1. **Question Type:** Main Point

   Conclusion: Not all efforts to increase business productivity are beneficial to the business as a whole.

   Reasoning: Attempts to increase productivity can decrease the number of employees, which in turn not only harms the dismissed employees, but also the remaining employees' sense of security.

   (A)   The argument never makes any claim suggesting that if an action doesn't help, that it cannot be good.
   (B)   This works – this is a pretty direct paraphrase of the conclusion noted above ('not all' help the business means that at least 'some' fail to help).
   (C)   The argument never mentions anything requiring the owners to also be the employees.
   (D)   While this is true (stated in the first sentence), it is not the main point – this is merely background information.
   (E)   While this is true, this isn't the main point. This is the evidence supporting the main point.

   Best Answer: (B)

2. **Question Type:** Parallel Flaw

   Conclusion: Rosa's dogs are moderate barkers.

   Reasoning: Labrador retrievers bark a great deal, while Saint Bernards bark infrequently, and Rosa's dog is a cross of the two.

   Flaw: Just because something has parts of two different things doesn't mean that properties of those two things will be present in the result (and in this case, averaged out). A pair of pants half of which are made of classy dress pants, the other half of which are made of casual jeans won't be moderately classy – it'll just be weird.

   (A)   The second class of students here only refers to 'some' students, and with the same results (good grades). In the original argument, **all** dogs of **both** classes were accounted for.
   (B)   This works – we have two classes of objects (type A and type B), both of which have opposing properties (extremely toxic and nontoxic), the mixture of which is presumed to be in the middle (moderately toxic).
   (C)   This is actually valid – the argument doesn't refer to a 'mixture' of two things, but **individual** members of the family going to different schools.
   (D)   This is also valid – while there is a 'mixture' of sorts here, the two properties aren't affecting each other.
   (E)   This is a necessity/sufficiency flaw, but nothing to do with the 'mixture' flaw noted above (it doesn't conclude that something must be 'moderately well made' because it's both Kenisha's and Connie's).

   Best Answer: (B)

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

The argument essentially sets up a comparison between two things: the end of a century and the end of a life. The argument establishes that people often act at the end of a century in a manner similar to how they would act at the end of a life. Upon establishing that people at the end of their life often look back upon their life, goes on to conclude that people at the end of a century…

Pre-phrase: … people would look back upon that century.

(A)   No – the parallel is to the end of a century, not the end of a life.
(B)   No, the argument never implies anything about such a fear.
(C)   No, if anything, we're looking on reminiscing about the *last* century.
(D)   This works – this a paraphrase of the pre-phrase noted above.
(E)   The argument never establishes anything about avoiding any particular events.
Best Answer: (D)

4.   **Question Type:** Flaw

Conclusion: Ocksenfrey's prepackaged meals really are nutritious.

Conclusion: The report that said Ocksenfrey's prepackaged meals weren't nutritious was biased.

Flaw: For one, the argument attacks the source of a claim rather than their claims themselves. Even if Ocksenfrey's rivals are biased, they may nevertheless have reasonable grounds for their claims. Further, even if we presuppose that their bias necessarily makes their claims questionable, that doesn't mean that Ocksenfrey's foods are nutritious – it just means that we don't know that they're not.

(A)   This works – paraphrase of flaw noted above.
(B)   There's no sample of products being used as evidence here – the only evidence provided is the rivals' potential bias.
(C)   Irrelevant – there is no negative publicity being generated against Danto here (nor would it be relevant even if there was).
(D)   The argument never claims nor depends upon any claim of Danto's being more nutritious.
(E)   The argument never goes as far as claiming this – it only goes as far as using the approval process as a basis for potential bias.
Best Answer: (A)

5.   **Question Type:** Weaken

Claim: Earth's average temperature increase over the last century is the result of the buildup of minor gases in the atmosphere, which blocks outward heat flow from the planet.

(A)   The source of the gases is completely irrelevant here.
(B)   This works – this shows that the actual warming occurred when there (mostly) was no such buildup of minor gases.
(C)   Subtle, but we don't necessarily care about a comparison between the last century and before – the claim is regarding events that occurred *over* the last century. In other words, if the radiation spiked up slightly in 1900, this would do much to the claim, which tries to explain the temperature increase *between* 1900 and 2000.

(D)   This doesn't provide an alternative explanation as to why there was an *increase* in the earth's temperature.

(E)   If anything, this strengthens the claim, as it shows that there *was* a notable increase in those gases to coincide with the earth's warming.

Best Answer: (B)

6.   **Question Type:** Sufficient Assumption

Conclusion: Murray, who has both a Bachelor's and Master's degree, cannot be appointed to Executive Administrator.

Reasoning: He has a felony conviction, and no one with a felony conviction can be appointed to the board.

Flaw: Theme shift – the argument jumps from a premise that shows that Murray can't be appointed to the board, to a conclusion stating he cannot be appointed Executive Administrator. But do we know that the position is on the board? If it's not, then he might still be eligible for appointment.

(A)   This only tells us who *would* be eligible, not who *wouldn't* be, so it doesn't help us much.

(B)   This works – if *only* people eligible for the board can be appointed to Executive Administrator, then given that Murray isn't eligible for the board, he wouldn't be eligible for the position either.

(C)   This only weakens the argument – it shows that something necessary for the board *isn't* necessary for the position, which highlights the possibility that one could be ineligible for the former, while eligible for the latter.

(D)   This doesn't prove that a felony conviction would *stop* him from getting the position.

(E)   This also doesn't prove that he's ineligible for the position – perhaps they might still allow him to get the position even if the charge is relevant?

Best Answer: (B)

7.   **Question Type:** Inference

(A)   This is an example of 'calculated self-interest', as Bobby is trying to look good in front of others. Not only does this not show motivation based on 'abstract principles', calculated self-interest is stated to be 'in contrast' to the most advanced kind of motivation.

(B)   Similar issue as with (A); the motive here is calculated self-interest more than any 'abstract principle'.

(C)   The motivation here is also self-interest (she doesn't want to get in trouble).

(D)   This could work – we definitely don't have self-interest or adherence to social norms here, and her motivation is a relatively 'abstract' concept.

(E)   The motivation here is social adherence (Leigh was pressured into doing this), which stands in contrast to what we're looking for (according to the stimulus).

Best Answer: (D)

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

Reasoning: Electric cars are claimed to result in benefits for the environment, but unless we dam more rivers, the source of the electricity will be from nuclear or coal-fired power plants. These power sources create significant environmental damage on their own. So, the electric car…

Implied Conclusion: …won't result in significant benefits for the environment, unless we dam more rivers?

(A)   This works – it notes that the consequences will be worse than believed (i.e., they won't be as dramatic as expected) without going too far overboard.
(B)   The argument never mentions anything about popularity.
(C)   The argument doesn't establish any requirements for electric cars' overall success. Further, the entire line of reasoning is based on a scenario in which technical problems **have** been overcome.
(D)   The argument never goes as far as providing evidence that emissions will actually **increase** – just that they might not decrease **as** much.
(E)   Similar to (D), the argument doesn't go as far as showing that there will be **no** net reduction in environmental damage – just that it might not be **that** significant.
Best Answer: (A)

9.   **Question Type:** Weaken

Conclusion: In the near future, we can expect a reversal of the trend that has had video game sales increase steadily over the past three years.

Reasoning: Historically, 75% of video games were purchased by people 13–16 years old, and the number of people in that age range is expected to steadily decline over the next decade.

Flaw: The argument doesn't account for a whole plethora of possibilities that could cause other age groups to buy video games. What if the people who were 13–16 at the time will continue buying games into older age? What if the companies start shifting their content toward older players?

(A)   This doesn't weaken the argument – in fact, this falls in line with the argument (they're unlikely to play video games).
(B)   This also falls in line with the argument (there are sales declines in certain segments of the video game industry).
(C)   This actually supports the argument as well, as new entertainment options might not fall under 'video games', providing people an alternative to video games.
(D)   This supports the argument, as it shows there's little reason for older or younger people to change their habits (the games aren't changing, and if they're not interested in them as-is…).
(E)   This works; if **recent** history shows that the trend in the age groups buying video games is shifting, this shows a shift to other age groups. Further, since the increase in sales has been over the last 3 years, this actually shows that the increase might have been as a result of other age groups in the first place.
Best Answer: (E)

10. **Question Type:** Main Point

Conclusion: Double-blind techniques should be used whenever possible in scientific experiments.

Reasoning: They help prevent misinterpretations, and scientists should try to prevent these.

(A) No – this is an issue that supports the idea that double-blind tests should be used.
(B) This works – essentially a paraphrase of the conclusion noted above.
(C) The argument never actually claims this happens (although it does imply it – either way, not the conclusion).
(D) While true, this is the support for why scientists should use double-blind tests.
(E) The argument never claims they're effective in **ensuring** such objectivity – just that they **help** maintain it. Further, the conclusion isn't that they're effective, but that they **should** be used; if anything, the fact that they're effective would be supporting that conclusion.

Best Answer: (B)

11. **Question Type:** Reasoning

Conclusion: What awaits us is likely just a change in the human mind as opposed to a devolution of it.

Reasoning: While people complain that certain electronic facilities are corroding our intellectual ability, similar complaints were made at the time that literacy was becoming widespread.

Pre-phrase: The complaints of several centuries ago are used as an example of a similar occurrence of complaints as we have today, but with a presumably different outcome from what people claim will happen.

(A) No, if anything, the argument is questioning whether these skills are really being destroyed by electronic media.
(B) The argument never claims or illustrates the claim that intellectual abilities are 'inseparable' from anything.
(C) This works – spread of literacy being the cultural change.
(D) The argument never claims that these claims are **unwarranted**, just that they're unlikely to be true.
(E) The argument never dismisses this evidence.

Best Answer: (C)

12. **Question Type:** Parallel Reasoning

Conclusion: One cannot be obliged both to answer all questions truthfully and to keep all promises

Reasoning: In the case of promising to keep a secret and being asked to answer a question that can't be honestly answered without revealing the secret, one can't do both.

Diffusion: The argument concludes that two things cannot both always be done by providing a particular example highlighting that the two ideas may conflict with each other.

(A) This works in a similar manner – the argument concludes that two things can't always both be done by noting that they may conflict with each other.
(B) This argument goes off in a different conclusion to note that something is necessary for something else (not that two things cannot always be done together).

(C)   The conclusion here is also different, as it doesn't show two things can't always be done together (just that they're at risk regardless).

(D)   This is a necessity/sufficiency line of reasoning – the evidence doesn't show that in a particular case two things can't be done together.

(E)   This is also a necessity/sufficiency line of reasoning – it notes that certain outcomes of an action are unacceptable, so the action shouldn't be undertaken. This doesn't show two things always be expected to happen together.

Best Answer: (A)

13.   **Question Type:** Sufficient Assumption

Conclusion: Group M contains twice as many cans as does group L.

Reasoning: 50% of the aluminum contained in group M was recycled from group L. Cans don't vary in size and aluminum content, materials other than aluminum in a can are negligible, and all the cans in L were recycled into cans in M.

Flaw: While half of the aluminum in group M is recycled from group L, do we know that all the recycled material actually makes it to the new product? In other words, what if only 10% of recycled material is usable in the new product? That would significantly throw off the statistics presented.

(A)   This doesn't fix the flaw, and thus wouldn't show that M does in fact have twice the cans of L.

(B)   This doesn't do anything – we're not concerned with aluminum quality.

(C)   Yes; if we know that 100% of the aluminum is recovered, then we know that all of group L makes up only half of group M, making group M twice as big.

(D)   We're not too concerned about where the aluminum in L came from – this doesn't prove anything regarding how large group M is.

(E)   We're not concerned with other material recyclability – this has no bearing on our conclusion.

Best Answer: (C)

14.   **Question Type:** Weaken

Conclusion: What destroys the lysozyme enzyme is not heat, but microwaves (which happen to generate heat).

Reasoning: When milk is heated in a microwave to a certain temperature in loses as much as half its lysozyme, while heating the milk through conventional heat sources will allow it to keep nearly all its lysozyme.

Flaw: There's nothing blatant here, but we're essentially looking for a reason to believe that perhaps it *is* the heat that destroys the enzyme.

(A)   This doesn't change much – we already know that heating milk in a microwave oven kills lysozyme. This doesn't make it any more likely that it's the heat vs. the microwaves that's destroying it.

(B)   Irrelevant – we're not concerned with replacing them, but simply with what destroys them in the first place.

(C)   This doesn't change whether or not it's the heat causing the lysozyme to be destroyed.

(D)   Taste is largely irrelevant to what causes destruction of the lysozyme.

(E)   This works – it shows that it ***could*** be the heat, just that heating by microwave makes certain parts much hotter than the eventual temperature (which is what could be killing the lysozyme).

Best Answer: (E)

15.   **Question Type:** Sufficient Assumption

Conclusion: Every year it will be necessary for all high-risk individuals to receive a vaccine for a different strain of the virus.

Reasoning: Each year's vaccination will only protect against the virus strain deemed most likely to be prevalent that year.

Flaw: Just because each year the vaccination will be for the most prevalent strain, does that mean every year there must be a new vaccination administered? What if the same virus strain will be prevalent for more than one year?

(A)   The number of individuals doesn't do much for us here in terms of whether these individuals will need to be vaccinated.

(B)   This doesn't do much, as it doesn't affect whether people will actually need a new vaccine every year.

(C)   This wouldn't prove much – in fact, we already know that the vaccines that will be administered will only protect against one strain (the one deemed most likely to be prevalent).

(D)   Yes – if we assume that each year there will be a completely new strain, then we'd be able to conclude that individuals would need to be vaccinated every year (as the vaccination will only work for that year).

(E)   This doesn't prove that we'll actually need to vaccinate every year – just that doing so might be a relatively smooth process.

Best Answer: (D)

16.   **Question Type:** Disagree

(A)   Neither really questions whether research might reveal this – Taylor clearly states it does (but happens to question the claim), while Sandra makes no reference to it.

(B)   While Taylor does claim that this is impossible, Sandra doesn't necessarily say that in ***this*** case it's possible – just that it could be possible in ***some*** cases.

(C)   While Taylor definitely agrees with this (as far as Taylor's concerned, one can never expect great precision), Sandra never claims that one ***can*** expect such precision from ***this*** particular study.

(D)   Yes – Taylor clearly states this is impossible, while Sandra claims that 'many' disciplines can obtain extremely precise numbers that shouldn't be inherently suspect.

(E)   Neither makes any claims about 'the majority of claims made by scientists', nor is any such statement based on 'inherently suspect claims usually [being] false'.

Best Answer: (D)

17.   **Question Type:** Flaw

Conclusion: We should make the protection of our clients' confidentiality our highest priority.

Reasoning: Several computer experts maintained that the most serious threat faced by institutions such as hospitals is unauthorized access to confidential data.

Flaw: Limited scope – the argument takes commentary by computer experts that would be presumably limited to computer issues, and makes a broad conclusion about the most important thing overall. But what if non-computer issues (that the computer experts may not be aware of) are more important, such as reducing emergency room wait times?

(A) The argument never discusses any particular solutions here, let alone confuses them with causes.
(B) This works – the experts cited are **computer experts**, but the conclusion drawn is about what is 'most important' in general.
(C) There's no cause claimed on the basis of a correlation here – the argument simply presents a threat as-is.
(D) The argument doesn't draw any conclusions about a 'group' (the conclusion is regarding the best course of action for the specific hospital).
(E) No – the argument's conclusion is limited to the hospital specifically. The argument never makes any claims about 'all institutions'.

Best Answer: (B)

18. **Question Type:** Inference

(A) We don't know this – the argument never actually says anything about the scientists reluctant to accept the global warming hypothesis (except for the fact that they have motive to hold such a position).
(B) Yes – we do have reason to believe this. The argument establishes that **nothing** brings more recognition than to overthrow conventional wisdom, and that the predictions of global warming are 'widely accepted'. Hence, there is substantial motive to discredit global warming.
(C) The argument never makes this claim – at best, it states that **not many** find evidence that global warming is **unlikely**. That doesn't mean there is conclusive evidence that it **is** true.
(D) We don't know this – the argument provides no basis for claiming that they **didn't** present any alternative hypothesis.
(E) We don't know that this is the primary factor driving global warming research. We know that recognition provides significant motive, but that doesn't mean that it's actually the primary motivator.

Best Answer: (B)

19. **Question Type:** Strengthen (EXCEPT)

Conclusion: The success of the Land Party in '35 was due to the combination of addressing concerns of agricultural and small business groups and those groups' existing economic problems.

Reasoning: The economic woes of those years hit those groups hardest, and the Land Party specifically targeted those groups.

Flaw: Causal – so there is a correlation between the Land Party targeting groups having trouble and their political success, but perhaps something else caused the Land Party's victory that was completely unrelated (maybe they rigged the election)?

(A) This doesn't do much, as it focuses on distressed **urban** groups. Even if this is true, this doesn't change much – they might have still targeted agricultural areas or other distressed groups, in which case it puts into question why they lost previously ('35 was their **only** victory).

(B) This works, as this covers up a subtle shift in the argument that assumes that people will actually vote for candidates that focus on their problems.

(C) This strengthens the correlation, as it notes their successes **actually** came from the disadvantaged sectors they were targeting.

(D) This supports the argument by noting that this is how they differed from the competition. If everyone targeted those groups, then it would put into question whether targeting those groups is what led to the Land Party's victory.

(E) This shows that targeting those specific groups would have had a greater effect, as those groups were more likely to vote.

Best Answer: (A)

20. **Question Type:** Reasoning (Technique)

Conclusion: The claim that there is evidence of citywide opposition to the new water system on the basis of the Neighbors Association's supposed opposition is questionable.

Reasoning: While the Neighbors Association did pass a resolution against the new water system, only 25 out of 350 members actually voted (of which only 15 opposed the system). These votes also happen to represent less than 1% of the populace.

(A) The argument doesn't establish that any particular group is more likely to vote – just that the group that did vote doesn't necessarily represent the populace.

(B) The argument doesn't go as far as claiming that statistical data can be used to support **whatever** view someone wants to support.

(C) The original argument never claimed that the truth of a given set of premises **guarantees** the truth of any particular conclusion.

(D) The argument never claimed that any particular evidence set is **impossible** to disconfirm (in fact, it doesn't make any claims regarding its disconfirmability at all).

(E) This works – the argument does attempt to show the statistical sample is too small (only 25 out of 350 actually voted, and they represent less than 1% of populace).

Best Answer: (E)

21. **Question Type:** Flaw

Conclusion: Trading my sports car in for a minivan would lower my risk of having an accident.

Reasoning: Minivans and sedans larger than sports cars have very low accident rates as compared with sports cars.

Flaw: Causal – while there is a correlation between larger cars and lower accident rates, does that necessarily mean that the former actually **causes** the latter? What if, for example, careful drivers are unlikely to buy sports cars, and happen to have lower accident rates because they're careful? In other words, it might be the driver that's the cause of the car choice and the accident rate, in which case changing the car without changing the driver's behavior wouldn't do much.

(A) This works – it is essentially a general description of the flaw noted above.
(B) We don't know the sample size, so we can't say any particular sample here is too narrow.
(C) The argument never draws any conclusions stating that anything is ***certain*** – the conclusion simply says that a risk is ***lowered***.
(D) There are no conditions noted here as being sufficient or necessary for a result.
(E) The sources used as evidence here are not identified, so we cannot make any calls on whether they are well-informed.

Best Answer: (A)

22. **Question Type:** Inference

(A) While we do know that isolation makes it ***less*** likely that resident participation will elicit a positive official response, we only know that without such isolation politicians would be ***more*** likely to provide such a response. Not that this would be 'likely' overall.
(B) We don't know anything about what 'should' be done – perhaps it's better that resident participation in politics be discouraged?
(C) We have no information in the stimulus to be able to say that any particular factor is ***most*** important. We only have a factor that ***influences*** participation (but we don't know that it's the ***greatest*** influence).
(D) Yes – we do know that a lack of thorough political coverage is what causes isolation, which is one source of discouragement of participation. Hence, we do have reason to believe that providing thorough coverage would remove one cause of such isolation (as a result reduce it), which would reduce one cause of resident discouragement.
(E) We don't know that a lack of discouragement would ***cause*** politicians to be less isolated. If anything, it seems that a lack of isolation would cause less discouragement. This tries to play off the idea of a contrapositive, but then the idea of 'cause' should be left out (to say that if residents are not discouraged, then politicians aren't isolated would have some merit to it).

Best Answer: (D)

23. **Question Type:** Sufficient Assumption

Conclusion: Actions that would be reasonably expected to leave people's well-being unchanged are 'right'.

Reasoning: If something increases well-being, then it's morally right. If, and only if, something reduces well-being, then it's morally wrong.

Flaw: The premises don't actually show that something that leaves well-being unchanged is morally right. If anything, it only shows that something that leaves well-being unchanged is ***not*** wrong (because 'morally wrong' actions ***require*** reduction of well-being). If we knew that something that is not wrong was necessarily right, then this could work.

Diagrammed:

IncreaseWellBeing ⟶ MorallyRight
~MorallyRight ⟶ ~IncreaseWellBeing

DecreaseWellBeing $\longleftrightarrow$ MorallyWrong
   ~MorallyWrong $\longleftrightarrow$ ~DecreaseWellBeing

(A) This doesn't prove that actions that don't do anything are 'right'.

(B) Touches on the right idea, but this doesn't prove that if it's not wrong, that it must be right.

(C) This works – as noted above, the argument provides evidence to show that an action that does nothing is not wrong, so if we know that actions that are not wrong are necessarily right, then the argument works.

(D) Whether or not such actions actually exist does nothing to show that such actions are 'right'.

(E) This doesn't show that actions that **don't** have **any** consequences are necessarily right.

Best Answer: (C)

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

Conclusion: Designer interaction with consumers is superior to survey data.

Reasoning: Survey data may tell why a feature wasn't liked, but it will not explain how to improve it.

Flaw: Do we know that designers **need** consumer input on how things should be done? What if they only need them to tell them what's wrong, while their input on improvements is useless?

(A) This works. The argument does conform to the idea that consumer input can help. If it couldn't, then the argument wouldn't be providing any substantive reason for why consumer interaction is superior to survey data.

(B) The argument is trying to show that designer interaction is **better** than surveys – we don't need to assume that companies actually conduct extensive surveys.

(C) This isn't necessary – even if they aim to appeal to the mass market, the argument could still hold.

(D) We don't have to go as far as saying that features will be unappealing – just that consumers might be able to help make features **more** appealing.

(E) We don't have to assume anything about which parts are being affected.

Best Answer: (A)

25. **Question Type:** Paradox

Discrepancy: While the academy (which was a major sponsor of both painting and sculpture) discouraged innovation in the arts, painting showed significant innovation while sculpture did not.

(A) This doesn't necessarily explain why the painting had more innovation if the academy (the source of the funding) discouraged it.

(B) Similar issue as with (A) – while this showed a discrepancy in funding, it doesn't explain why there was innovation if the sponsor of the funding discouraged innovation.

(C) This works – this showed that there were far more unsponsored paintings than unsponsored sculpture that wouldn't have been under the influence of the academy that discouraged innovation.

(D) This doesn't show why there was innovation in one but not the other.

(E) This shows both arts are in the same boat – it doesn't explain why painting showed innovation while sculpture did not.

Best Answer: (C)