

1. **Question Type:** Inference

- (A) No, there's no sacrifice of comfort for the sake of appearance.
- (B) Close, as there is an action motivated for the sake of appearance here. However, there is no sacrifice.
- (C) This works – we have a sacrifice of 'sensual comfort' (the wine tastes worse) for the sake of appearance.
- (D) There's no sacrifice for the sake of appearance here.
- (E) While there is an appearance based motive here, there's no sacrifice of 'sensual comfort'.

**Best Answer:** (C)

2. **Question Type:** Paradox (EXCEPT)

**Discrepancy:** While Jimmy replaced his heater with one rated as highly efficient, his gas bill actually increased.

- (A) This doesn't seem to do much – so what if it uses a smaller percentage of the gas?
- (B) This works, as it shows there is higher consumption (hence, higher bill).
- (C) This works, as it also shows higher consumption.
- (D) This works, as a higher rate would increase his gas bill.
- (E) This works as well, as this also shows higher consumption.

**Best Answer:** (A)

3. **Question Type:** Disagreement

- (A) Neither questions whether this is art – simply whether it is a 'portrait'.
- (B) Neither questions whether this work can be ascribed to Quinn.
- (C) Close, but Arnold doesn't claim that it bears a 'recognizable resemblance' to Sulston – just that it's 'maximally realistic' (which may be true in some other way).
- (D) Carolyn doesn't necessarily disagree with this point.
- (E) Yes – according to Carolyn it's not a portrait (it violates one of her claimed requirements for a portrait), while according to Arnold it is a 'maximally realistic portrait'.

**Best Answer:** (E)

4. **Question Type:** Flaw

**Conclusion:** These companies use of motivational posters to boost their employees' motivation to work productively is unlikely to achieve its purpose.

**Reasoning:** Almost all the employees of these companies are already motivated to work productively.

**Flaw:** The companies' goals are explicitly stated as to *boost* their employees' motivation. Even if their employees are already motivated, their motivation might still be boosted (i.e. they might be made *more* motivated).

- (A) The conclusion isn't concerned with companies that *don't* currently use these posters – only with the ones that do.

- (B) No, the argument makes no claims regarding corporations in general – the conclusion is limited to those that are using these posters.
- (C) Irrelevant – the argument never claims the posters won't have *any* benefits – just that it won't meet its' *intended* benefits.
- (D) Irrelevant – the argument makes no claims (whether implicitly or explicitly) about *other* attempts to improve productivity.
- (E) Perfect – essentially a paraphrase of the flaw noted above.

**Best Answer:** (E)

5. **Question Type:** Sufficient Assumption

**Conclusion:** The early entomologist, in claiming that the ants were bringing food to their neighbors, was wrong.

**Reasoning:** The ants were actually emptying their own colony's dumping site.

**Flaw:** False dichotomy – just because the ants were emptying their own dumping site, could they not also be bringing food to their neighbors? Do we know that the two are mutually exclusive?

- (A) This doesn't prove that the ants weren't carrying food to the other ants.
- (B) This also doesn't prove that they *weren't* carrying food over.
- (C) This works. If this is true, then it becomes impossible for them to be carrying food (as no food could be found in the dumping site).
- (D) Irrelevant – even if they didn't carry them into their colony, the first ants *still* could have been bringing the other ants food (regardless of whether they brought it into their colony or accepted it).
- (E) Even if he retracted his conclusion, his conclusion might have still been right, so this doesn't prove that his conclusion was necessarily wrong.

**Best Answer:** (C)

6. **Question Type:** Inference (Principle Variant)

- (A) No; this argument provides no reason to believe that this is the *only* way. In fact, it doesn't even establish that this *does* reduce traffic accidents.
- (B) This works; we have an apparently altruistic action here (donating cars) that benefits the person performing it (Jablonski).
- (C) No; we have no reason to believe anything about young drivers here.
- (D) We don't know whether this is *usually* the case; just that it happens to be the case in this scenario.
- (E) For one, we don't know whether Jablonski was actually successful in encouraging better driving; for two, the stimulus provides no reason to believe that community support is *necessary* for this.

**Best Answer:** (B)

7. **Question Type:** Disagree

- (A) Marla makes no comment on whether taking great chances is or isn't desirable.

- (B) This works; Marla claims that living without ever risking anything isn't actually a life of moderation as 'living moderately requires moderation in one's moderation'. According to Antonio, one can live a life of moderation by never deviating from the 'middle course' (and not taking risks).
- (C) Neither disagrees with whether this is possible (so long as those virtues are 'moderate', Antonio might be okay with it).
- (D) Neither discusses the frequency with which one should deviate from moderate life.
- (E) Antonio does imply that some spontaneity is positive; Marla, however, makes no comment on the matter.

**Best Answer:** (B)

8. **Question Type:** Flaw

**Conclusion:** Fabric-Soft is the most effective fabric softener out there.

**Reasoning:** A test with over 100 consumers showed that consumers prefer towels washed with Fabric-Soft over towels washed without any fabric softener.

**Flaw:** The argument's evidence only shows that Fabric-Soft is preferred to *no fabric softener*. This doesn't show that it's any better than *other* fabric softeners.

- (A) Irrelevant – this wouldn't change the fact that the vast majority still prefer the one with Fabric-Soft.
- (B) Irrelevant – we're not concerned with harm to the environment, only with the effectiveness of the fabric softener.
- (C) Similar to (B) – the conclusion is regarding how effective it is (not how *cost* effective it is).
- (D) Similar to (B) and (C) – the conclusion is regarding how effective it is (not how *cost* effective it is).
- (E) Perfect – essentially a paraphrase of the flaw noted above. If they didn't compare it to other fabric softeners, how could they conclude that Fabric-Soft is better?

**Best Answer:** (E)

9. **Question Type:** Necessary Assumption

**Conclusion:** The recent claims that the Tasmanian tiger is not extinct are false (i.e. it *is* extinct).

**Reasoning:** The Tasmanian tiger's natural habitat was overtaken, and no hard evidence of its survival in the region exists.

**Flaw:** Just because there's no trace of it in *this* region, does that mean that it doesn't exist at all? What if it can be found in another region?

Further, there's the minor issue of absence of evidence – just because they can't find evidence of its existence, does that mean that it doesn't exist? What if they're hidden very well?

- (A) We don't have to assume *that* is how they were made extinct. Even if this didn't happen, the argument could still work if they were made extinct via some other manner.
- (B) We don't have to assume this – the lack of carcasses might also be explained by decay, for example.

- (C) We don't have to assume that *every* naturalist in the area has looked for the Tasmanian tiger. If Bob was being lazy and just sat back, the argument could still work.
- (D) This works – we *must* assume the Tasmanian tiger didn't just migrate to a different habitat. If it did, then it might not be extinct (even though it couldn't be found in its original habitat).
- (E) We don't have to assume this – the argument could allow for experienced naturalists to have made those sightings (and for them to be wrong).

**Best Answer:** (D)

10. **Question Type:** Inference/Main Point (Fill in Blank)

**Reasoning:** Advertisers find that people develop positive feelings about things they don't like if those things are pictorially linked to things they do like.

**Implied Conclusion:** Advertisers are likely to... pictorially link things they're trying to sell to things that people generally like?

- (A) No – minimizing prose won't necessarily maximize pictorial links (which is what we're looking for).
- (B) Close, but this doesn't account for the method of linking them to products people already like.
- (C) We don't know that television is any more pictorial than are magazines.
- (D) No – this is supposed to be done by linking the things they're trying to advertise to other things people *like*.
- (E) Perfect – this would provide that pictorial link to things people already like.

**Best Answer:** (E)

11. **Question Type:** Necessary Assumption

**Conclusion:** Mercury levels in saltwater fish are higher now than they were 100 years ago.

**Reasoning:** Mercury in a bird's feathers reflects the mercury levels of the fish those birds eat, and bird feathers found in living birds today have double the mercury of bird feathers found from 1880s.

**Flaw:** For one, the argument overlooks the possibility that mercury in the feathers might decrease over time after the bird's death – if it did, then the birds' feathers back then might have had much more mercury than they do now.

For two, the argument also draws a conclusion about saltwater fish based on fish that the birds eat. But what if birds don't eat saltwater fish, but some other fish? If that was true, then we wouldn't be able to draw *any* conclusions about saltwater fish.

- (A) No, if anything, we have to assume that it *was* as high – if the proportion of fish in a bird's diet was any different, we wouldn't be able to draw any conclusions about the fish based on mercury accumulation (as a smaller amount of fish eaten would result in less mercury, regardless of whether the fish themselves have more mercury).
- (B) No; we don't have to assume anything about what mercury in fish depends on. This wouldn't change anything regarding how much mercury they did or didn't have.
- (C) We don't have to assume that it's *essential* – even if it wasn't, the argument would still hold.

- (D) We don't have to assume this – in fact, we arguably have to assume that they *were* fully grown (so as to make a valid comparison to the feather's found today).
- (E) Yes – we must assume that the preservation process didn't itself reduce the mercury in the feathers. If it had, then similarly to the first flaw found above, the birds back then might have originally had more mercury in them than was found today.

**Best Answer:** (E)

12. **Question Type:** Main Point

**Conclusion:** It's more likely that the similarity between semiautobiographical novels X and Y is coincidental than the result of plagiarism.

**Reasoning:** Both authors are from similar backgrounds and have led similar lives.

- (A) No – while true, this is used to support that the similarity is likely the result of coincidence.
- (B) No – while some *may* suspect this to be the case, the main point is that it's likely just a coincidence.
- (C) Similarly to (A), this is merely support for the conclusion noted above.
- (D) Yes – convolutedly, this is a paraphrase of the conclusion noted above.
- (E) The conclusion isn't that such suspicions are unwarranted (they may be warranted, just not true).

**Best Answer:** (D)

13. **Question Type:** Strengthen

**Conclusion:** Cognitive psychotherapy is likely to be more effective at helping patients overcome psychological problems than forms of psychotherapy that focus on changing unconscious beliefs and desires.

**Reasoning:** Cognitive psychotherapy focuses on changing a patient's conscious beliefs, and only conscious beliefs are under the patient's direct conscious control.

**Flaw:** So what if only conscious beliefs are under the patient's conscious control? Do we know that we need to affect those things that are under the patient's direct conscious control to be effective at helping the patients?

- (A) This doesn't show that cognitive psychotherapy is any better than other psychotherapies.
- (B) This works – if we assume that it's difficult to be effective without affecting states that are under a patient's conscious control.
- (C) This doesn't help show it's actually any better than any of the other psychotherapies. It'd be like saying that a car is faster than other cars because it's red, and then 'supporting' that by pointing that it's the only car that is red.
- (D) This is very close, but the issue here is that the psychotherapies that *focus* on changing unconscious beliefs and desires *might* help change a patient's conscious beliefs (which would be under a patient's direct control). If such was the case, then this would make the other psychotherapies no worse than cognitive psychotherapy. The difference between this and (B) is that answer choice (B) notes that a *focus* on mental states under the patient's direct control is needed (and these other psychotherapies are instead *focused* on unconscious beliefs that are not under the patient's direct control).

(E) This is a moot point – even if they can't be controlled without the aid of psychotherapy, the whole premise of the argument is that we *have* the aid of psychotherapy.

**Best Answer:** (B)

14. **Question Type:** Necessary Assumption (Principle Variant)

**Conclusion:** Universities should only use open-source software.

**Reasoning:** Open-source software better matches the values embodied in academic scholarship, which is central to the mission of universities.

**Flaw:** So what if it's a better 'match' in terms of values? Do universities necessarily have to use software that intellectually resembles the academic process?

- (A) No – this isn't the basis of the argument, and may run counter. We don't know that open-source software is necessarily more advanced (nor is the advancement the reasoning cited).
- (B) Similar issue as with (A) – we don't know that open source is least expensive (there's no fees for using open source software, but perhaps there's much implementation costs associated with open-source software). Further, cost is not the basis of the reasoning the argument cites.
- (C) This works – the reasoning cited was that it best matches the university's goals, and connects the argument by noting schools actually should go with the software that best matches the schools' goals.
- (D) The argument never makes any claims (or rests any claims) regarding efficiency.
- (E) The argument never cites anything that (or makes any points regarding) blocks any particular achievement.

**Best Answer:** (C)

15. **Question Type:** Weaken

**Conclusion:** Psychological treatment lasting more than 6 months is more effective than shorter term treatment.

**Conclusion:** A fewer proportion of people who received 6 months of treatment or less claimed that the treatment made things "a lot better" (20%) when compared to people who received more than 6 months of treatment (36%).

**Reasoning:** Causal flaw; we have a correlation established: longer therapy means better results. But does that mean that the former is what *causes* the latter? What if it's reversed? What if there's some other factor that causes people to go to therapy for longer, and to have better results (such as motivation)?

- (A) This doesn't do much – we don't know what percentage in the other group had similar sentiment.
- (B) This just means that the sample size of that group was proportionally greater. This doesn't do much in terms of whether the conclusion drawn is true or not, however.
- (C) This works – this shows that the group that is in therapy for longer is there *because* the treatment is working. In other words, it's the success of the treatment causing the longer therapy, not the longer therapy causing the greater success.

- (D) The issue here is that this would be true for both groups, so wouldn't bias either one against the other.
- (E) This doesn't do much in terms of whether that additional treatment does or doesn't help the patients.

**Best Answer:** (C)

16. **Question Type:** Inference/Main Point (Fill in Blank)

**Reasoning:** Nations aren't literally persons and thus don't have rights or responsibilities, but citizens need to ascribe to them such rights and responsibilities for the nations to survive.

**Implied Conclusion:** Thus, a nation... requires citizens to ascribe to it things that it doesn't actually have?

- (A) No, we don't necessarily need something *other* than this false belief – perhaps this false belief would be sufficient?
- (B) This works – essentially a paraphrase of the implied conclusion noted above.
- (C) The argument never discusses anything to do with 'praise' or 'blame'.
- (D) The argument never establishes anything regarding 'worth'.
- (E) The argument never makes any claims regarding thinking of a nation 'metaphorically'.

**Best Answer:** (B)

17. **Question Type:** Necessary Assumption

**Conclusion:** When exercising back muscles, it's important to exercise opposing sides of the spine equally.

**Reasoning:** Balanced muscle development is needed to maintain a healthy back, because muscles on opposing sides must pull equally in opposing directions to keep the back in proper alignment.

**Flaw:** Subtle theme shift, but the argument jumps from the necessity of having 'balanced muscle development', to concluding that it's important to 'exercise opposing sides of the spine equally'. But, do we know that balanced muscle development requires one to exercise the opposing sides of the spine equally? What if one can develop balanced back muscles with unequal exercise?

- (A) We don't have to assume that this will be *enough* to keep the back in proper alignment – just that it's *necessary* to keep it in proper alignment (other things may be necessary as well, such as avoiding certain other injuries).
- (B) Yes – we must assume that unequal exercise will lead to unbalanced muscle development. If it didn't (i.e. if unequal exercise could lead to balanced development), then the argument is providing no substantive reason for why we need to exercise the muscles equally.
- (C) Similar issue as with (A) – we don't have to assume that equal exercise actually *will* result in a healthy back (generally or not), just that it's *needed* to maintain a healthy back.
- (D) We don't have to go as far as assuming irreparable damage in case of unequal exercise – just that it wouldn't be conducive to a healthy back.
- (E) We don't have to assume that *daily* exercise (or any exercise) is required – just that when someone *does* exercise, that they do it equally for both sides of the spine.

**Best Answer:** (B)

18. **Question Type:** Flaw

**Conclusion:** It is likely to be widely accepted that it is sometimes morally right to obstruct the police in their work.

**Reasoning:** It's almost universally accepted that one has a moral duty to prevent members of their family from being harmed, and as a result, few would deny that if a person was known by a family member to be falsely accused of a crime that it would be okay for that family member to lie to the police.

**Flaw:** There argument establishes one value here (moral duty to prevent family members from harm), but either ignores or arbitrarily overrules another potential value: a moral duty to help the police. In other words, what if it's widely recognized that helping the police is *more important* than helping a family member?

- (A) The conclusion here isn't any broader than the evidence provided – the evidence highlights one example, and the conclusion is only regarding *some* cases.
- (B) This works – if other moral principles (such as helping the police) *were* recognized as overriding the obligation to help a family member, then the conclusion would be put in question.
- (C) The argument never made any claims regarding obstruction of *justice* – only regarding obstruction of the *police* in their work.
- (D) The argument doesn't necessarily go as far as assuming there *no* such obligation – it might allow for such an obligation, but simply assume that helping a family member is a more important obligation.
- (E) No – the argument doesn't rest on their knowledge being correct, just on their knowledge actually being there. In other words, regardless of whether they're actually correct, the argument still holds.

**Best Answer:** (B)

19. **Question Type:** Strengthen

**Conclusion:** Government intrusion into voters' lives will rarely be substantially reduced over time in a democracy.

**Reasoning:** Voters elect politicians who promise the government will help their most pressing problems, which requires money, which must come from taxes, which can be considered a form of government intrusion.

**Flaw:** There's a bit of a shift here – the argument establishes that voters elect politicians who *promise* something that will lead to government intrusion, but then concludes that democracy *will* extend government intrusion. But that assumes that politicians will actually keep their promises which would lead to government intrusion.

- (A) This works – this covers up for the flaw noted above.
- (B) If anything, this weakens the argument as it shows that politicians will actually do something else in office (potentially not being intrusive).
- (C) This doesn't help – non-financial problems may also require money to resolve.
- (D) We don't have to assume anything about non-democratic countries for this to work.



- (E) Whether they promise what they ‘think ought to be done’ is irrelevant – it doesn’t change whether they promise to do something that will intrude on people’s lives, or whether they’ll actually go through with such promises.

**Best Answer:** (A)

20. **Question Type:** Parallel Flaw

**Conclusion:** We should accept the proposal to demolish the old train station.

**Reasoning:** Preserving old buildings creates an impediment to new development, which is critical to economic health. Further, a group that opposes the proposal has no commitment to long term economic well-being.

**Flaw:** The reasoning provided by the argument is that something should be done because the motives of a group saying otherwise are questionable. But just because they have questionable motives, does that mean that they’re wrong?

- (A) The argument neither provides *any* reasons for safeguarding works of art (the last sentence just reiterates that it should be done), nor criticizes any group’s motives.
- (B) While the argument does provide reasons to undertake the action proposed, there’s no flaw of criticizing a particular group’s motives here.
- (C) This argument does commit a similar flaw – it suggests that something should not be done because of the motives of people advocating that it be done.
- (D) The conclusion here isn’t based on the *motives* of the residents – but on the committee’s obligation to avoid alienating those residents.
- (E) There’s no rejection of a proposal on the basis of the motives of the person proposing it.

**Best Answer:** (C)

21. **Question Type:** Weaken

**Conclusion:** We must accept the fact that consumption of meat will soon be morally unacceptable.

**Reasoning:** Many more people can be fed with the grain used to produce meat than with the meat that such grain produces, grain yields are leveling off and no longer increasing, and the population is rapidly expanding.

**Flaw:** The argument shifts from a premise regarding ‘animals raised on grain’ to ‘consumption of meat’ in general. But, perhaps some meat can be produced from animals not raised from grain?

- (A) This doesn’t change anything regarding whether such practice would be ‘acceptable’.
- (B) This works – if this is true, then it might be okay to eat such meat, as the land used couldn’t provide any other farming benefits anyway.
- (C) This only strengthens the argument, as it shows meat becomes unnecessary.
- (D) This wouldn’t change much, as we don’t know whether this would actually happen, and as it would only stop *loss* of farmland (it wouldn’t *increase* available farmland to meet increasing demand).
- (E) The argument never claims we’d have to rely *solely* on grain products – there may be other non-meat foods available.

**Best Answer:** (B)

22. **Question Type:** Inference

- (A) This is a mistaken reversal – we know that if the price continues to increase, then their profitability will decrease. However, their overall profitability might decrease for a variety of reasons that have nothing to do with the price of coffee beans.
- (B) Same issue as with (A) – their overall profitability might decrease for a variety of other reasons.
- (C) Yes – we know that if the price of coffee beans increases, that they will either sell non-coffee products (which will decrease their overall profitability) or that its coffee sales will decrease (which will also result in a decrease in overall profitability). In other words, no matter what, overall profitability will take a hit.
- (D) No – if anything, it’s the opposite. The price it pays for coffee beans cannot *increase* without a decrease in overall profitability (given that an increase in price will necessarily lead to a decrease in overall profitability [see (C)]).
- (E) We don’t have to assume that one of these must be true. If the price it pays for coffee doesn’t continue to increase, their coffee sales might still stay the same.

**Best Answer:** (C)

23. **Question Type:** Flaw

**Conclusion:** Political candidates’ speeches are selfishly motivated and the promises made in them are unreliable.

**Reasoning:** The politicians’ purpose in giving these speeches is to get themselves elected.

**Flaw:** Attack – the argument is attacking the motives of the politicians to question their actual statements. Regardless of the motive, however, their statements may be sincere.

- (A) No, the argument never assumes that *unselfish* promises *are* reliable. Just that selfishly motivated ones are *not*.
- (B) The argument doesn’t go as far as claiming that they’re *never* kept. Just that they’re unreliable.
- (C) There are no claims regarding cause here.
- (D) Perfect – essentially a paraphrase of the flaw noted above.
- (E) Close, but the argument makes no claims regarding whether the person is or isn’t worthy of the office for which they’re running; it only makes claims regarding whether the promises are reliable.

**Best Answer:** (D)

24. **Question Type:** Strengthen

**Conclusion:** Romantics that claim that people aren’t born evil, but are made evil by imperfect institutions are wrong.

**Reasoning:** Institutions are merely collections of people.

**Flaw:** So what if institutions are collections of people? Can such collections of people not make otherwise ‘innocent’ people evil?

- (A) The argument isn't dependent upon comparing how effective institutions are vs. individuals.
- (B) If anything, this weakens the argument, as it supports the idea that institutions are imperfect (which is part of the claim the argument is trying to refute).
- (C) Views on optimism have no relation or effect to this argument.
- (D) This doesn't show that institutions can't make people evil.
- (E) This works – if the whole can't determine properties of its parts, then institutions (which is a 'whole' made of people) can't determine properties of people (the 'parts').

**Best Answer:** (E)

25. **Question Type:** Flaw

**Conclusion:** The anthropologists claim that humans couldn't have survived prehistoric times without evolving the ability to cope with diverse natural environments is false.

**Reasoning:** A particular species *did* learn to cope with diverse natural environments, but went extinct.

**Flaw:** Necessity/Sufficiency – the claim the argument is trying to refute is that 'ability to cope' was *necessary* to survival. However, that doesn't mean that having 'ability to cope' will guarantee survival. The evidence regarding the particular species only shows that 'ability to cope' didn't guarantee survival, which simply shows that it wasn't *sufficient* for survival. This doesn't show that it wasn't necessary.

- (A) Perfect – essentially a paraphrase of the flaw noted above.
- (B) The argument never establishes any particular characteristic that enabled a species to survive.
- (C) The argument never establishes any species that actually survived any given conditions.
- (D) Irrelevant – regardless of whether it had such characteristics, this would have no effect on whether 'ability to cope' is either necessary or sufficient for survival.
- (E) There's no particular condition that is claimed to have *caused* a particular result here (nor is it compared to a similar case).

**Best Answer:** (A)