

## Analytical Writing Assessment

トピックは、長いために省略します。ある程度推察可能と思います。

Criterion 採点: 6.0

The argument suggests that City L had a good environmental as well as good location among cities in the United States. The logical flaws here are: 1) the data was of two years ago; 2) an influx of people might have damaged the quality of life; 3) there might not be any room available for the new comers. With these three major problems, the argument will be weakened. Now, I discuss these factors in more detail.

First, the ranking data is too old to be recognized as being suitable still today. Industrial conditions have rapidly shifted from Silicon Valley to other industries since the market crash in 2001. The same thing can be said to every industry. Thereby, there would be no proper jobs available in the city. It passed only two years; however, two years is long enough to change the labor market in the city. As a result, there is a high chance that City L will not hold its position of being a good city.

Second, because City L received a higher rank among cities, many people might have moved to City L. If this had happened, the infrastructure of City L would not have been able to satisfy people's safety life-style anymore. For example, there would not be sufficient police officials in the city; thus, the crime rate might have gotten worse. How about school facilities? Too many new students might have caused a problem of over-sitting in one class. To keep good qualities of education, it is important to keep a constant 'teacher-students' ratio. From this point of view, City L already would not be suitable place to live in.

Third, there would not be enough spaces for new comers. Upon the announcement of the 14th place in the United States, many people might have migrated to the City L. In other words, well-suited places to live in might have been already occupied with new residents within two years. Thus, there will be no more rooms for people who want to live in the city, or people who are willing to live in the city must choose the outskirts of City L, which means that the living conditions for the people will no longer be satisfactory. Attractiveness of City L would have been deteriorated.

Last of all, I have to say that the ranking is a weighted average of each available condition. City L might have been the fourteenth because housing cost was very low among cities; thus, City L might have been ranked 1 in this category of research. On the other hand, it will be hard to determine how people are friendly in the city. The number of persons who were asked might have been low; but their answers reflected in the census might have been very positive. We need to know how the ranking measurement was made as well as the rankings of each category asked.

On the basis of the reasons, I have found that this argument is not sufficient enough to show complete evidences to support the conclusion. I conclude that City L might not be one of the best places to live in. In order to evaluate the current living conditions in City L, it is required to notify 'today's conditions'; whether City L still keeps a good living condition or not. These criteria include: job security; accessibility to work place, the number of police officers, and so forth. Those sorts of information surely will ensure factors of being evaluated as a good city. The argument will be strengthened if the above-mentioned flaws are examined, and new pieces of information are provided properly.

[604 words]

著作権：神部 孝