphasizes on the fact that college is supposed to be a period when students get to discover themselves. She believes in the fact that pupils who have gotten into a 4 year college program have already proved themselves. The fact that they have competed and went through a tough entry test says a lot about that. On the contrary, community colleges accept everyone. The fact that they have no tests is the best thing. Students who do not otherwise have a chance to higher education benefit from community colleges the most. At the end, Addison views community colleges as great American institutes. She believes in the fact that the community colleges provide great opportunity to the general public.

In this article Addison uses the denial to start off. In the starting paragraphs she talks about the point of view Rick Perlstein gave. She disagrees with him because she believes that he cannot comment on the life in a community college without ever stepping foot in it. She is using Perlstein's view to form a counter argument. However, the main argument that Addison wants to give is that community colleges get overlooked.

Even though Addison is referring to Perlstein repeatedly throughout, her main focus is the importance of community colleges. She just wants to get her point across repeatedly by telling that community colleges are great American institutes. She believes in the fact that people who step into 4 year programs are already well trained. However, the students who enter community colleges have the opportunity to grow. Throughout the article, Addison is trying to give the readers logical reasoning as to why they should support her point of view about community colleges.

Although i agree with what she has to say, but i did not like her tone in this writing piece. Yes, community colleges are an asset to the society but her tone is mocking. It is alright that she pinpointed Perlstein, but the way she did was disrespectful. Her point of view would have come across even more if she would have treated the opposing party with more respect. This is an error of ethos. The tone that she used might make her seem unreasonable to most readers.