Designed and developed by:

Sandeep Gupta – Director, Ivy-GMAT

+91-97395-61394 (Call b/w Mon and Fri)
sandeepgupta01@gmail.com

Address: # 24, 2nd floor, above BATA Showroom,
Near Sukh Sagar Restaurant, Titan Eye-Plus Road
(Opp IIPM), 5th Block, Koramangala…
PINNACLE office

CR

Conclusion

1.
To make a valid assertion from the information in the argument, we can only rely on the facts that we are given: 1) A study found that middle-aged white Americans are sicker than middle-aged white Britons, 2) the researchers eliminated the lifestyle differences of diet, exercise, smoking, and drinking as causes of the health difference, and 3) average health care spending per person is higher in the United States than in Britain. If any additional information is needed in order to support an assertion, then it is not a valid conclusion.

Be careful to avoid making unintentional assumptions! The health care costs given in the argument are the average costs per person per year in each nation, yet the study only looked at the health of middle-aged white people. It is unclear exactly what amount of money is spent on health care for the age group and race studied. For example, the average health care spending in the United States may include dramatically higher costs for care of premature infants, so it is possible that health care expenditures for the middle-aged white Americans in the study are actually the same as, or even less than, expenditures for their British counterparts.

(A) Reducing health care spending in the United States by 50% would equalize the amount of money spent on health care in the United States and Britain. There is an assumption made that there is some reason to do so, perhaps in the hopes that American health will consequently improve to the level of British health, or perhaps simply to save money. The facts given in the argument are not sufficient to support this assertion.

(B) Although the recent study indicated that the middle-aged white Americans have poorer health than their British counterparts despite apparently more expensive health care, there is no evidence that the cost of the health care is a cause of health or sickness for either group.

(C) It is possible that health care in the United States costs more because the money is being used ineffectively. This assertion is one potential explanation for the poorer health of the Americans in the study, despite apparently higher spending on health care. However, more information is needed to conclusively make this assertion, such as proving that money is currently being wasted, and on what. Additionally, it is unclear exactly how much money is spent on health care for the age group and race studied, so the poorer health of the American patients does not necessarily tell us anything about the effectiveness of the money spent on them.

(D) As mentioned previously, the health care costs given in the argument are the average per person per year in each nation, yet the study only looked at the health of middle-aged white people. It is unclear exactly what amount of money is spent on health care for the age group and race studied. While it is reasonable to wonder whether the average health care spending for middle-aged white Americans is less than the average health care spending for Americans in general, we don't have enough information to conclude that this is the case.

(E) CORRECT. The study revealed some differences in the health of middle-aged white Americans and middle-aged white Britons. The study did not indicate the reason for the difference. However, the researchers did eliminate the lifestyle differences of diet, exercise, smoking, and drinking as causes of the health difference. Thus, it can be conclusively asserted that something else (other than diet, exercise, smoking and drinking) must account for the difference in health for the two groups in the study.

2.
This argument essentially asks us to find a conclusion that must be true based on the facts presented by the spokesperson. When you analyze the answer choices, remember that the correct answer to questions of this type must be the claim that does not require any additional assumptions.

(A) This statement does not have to be true, since the female voters represented only slightly more than a half of the electorate. For example, the mayor would be able to receive 2/3 of all voters if he received all the votes of the male voters (i.e. 45%) and just some substantial portion of the female voters (say 40%).

(B) This statement does not have to be true. For example, the incumbent mayor could have received the vast majority of the male votes and a smaller share of the female votes.

(C) Since the incumbent mayor received 2/3 (i.e. approximately 67%) of the votes, the maximum number of votes received by any other candidate could have been around 33%, which is still substantially less than the number of votes received by the incumbent mayor. Since we do not know how many candidates participated in the election and the proportion of votes received by each candidate, we cannot conclude that no other candidate received more than 30% of all votes.

(D) CORRECT. Since 55% of the voters were female, the remaining 45% were male; also, since all the voters were between ages 18 and 70, no voters, either

male or female, could have been 75 years old. This answer choice does not require any additional assumptions and therefore must be true.

(E) Even if the proportion of the male and female voters remains the same, their preferences may change substantially and there is no guarantee that they will vote in the same way in the next election.

3.
When drawing a conclusion, we must remember not to conclude too much; i.e., do not make unwarranted assumptions. In this case, we are looking for the conclusion that must be true based only on the information given in the passage without requiring any additional assumptions.

(A) While we are given information about the percentage of the total budgets spent on marketing, we have no information about the actual amount of money either company spent on marketing.

(B) While we are given information about the percentage of the total budgets spent on production, we have no information about the actual amount of money either company spent on production.

(C) Because we have no information on the sale price per copy for either company, we cannot make any conclusions about the revenue generated by either company. It's very possible that Making Hits sold its copies at twice the price of the Song Factory copies, in which case the revenues for the two companies would be the same.

(D) CORRECT. Since Making Hits spent 40% of its budget on production, 30% on marketing, and the rest on overhead, we can conclude that Making Hits spent 30% of its budget on overhead. Since the Song Factory spent 20% of its budget on production and 60% on marketing, and met its budget, it could not have spent more than 20% on overhead. Therefore, Making Hits spent a higher percentage of its budget on overhead than did the Song Factory.

(E) A valid conclusion must be true. While it is possible, and perhaps even likely, that the percentage of the budget spent on marketing was a driver of sales, this is not necessarily true; there are many other factors that could have affected sales. For example, it is possible that the Song Factory sold more copies of its 10 albums because the music was better than the music produced at Making Hits, and not because the Song Factory spent a higher percentage on marketing.

4.
Only two pieces of information are given about Airline A's standing room "seats" proposal. First, that it is geared toward increasing revenue in order to counteract

declining profits. And second, that, since the proposal relates to passenger safety, it must be approved by the Federal Aviation Administration. Airline A must have concluded that the cost of implementation of its proposal is less than the revenue that the new seats will generate.
(A) CORRECT. Since Airline A knows that its proposal would have to comply with safety standards, it must have concluded that the cost of compliance is worth it. In other words, the only way for Airline A to achieve its goal of increasing profit is to implement ideas that will generate more revenue than they cost. Airline A must therefore have concluded that the standing room only "seats" meet this criteria.

(B) The statements in the passage imply nothing about whether Airline A believes that the Federal Aviation Administration will approve the proposal. Although Airline A must believe that the proposal has a chance of being approved (otherwise it's unlikely to have proposed it), the airline might have proposed its specific plan knowing that it might not be approved or, that it might have to be changed in certain ways.

(C) Airline A's goal is simply to "counteract declining profits" caused by the high cost of jet fuel. This does not mean, however, that the proposal must fully mitigate the cost of jet fuel. As long as the proposal increases revenue without a corollary increase in cost, it will in some way (even if it's relatively small) counteract declining profits.

(D) The passage does not mention any other ways that Airline A has considered increasing revenue. Therefore, it is impossible to conclude anything about Airline A's perception of its standing room "seats" proposal to any other ideas.

(E) The statements in the passage do not address Airline A's view regarding the safety of the standing room only "seats". It is very possible that Airline A views its proposal as safe and sees no conflict between passenger safety and increasing revenue, much less that it has made any determination about the relative importance of these two issues.

5.
The argument above provides a detailed description of a research study. Note that the question stem contains only factual information and does not have a conclusion. Our task is to provide the most probable conclusion for this argument, i.e. the one that must be true based on the provided evidence. When looking for the most probable conclusion, remember not to make any additional assumptions and choose the answer that directly follows from premises stated in the argument.

(A) This statement does not have to be true. The argument provides evidence about the emotional progress of only 30 participants. The fact that we have no information about the vast majority of participants demonstrates that the statement in this answer choice cannot be justified.

(B) While each participant did spend at least 2 hours each week attending the concerts, there is no information in the argument that would suggest that the students reduced their study time. For example, they could have attended the concerts in their free time.

(C) This statement does not have to be true, since we have no information about the emotional progress of the vast majority of study participants. Note that even if the study did demonstrate a positive effect of classical music on the majority of participants, it would still be uncertain whether this effect would hold for the majority of young adults.

(D) CORRECT. We know that 20 students attended the fewest number of concerts, 10 students attended the greatest number of concerts, and the remaining 170 students attended some other number of concerts in between. The term 'greatest' indicates that there are at least 3 different numbers of concerts attended by the students (as opposed to 'greater' to distinguish between 2 different numbers). Since each of the participants attended at least one concert per week during the 12 weeks of the experiment, all of the study participants must have attended at least 12 concerts. Even if the 20 bottom students attended the smallest possible number of concerts (i.e. 12), it must be the case that the next 170 students in the middle attended at least one more (i.e. at least 13 concerts) and the 10 most active participants must have attended at least one more than the middle group, i.e at least 14 concerts. Thus, it must be true that the 10 most active participants (i.e. more than 6 participants) attended at least 14 concerts, as stated in this answer choice. Note that if the students attended more concerts than the minimum requirement, the number of students with at least 14 concerts attended will be even greater, still validating the accuracy of this statement.

(E) The argument does not explicitly state whether the participants received free access to the concerts or had to pay for admission (e.g. they could have just received a discount). In addition, no information is provided about the motivation of study participants.

6.
This argument concludes that spelling bees should only use anglicized words in the dictionary because spelling should be the only criterion that determines the winner. To make this point, the author must believe that correctly spelling

spoken foreign words requires knowledge of the phonetics of the particular language.

(A) This choice does not have to follow from the argument, as a correct inference must. The winner did not have to know how to spell most of the anglicized words in the dictionary, only the ones that she was given.

(B) This choice does not have to follow from the argument, as a correct inference must. All contestants don't have to find foreign words more difficult. For instance, the child of German parents might find it easy to spell Ursprache.

(C) This choice does not have to follow from the argument, as a correct inference must. In fact, it must follow from the argument that contestants should be judged only by their spelling ability, not by their facility with "all aspects of language."

(D) CORRECT. The author wants to exclude foreign words because spelling bees should be based only on spelling ability, not on "knowledge of linguistics and international phonetics." Thus, the author must believe that spelling foreign words correctly when they are spoken requires knowledge of the phonetics of the foreign language in question.

(E) This choice does not have to follow from the argument, as a correct inference must. While this might be factually true, no where in the argument is there any comparison between the number of words in English and that of any other language.

7.

This argument includes statistics about the relative increases in the consumption of fish and poultry in Eastland, respectively, as well as the population growth in Eastland during the same period. Because we are given only information about the percentage increases of fish consumption, poultry consumption, and the population of Eastland, we should look for an inference that is closely tied to percentage information and not actual numbers.

(A) Though poultry consumption increased at a higher rate than fish consumption, there is no way to determine if this is due to the dietary habits of the new arrivals in Eastland. It is also possible that consumption among long-time residents of Eastland increased at a dramatically higher rate.

(B) We are given information about the relative rate of increases, not the actual amounts of poultry or fish consumed. As a result, there is no way to know if this statement is true.

(C) CORRECT. As we are given that the population of Eastland increased by 6 percent, and the total consumption of poultry increased by 9 percent in the same period, then it must be the case that the per capita, or average, consumption of poultry rose from 2000 to 2005. For example, let's say that the population of Eastland increased by 6 percent from 1000 to 1060 people, while the consumption of poultry increased by 9 percent from 100 to 109 units. The per capita consumption in 2000 would have been exactly 100/1000 while the per capita consumption in 2005 would have been 109/1060, a slightly greater value.

(D) There is no way to determine if fish or poultry comprised a regular portion of the diets of "a significant proportion" of Eastland residents, as the cited percentage increases may have come from very low original amounts.

(E) There are many variables in determining the profits of wholesale distributors aside from the total consumption of poultry or fish. For example, labor costs, transport, and procurement could all impact the profitability of distribution companies. It is not possible to determine that the profitability of these companies maintained the same relationship as the total consumption of poultry and fish.

8.
Since the passage contains information about both TopNotch High School graduates and those accepted to Ivy League universities, a valid conclusion must contain information that does not contradict either situation. In addition, a valid conclusion must remain true for every possible situation compatible with the passage. In contrast, a conclusion can be shown to be invalid if it can be demonstrated that a situation can occur that does not contradict the passage, but contradicts the given conclusion. Be careful not to make unwarranted assumptions: for example, a person who attends a school does not necessary graduate from it, a person who graduates from high school does not necessarily apply to a university, and a person who is accepted to a university does not necessarily attend it.

(A) The passage states that every student with an IQ of 150 who applies to the Ivy League will be accepted by at least one of the universities. However, it is possible that a graduate of TopNotch High with an IQ of 150 did not apply, and thereby was not accepted, to any of the schools. Hence, this conclusion is not valid.

(B) The passage states that every graduate of TopNotch High has an IQ of over 120. The conclusion only states that the student is a high school graduate and that he has an IQ of less than 120. It does NOT state that he or she was a graduate of TopNotch High. It is possible, however, that after attending

TopNotch High for a period of time, he or she graduated from another high school. If this is the case, the situation does not contradict the passage, but contradicts the conclusion (he or she was a student at TopNotch High). Hence, this conclusion is not valid.

(C) CORRECT. Nothing in the passage precludes a person who is a graduate of TopNotch High from having an IQ of 130 and from attending an Ivy League university. Neither does anything in the passage preclude a person who has an IQ of 130 and is attending an Ivy League school to have graduated from TopNotch High. Therefore, it is possible for both situations to exist simultaneously, so the conclusion is valid.

(D) The conclusion states that most, but not necessarily all, of the graduates from TopNotch High with IQ of 120 who apply to the Ivy League are accepted by at least one of the school. The conclusion, however, does not state positively that any of the TopNotch High graduates had an IQ of over 150. Hence, even if it is unlikely, it is possible that none of the TopNotch graduates had IQ of over 150, and, of the remaining graduates who applied to the Ivy League, none were accepted to an Ivy League university. This conclusion is thereby not valid.

(E) The passage states that any student with an IQ of 150 who applies to one or more Ivy League universities will be accepted to at least one of them. It is possible, however, that some of those who had applied and been accepted to an Ivy League university chose not to attend. Hence, this conclusion is not valid.

9.
This passage relates information from two studies concerning high school seniors: the first discusses the financial responsibilities of high school seniors, while the second explains the coursework in finance taken by typical high school seniors. On the GMAT, a proper response to a draw-a-conclusion question must be directly supported by evidence from the passage.

(A) Although it might be true that schools would be wise to educate students in finance, this is an opinion; it doesn't necessarily need to follow from the given evidence. A conclusion must be directly supported by evidence from the passage without any additional information or assumptions.

(B) The fact that one-third of high school seniors claim "significant financial responsibilities" to their families does not necessarily mean that these same students work "part-time jobs after school." There are many possible ways that these students might earn money for their families. If they do work, they might work on weekends or over the summer, for example.

(C) CORRECT. The first study states that one-third of all high school seniors have significant financial responsibilities to their families. The second study states that 80% of seniors have opened a bank account, and of this 80%, one-third has bounced a check. The number of seniors that has bounced a check (one-third of 80%) is fewer than the number of seniors with significant financial responsibilities to their families (one-third of 100%).

(D) The passage states that certain high school seniors who contribute to the food, shelter, or clothing for themselves or their families rate themselves as having significant financial responsibilities. This does not mean that any high school senior who contributes to these categories has significant financial responsibilities.

(E) The passage states that one-third of high school seniors say that they have "significant financial responsibilities." This in no way indicates that the other two-thirds have "no" responsibilities. Because no information is given about the other two-thirds of the students, a reasoned conclusion cannot be drawn about them.

10.
The analyst presents several points about the business talents of creative professionals. In drawing a conclusion from the analyst's argument, we must be careful to choose a provable claim, whether or not this claim pulls together all the premises. We also must avoid extending the analyst's argument or selecting statements that are too extreme. Finally, we must not allow this process to be clouded by reactions to the content of the argument; whether or not we agree with the premises, we have to find a provable conclusion.

(A) This choice takes the passage's claim that creativity and business acumen rarely go hand in hand to an extreme. The analyst does not assert that absolutely no successful people are creative.

(B) CORRECT. The passage states that most creative types are less skilled in business than the average white-collar worker who does not work in a creative field. This implies that some creative types are not less skilled than the average white-collar worker who is not creative.

(C) This choice again takes the passage's claim that creativity and business acumen rarely go hand in hand to an extreme. Creativity and business acumen are not mutually exclusive.

(D) The passage does not say that all white-collar workers are successful, nor does it say that no creative professionals are successful.

(E) The passage makes a distinction between creative talent and business acumen. This does not mean that there are no aspects of business that fall under the realm of creativity.

11.
The passage states that health savings accounts will undermine the health of the public because people will not use them for preventive care. Furthermore, people who cannot afford them will not be able to receive even basic care such as vaccinations. The correct answer will be a conclusion that can be supported solely by the facts stated in the argument, without relying on outside information or additional assumptions.

(A) The argument does not provide enough information to conclude that wealthy individuals will not be affected negatively by health savings accounts. The argument never specifically mentions wealthy individuals, just people in general.

(B) The argument does not provide enough information to conclude that private health insurance will no longer be available. In fact, private health insurance is never mentioned.

(C) The author argues that people will not get regular preventive examinations, and will therefore not receive medical attention until diseases are advanced. This logic, even if true, does not allow us to conclude that most diseases are detected during regular preventive examinations.

(D) CORRECT. The argument states that "poor people, who will not be able to afford health savings accounts, will no longer receive vaccinations". Based on this statement, it is reasonable to conclude that some people without health savings are likely to contract infectious diseases.

(E) The argument does not provide enough information to conclude that the causal relationship between an individual's health and that person’s medical care has been adequately documented. In fact, neither the link between medical care and health nor documentation of such a link is directly discussed.

12.
This argument provides that albinos, or people whose bodies do not produce melanin, are unusually susceptible to solar exposure. This suggests a connection between the production of melanin in humans and protection from sunburn and

other sun-related ailments; we should look for a conclusion that draws this connection.

(A) The argument does not indicate that people born with albinism somehow develop other natural defenses against sun-related health issues.

(B) This conclusion is too extreme to be supported by the argument; nothing in the argument suggests that humans whose bodies produce high levels of melanin can "easily ignore" sunburn or other sun-related health issues.

(C) There is no indication in the argument that sunburn reduces melanin production.

(D) CORRECT. The argument does strongly suggest that melanin plays some role in protecting the skin from developing sunburn and other sun-related ailments, since albinos do not produce melanin and are unusually susceptible to sun-related ailments.

(E) It is not suggested in the argument that an albino person could not protect him or herself from solar exposure through artificial means, e.g. wearing protective clothing or powerful sunblock.

13.
The text tells us that celiac disease results when the body mistakes gluten for a harmful pathogen, causing damage to the intestine. We are also told that gluten is a protein found in certain grains, and that people suffering from celiac disease must eliminate it from their diets. Finally, we are told that symptoms of the disease include cramps, bloating, and anemia. We need to find an answer choice that is inferable from these facts alone.

(A) Anemia is just one of several symptoms of the disease. We do not know whether everyone who has the disease will also develop anemia.

(B) We do not know whether eliminating gluten will cure the disease, only that people with the disease must not eat gluten. Perhaps the disease will exist anyway in a latent form.

(C) We do not know whether the symptoms mentioned are also symptoms of other conditions.

(D) We do not know whether gluten is found only in grains. It may exist in other foods as well.

(E) CORRECT. If the body mistakes gluten for a harmful pathogen, then it must be true that the body cannot always recognize harmless substances.

14.
When drawing a conclusion, we must remember not to conclude too much. In this case, we are looking for the conclusion that comes directly from the information given without requiring any additional assumptions.

(A) CORRECT. In general, Mayville experiences a greater number of delays per 100 flights than Newcomb does. However, when delays caused by bad weather are discounted, Mayville has 5 fewer delays per 100 flights. Since the two airports run the same number of flights, bad weather must cause a greater number of delays at Mayville Airport than at Newcomb Airport.

(B) While we can conclude that Mayville experiences a greater number of delays caused by bad weather, we cannot make any conclusions about the relative weather conditions at either airport. It is very possible that the airports experience the same weather, but that for some reason Newcomb's airport is better equipped than Mayville's airport to handle inclement weather (e.g. the fleet of aircraft at Newcomb is better suited to bad weather, or the air traffic controllers at Newcomb are more competent, etc.). Some other factor could cause the discrepancy in weather related delays aside from the weather conditions being different.

(C) While we can conclude that Mayville experiences a greater number of delays caused by bad weather, we have no information about delays caused by mechanical problems. There may be other reasons aside from either bad weather or mechanical problems that account for departure delays (e.g. human error).

(D) We have no information regarding the quality of airplane fleets at either airport.

(E) The argument gives no information about arrival delays.

15.
The cost of flour from the local mill is higher than the cost of the flour from the out-of-state mill. However, when purchasing from the out-of-state mill, Barry's Bagels must pay shipping and handling fees that would not apply to a purchase from the local mill. Purchasing the flour from the out-of-state mill will only be cheaper if those shipping and handling fees are smaller than the difference in the flour costs of the two suppliers. Also, we cannot assume any additional

information or move beyond the scope of the given premises in order to find the conclusion.

(A) Lower production costs could explain the lower price of the flour from Isadore's Interstate Mill, but there may be a variety of other reasons. We cannot state this conclusively.

(B) It is possible that the number of local flour mill jobs would be decreased, but no evidence in the passage leads to that conclusion.

(C) CORRECT. This statement properly identifies the point that, for ordering from an out-of-state mill to be less expensive, the shipping and handling fees must be less than the difference in the flour costs of the two suppliers. Say, for example, that a batch of flour costs $100 from Larry's Local Mill. The passage tells us that the same batch would cost $90 from Isadore's Interstate Mill, yet when purchasing from Isadore's, shipping and handling fees would apply. We are told that Isadore's total cost is cheaper than Larry's, so mathematically that is: $90 + Shipping & Handling < $100, which means that Shipping & Handling < $10 = 10% of the cost of flour from Larry's.

(D) If shipping and handling fees were more than 10 percent, purchasing from the out-of-state supplier would be more expensive, not less.

(E) Higher efficiency could explain the lower price of the flour from Isadore's Interstate Mill, but there may be a variety of other reasons. We cannot state this conclusively.

16.
The text tells us that the revenues for independent movies for the first have of this year are already greater than the total revenues for independent movies for all of last year. We are then asked to draw a conclusion based on that information.

(A) There is no way to predict box-office receipts for the year.

(B) There is no way to know how many movies were released in the first half of last year.

(C) We cannot infer that the price of a movie ticket has not increased.

(D) CORRECT. The average revenue per film = total revenues ÷ number of films.

Revenues: We are told that the revenues for independent movies for the first half of this year (say $1000) are already greater than the total revenues for all of last year (say $999).

Number of Films: We know that more independent movies were released last year (say 10) than in the first half of this year (say 9).

We can clearly see that the average revenues per film for independent movies in the first half of this year ($1000 ÷ 9) are greater than the average revenues for all independent movies released last year ($999 ÷ 10).

(E) We cannot infer that more people have seen movies in the first half of this year, even though revenues are higher. It could be, for example, that the same number of people saw movies but ticket prices have risen sharply.

17.
The passage presents information about what office employees who work 8-hour days and who have worked at home told a certain magazine. The first piece of information is about what some of those office employees actually do: 25 percent of office employees actually work less than an hour on days that they work at home. The second piece of information is about what some of those office employees believe: 90 percent believe that they are more productive working at home than at the office. A proper GMAT conclusion must be provable by those two pieces of information.

(A) The passage only provides information about the working hours of 25 percent of the office employees. The passage does not provide any information regarding the working hours of the other 75 percent, hence, it is not possible to conclude anything about the office employees on average. For example, it is possible that the other 75 percent of the office employees work 14 hour days when working from home. It is also possible that they work 6 hour days when working from home.

(B) The passage provides no information about the actual productivity of any of the office employees. It only provides information about what the office employees believe about their productivity.

(C) CORRECT. 90 percent of the office employees believe that they are more productive at home than at work. At the same time, 25 percent of the office employees actually work fewer hours when they work at home than when they work at the office. The overlap between these two groups is at least 15 percent of all of the office employees. This group of employees believes that they are more productive at home than at work and yet this group actually works fewer

hours at home than at work. Thus, these employees must not define productivity exclusively in terms of the number of hours worked.

(D) The passage discusses the actual work hours of 25 percent of the office employees. Then it describes the beliefs of 90 percent of office employees regarding their productivity. First, there is no necessary link between an individual's beliefs about his or her productivity and that individual's actual productivity; hence, no conclusion can be made regarding actual productivity from the information about beliefs. Second, the number of hours worked alone is not an indication of productivity; it is possible, for example, that an employee who works 1 hour is more productive in terms of work done per hour than when he works 8 hours and yet that employee might still accomplish more total work when working 8 hours. Therefore, it is not possible to conclude anything regarding productivity for any of the office employees.

(E) The fact that 90 percent of the office employees believe they are more productive at home than at work does not necessarily contradict the fact that 25 percent of the office employees work fewer hours at home than at work. It is possible to work fewer hours and still be more productive.

18.
The passage gives information about Monday's business at two lemonade stores. The question asks us to make an assertion, or conclusion, based on the information provided. The answer choice that requires no additional assumptions will be the correct answer.

(A) This conclusion is incorrect. If Daisy's sells its lemonade at a lower price than the Lemon Shack, and if the stores reported identical revenues for the day, then Daisy's sold more cups of lemonade than the Lemon Shack, not less.

(B) We know nothing about the quality of lemonade at either store.

(C) CORRECT. If the stores reported identical revenues and identical profits, the profit equation Profit = Revenue – Cost tells us that their costs must have been identical as well.

(D) We know nothing about the preferences of lemonade consumers.

(E) We know nothing about the market conditions surrounding either store. Therefore, we cannot make any conclusions about what might happen if the Lemon Shack were to lower its prices. It is very possible that the Lemon Shack could in fact sell many more cups per day at lower prices, and it's possible this could lead to higher revenues.

19.
In this argument, a cause-and-effect relationship is presented between American scientists signing long-term contracts with foreign companies and the government's restrictions on stem cell research. This cause-and-effect relationship is the key to the correct answer.

(A) CORRECT. If American scientists signed the contracts because of U.S. restrictions, we can infer that the new companies they signed with were under fewer restrictions. Therefore, at least some foreign companies must work under fewer restrictions than some American companies do.

(B) While it is possible that once the restrictions are banned American companies will want to hire more scientists and will seek them overseas, there are too many unknowns between the premises we have have been given and this conclusion. It is doubtful that an increase in the number of immigrating stem cell research scientists would have a significant impact on the number of foreign professionals overall.

(C) This passage is about government restrictions; we are given no information about financial backing. Beware of extreme statements such as in all parts of the world.

(D) We are not given any information regarding America's current or future position in terms of stem cell research. Though restrictions and scientists switching companies are two issues related to a company's prosperity, we are given no information about how these directly affect America's position.

(E) We are not given any information that will help us predict the behavior of the scientists in the future.

20.
The argument presents data about deaths due to medical errors. A campaign designed to reduce these deaths due to lethal errors does indeed reduce the number of deaths over an 18-month period. No conclusion is presented in the body of the argument; in fact, the question asks us to "infer" or draw a conclusion from the given statements. The conclusion, therefore, will be found in the answer choices; our task is to find a statement that follows directly from the given statements without introducing any new information or assumptions.

(A) While this might generally be true in the real world, the given information does not address whether doctors and nurses are too careless in conducting their jobs.

(B) While the campaign did save a large number of people, we cannot say that every single person who would have died was saved; this answer choice is too extreme.

(C) The argument does not provide information to make predictions about the future; in addition, this answer choice is extreme. Common sense tells us that we cannot prevent every single medical error in the future.

(D) CORRECT. This statement can be inferred from the original argument. If the campaign saved the lives of people who otherwise would have died of medical error, then the absence of the campaign would have meant that many of those people might not have been saved. Notice that this answer choice is more of a restatement of the given information, rather than what we would consider a true conclusion in the real world; this is typical of correct answer choices on GMAT inference questions.

(E) While this sounds like a good idea, given the evidence, the argument does not provide information to make predictions about the future.

21.
According to the statements, the companies that own private aircraft for business use are fully in compliance with the relevant law, which is summarized. A correct inference will be a statement that must follow from at least part of the premises given.

(A) It does not have to be true that the law costs the businesses money, as no evidence about the relative costs is given.

(B) This choice is an irrelevant comparison, as the preferences of the executives are not the concern of the statements.

(C) This choice does not have to follow, as there is no information given about the travel arrangements made by large companies. The statements only indicate that the majority of private planes are not owned by large companies.

(D) There is no information given about the travel arrangements of upper level executives and no reason to believe that those with the companies discussed do not comply with their companies' policies.

(E) CORRECT. If, as the statements indicate, the companies are in full compliance with this law, it must be true that the executives following their guidelines also are.

22.

Antoine is alarmed that the number of children on antipsychotic medication has increased by 73 percent. Lucy begins her reply with "but," indicating that she is about to counter either Antoine's facts or his alarm; she accepts his facts but addresses his alarm. If the number of children taking antipsychotic medication is still within the normal range, the rate at which the total number has increased is not cause for alarm. Lucy shows that even though the total number of children on such medications has increased, children still take antipsychotic drugs at an even lower rate than do adults, and the current adult rate is considered normal.

(A) Lucy's argument is that the rate of adults taking antipsychotic drugs is normal, and the rate of children taking such drugs is even lower. Thus, the argument does not lead to the conclusion that the current level of antipsychotic drug use in children is abnormally high.

(B) CORRECT. This statement properly identifies the conclusion to which Lucy's argument is leading.

(C) Lucy does not dispute Antoine's statistics, and her argument is designed to make a conclusion about their interpretation, not about their accuracy. Also, it is mathematically possible for the increase in the use of such medicines to be 73 percent, as Antoine cites. An increase from 3.8 to 6.6 out of every 1,000 represents an approximately 73 percent increase.

(D) There is no information about what might happen in the future, so no conclusion can be made about whether the use of antipsychotic medicines by children will increase or decrease, or at what rate that might happen.

(E) No information in Lucy's argument supports the conclusion that the rate of antipsychotic drug use in children is higher than that reported.

23.
The statements indicate that DNA analysis has become more sophisticated and thus produced better results. The passage comments on a "new analysis" and "a very startling new theory" about the origins of modern man and chimpanzees. An appropriate inference would focus on what must follow from those statements.

(A) This choice does not have to follow from the information given, as GMAT inferences must. While the hybridized species must have had positive attributes, it certainly did not have to combine the best of pre-humans and chimpanzees.

(B) This choice does not have to follow. Politics and religion are outside the scope of this argument and thus the existence of such pressures is not a given.

(C) This choice is too extreme to have to follow from the statements. We don't know any specifics about the capacity or direction of the research.

(D) CORRECT. The passage states that a "new analysis of the genetic links between early humans and chimpanzees has led to a hypothesis that the two species diverged more recently than previous estimates indicated." The fact that this is a "new" analysis suggests that prior analysis had already established the links; also, since the new theory has altered the time frame for the divergence, it follows that some genetic link and subsequent divergence was already ascertained.

(E) This choice does not have to follow from the information given. Nothing is said about the differences between human and chimpanzee DNA. We do not know if the differences involve complexity or something else, such as the composition of the DNA.

24.
The passage provides two pieces of statistical information about the restaurant business in the United States. Both pieces of information are framed in terms of percentages. To draw a proper GMAT conclusion, we will need to find an answer choice that is directly in line with the statistical data cited in the passage.

(A) The passage makes no connection between the availability of energy-efficient equipment and a 30 percent reduction in energy costs.

(B) The passage provides no information about the annual energy costs of any industry except the restaurant business. While the passage states that the restaurant business wastes more energy than any other industry in the United States, it makes no claim about the amount spent on energy by the restaurant industry relative to other industries.

(C) The difference in relative energy savings accrued by a small restaurant as compared to that of a large restaurant is not addressed in the passage.

(D) According to the passage, $8 billion (80% of the $10 billion spent on energy each year) is squandered on inefficient equipment. This leaves $2 billion unaccounted for in the passage. This does not necessarily mean that some of this $2 billion is not squandered; it simply means that it is not squandered on inefficient equipment. It might, for example, be squandered on employees who forget to turn off the lights after closing.

(E) CORRECT. Since the waste attributed to the use of inefficient equipment accounts for 80% of the $10 billion spent on energy each year, savings from

other sources could account for, at most, 20% of the $10 billion spent. Thus, the replacement of inefficient equipment represents – by far – the largest potential source of energy savings.

25.
The government is attempting to limit the release of carcinogens by chemical plants, but it is permitting the chemical industry itself to monitor the plan's implementation. The author believes this to be an unacceptable proposal, since the past behavior of certain chemical companies indicates that they will increase their emissions of toxic carcinogens.

(A) The author states only that certain chemical companies cannot be trusted; saying that no company can be trusted is too extreme.

(B) The argument states that the chemical industry does release certain carcinogens but does not suggest that it releases the majority of carcinogens.

(C) CORRECT. This statement properly identifies the author's argument that the net result of the plan will be an increase of toxic carcinogens into the air.

(D) The argument is about a certain proposal in a specific industry; it is too far reaching to argue that the author believes the government should always monitor all of its proposals.

(E) This is not the point of the argument. Moreover, it is never suggested that these chemicals are more hazardous than other cancer-causing chemicals.

26.
The oil executives argue that the leases should not be renegotiated because a duly executed contract should be strictly honored. The best answer choice will reflect this argument.

(A) This is a tempting answer because the windfall from the government error is certainly an opportunistic event that is unlike to repeat itself. However, it does not reflect the argument that the oil executives have made justifying their opposition to renegotiating the leases and therefore is not the best answer.

(B) The oil company executives would not agree with this answer choice: should the positions be reversed, they would certainly not want the government to hold them to a contract that contains an error unfavorable to them.

(C) While it is true that the taxpayers' loss is the oil companies' gain, this answer choice does not reflect the argument that the oil executives have made justifying their opposition to renegotiating the leases and therefore is not the best answer.

(D) CORRECT. The executives argue that the government should strictly honor the agreement already in place; i.e., they should not "change the rules in the middle of the game."

(E) While the unexpected windfall may indeed be "sweet" to the oil executives, getting "revenge" requires that some prior injustice was inflicted by the government upon the oil companies. There is nothing in the passage that indicates or implies such.

27.
The argument first presents a rule (only students with at least a 2.5 GPA can play school sports) and then a fact (Amy is on a school sports team). It then draws a logical conclusion: Amy must have at least a 2.5 GPA. Questions that ask us to summarize the main point are asking us to restate the conclusion.

(A) Although this statement is true, it is not the main point of the argument. The main point is the conclusion that Amy must have at least a 2.5 GPA.

(B) Amy's tennis skills are irrelevant to the entire argument.

(C) This choice states an opinion about the presented rule; it does not restate the conclusion.

(D) CORRECT. This choice restates the conclusion that Amy must have earned at least a 2.5 GPA.

(E) Amy could still be captain if her GPA were "lower," as long as her GPA didn't drop below a 2.5.

28.
The tension indicated in the argument is that between the benefits of focusing on one primary product or service and the inherent risks of relying too heavily on an undiversified income stream. The correct answer choice must exemplify this tension.

(A) CORRECT. This example correctly identifies a company with a clear, narrow focus – a local messenger service - that enjoys a competitive advantage because of its reputation for speedy deliveries. At the same time, its undiversified income

stream becomes problematic when a factor outside of its control – the relocation of local businesses out of state – forces it to lay off employees.

(B) This example does not specify any particular focus of the advertising agency nor does it demonstrate any major cash flow consequences due to the loss of the client.

(C) In contrast to the predicament described in the passage, this example describes a company that is interested in diversifying its holdings.

(D) The fact that the construction company is attempting to increase its profits does not illustrate the tension described in the passage.

(E) Though the specialty sandwich store that uses local ingredients might be called a very focused company, there is no evidence presented that this focus has had any adverse effect on cash flow.

29.
The passage provides some specific information about the effects of calorie restriction. In rats and mice, this diet is known to prolong life by preventing diseases. In a study of moderately overweight humans, insulin levels and body temperature decreased. A proper GMAT inference will be based on the specific information provided, without relying on any significant assumptions.

(A) The passage states that calorie restriction in mice and rats prolongs life by preventing diseases. The human study had much more limited findings – that calorie restriction in moderately overweight humans decreases insulin levels and body temperature. While these traits are known to be associated with longevity, there are no data that link calorie restriction itself to prolonged human life. Additionally, calorie restriction may have other unstated effects, unrelated to longevity. There is no information in the passage that indicates whether these effects are the same in humans as in mice and rats. Finally, the use of the term "humans" is far too general; the study dealt only with moderately overweight humans and so any inference would need to be restricted to this subset of individuals.

(B) While the passage indicates that certain traits known to be associated with longevity are found in moderately overweight humans who reduce their calorie intake, this is far removed from the conclusion that calorie intake will actually increase a human's lifespan. Additionally, the use of the term "humans" is far too general; the study dealt only with moderately overweight humans and so any inference would need to be restricted to this subset of individuals.

(C) The study observed that individuals with the greatest percentage decrease in their calorie intake demonstrated the greatest decrease in insulin levels and body temperature. This shows a strong correlation between calorie intake and insulin levels. However, this correlation is not necessarily direct. It is possible that this correlation holds, but only up to a point. For example, it might be the case that any reduction in calorie intake over 50 percent does not result in any additional insulin level decreases. Moreover, the passage only draws this correlation for individuals with the greatest percent decrease in calorie intake. It is very possible that individuals with a relatively low decrease in calorie intake exhibit the exact same decrease in insulin levels as individuals with a moderate decrease in calorie intake.

(D) The study makes no reference to the health of individuals who reduce their calorie intake. It tries to draw some connection to the longevity of those individuals, but longevity is not the same as health. An individual could live a very long, unhealthy life.

(E) CORRECT. The passage states that the greatest decrease in insulin levels was observed in individuals with the greatest percentage change in their calorie intake. This means that some individuals in the study reduced their calorie intake by a greater percentage than other individuals in the study. The passage also states that the study participants reduced their individual calorie intakes by "at least 25 percent." Thus, one can safely infer that there were some participants who reduced their calorie intake by more than 25 percent.

30.
The argument explains that the new "Click It or Ticket" law is generating controversy. Under the new law, drivers can be cited for not wearing their seat belts, even in the absence of an additional driving infraction. Any acceptable inference must be directly supported by evidence from the text.

(A) CORRECT. The entire controversy is based on the new law that allows motorists to be cited, even in the absence of an additional infraction. Thus, it follows that prior to the passage of this law, an additional driving infraction must have been necessary in order to stop and cite an individual for not wearing a seat belt.

(B) Search and seizure laws are never mentioned in the text. This answer choice is outside the scope of the argument.

(C) Laws in other states are never mentioned in the text. This answer choice is outside the scope of the argument.

(D) Though the text states that the new regulation might save countless additional lives, the effectiveness of the previous laws are never mentioned.

(E) No preference is stated between law enforcement groups and the citizens' groups. This answer choice is simply an opinion that is unsubstantiated by the text.

31.
We are asked to determine what we can infer based upon the given information; on the GMAT, whatever we infer must be based only upon the argument itself and cannot extend beyond the scope of that argument.

(A) The argument says nothing about requirements in other states; this choice is out of scope.

(B) While it may be illegal for those under 21 to consume alcohol, the argument makes no mention of special rules for this age category. Indeed, the argument says that "hunters" have to sign the pledge, not just "hunters aged 21 and over."

(C) CORRECT. The argument says that the hunter must have completed a safety program within the past five years. If he has not, then he will have to do so before he can be eligible for a permit. (Note that this choice doesn't say he will get a permit if he completes the program again; we don't know what other requirements he may not meet. We only know that he will have to retake the program, at least, before he can become eligible.)

(D) This choice mentions someone who "isn't 18 years old." Someone who isn't 18 can be either younger than 18 or older than 18 and, according to the argument, those older than 18 are eligible for permits if they complete all of the requirements.

(E) While this may be true as a general rule, it is outside of the scope of the argument, which mentions nothing about danger or why these rules were enacted. In addition, any requirements cannot "ensure" that nobody ever gets hurt; they can only help to minimize risks.

32.
The passage describes how public complaints about one issue (corruption in unregulated service industries) can have consequences (increased costs) that lead to new public complaints. The correct answer will tie together this information without assuming too much.

(A) This answer choice is too extreme. While regulation does often result in increased costs, which consumers don't like, the regulation presumably halts the corruption, which consumers also don't like.
(B) This answer choice is a judgment call based on the idea that the increased costs are less desirable than the corruption. The passage does not provide information to support this claim.
(C) The passage doesn't address what types of services are subject to public protest. In addition, the word "only" is extreme.
(D) CORRECT. This answer summarizes what the passage describes – a cycle of public discontent. Notice that the correct "inference" or "conclusion" here isn't much more than a summary of the premises in the passage.
(E) In the passage, the author says "regulation often leads to increased costs for the consumer" due to decreased competition. Always is not the same as often. This answer choice is too extreme.

33.
For questions asking us to draw a conclusion, we need to base the conclusion only on the information presented; we cannot add any new information or assumptions. In addition, remember that we are not required to use all of the information presented in the premises, though the more information we can include, the better (as long as we don't take it too far!).
(A) The passage says that grapefruit or grapefruit juice ingested within an hour will "significantly" diminish the effectiveness of the medication. This does not mean that grapefruit or grapefruit juice ingested more than an hour before the medication is ingested will have no effect on the medication; it may have a mild effect.

(B) The passage speaks only of taking the medication after ingesting grapefruit; it says nothing about the effects of eating grapefruit after taking the medication.

(C) The passage implies that the pain receptors that the specific medication works on are the pain receptors that are affected by grapefruit. This does not mean that these are the only pain receptors in the brain.

(D) CORRECT. The passage says that the medication has been shown to be less effective when taken after grapefruit consumption. Furthermore, grapefruit has been shown to affect the binding of the medication to pain receptors. It can be concluded that effective binding is needed to enable the effectiveness of the medication.

(E) This choice is out of scope. We are given no information about possible research or design of new migraine medications.

34.
We are asked to draw a conclusion based on the educator's statements. The educator states that children who demonstrate early talent for music are encouraged to pursue it while children who do not show such talent are not encouraged and thus deprive themselves of the opportunity to develop a latent talent. We must find an answer choice that is based only on these statements.
(A) This choice states that music education should not devote special attention to talented students. This goes beyond the scope of the educator's statements.
(B) This choice states that everyone has the potential to learn music. This goes beyond the scope of the educator's statements. The educator is arguing against classifying students as musically inept at an early age because they might have latent talent that is not showing itself. He is not necessarily saying that everyone has the potential to learn music.
(C) CORRECT. By referring to the latent talent that some children may be neglecting, the educator is implying that not all talent shows its face at an early age.
(D) The fact that children who are directed towards other activities have learned to think of themselves as musically inept doesn't mean that children are particularly sensitive to criticism from adults. The being "directed towards other activities" is not necessarily best characterized criticism, and furthermore, it is not just children that tend to think themselves incapable of something if they don't partake in that activity.
(E) The educator is not necessarily claiming that all children should study music.
The correct answer is C.

35.
The correct answer is C. The text states that preparation, like equipment, is a major factor in the risk of injury during high-risk activities. People who are poorly trained run a higher risk of injury even if provided with the best equipment. From this we can infer that whatever benefits might derive from the best equipment can be negated by improper training. This is choice C.

36.
The correct answer is C. The passage that heart scans take less time than angiograms and do not require recovery time. They are also more sensitive than angiograms. But they use more radiation than other diagnostic procedures. And finally, their sensitivity can result in detection of harmless abnormalities that may worry patients. We are asked to find among the choices a conclusion that can be drawn on the basis of that information.
Choice A states that a heart scan is safer than an angiogram. We are given no information about the relative safety of the procedures. Incorrect.
Choice B states that patients should not be concerned about heart abnormalities that appear in a heart scan. This misrepresents the information in the passage.

The passage simply stated that the scans may pick up harmless abnormalities, not that all abnormalities are harmless. Incorrect.
Choice C states that a heart scan could result in indirect harm by causing a patient to undergo risky unnecessary procedures. This is supported by the passage, which states that the scans could result in undue concern and treatment. Correct.
Choice D states an angiogram is the appropriate treatment for most patients. The information in the passage does not support this. In fact, if anything, the passage would seem to support the contradictory assertion that heart scans are more appropriate for most patients. Incorrect.
Choice E states that a heart scan is more expensive. We are given no information about cost. Incorrect.

Assumptions

1.
The Police Commissioner's proposal hopes to decrease the number of crimes in city Y by shifting police officers from low-crime to high-crime districts. His proposal is based on data that demonstrate that crime decreases when additional police officers are moved into a district. However, the data do not mention anything about the effect on the districts from which the police officers were removed. The commissioner's plan is based on the assumption that the movement of police officers will not have any adverse effects on the low-crime districts.

(A) While it is encouraging that a similar plan worked successfully in City X, this fact is certainly not essential for the success of the plan in City Y. The cities may be so different as to make the comparison meaningless.

(B) The police commissioner's proposal is focused solely on decreasing the number of crimes in city Y. The severity of the crimes has no bearing on whether the commissioner's proposal will succeed or not.

(C) The actual numerical distinction between high and low-crime areas of the city is immaterial to the commissioner's proposal. For instance, if the number of crimes committed in all high crime districts was only double (instead of more than triple) the number of crimes committed in low crime districts, the proposal could still be valid.

(D) It would be practically beneficial to the commissioner's plan if there were more low crime than high crime districts in city Y. This would enable the

movement of police officers to every high crime district. However, this is not necessary to achieve the commissioner's goal of decreasing the total number of crimes in city Y. Even if there were more high-crime districts than low-crime districts in city Y, police officers could still be shifted to some (though not all) high-crime districts, and thereby possibly reduce the total number of crimes in city Y.

(E) CORRECT. The police commissioner's proposal would not make sense if districts of the city from which police officers are removed experience significant crime increases shortly after the removal of those officers. This would at least partially, if not fully, negate the reduction in the number of crimes in the high-crime districts. This choice establishes that, in fact, the low-crime districts do NOT suffer from significant crime increases after the removal of some officers--an essential assumption upon which the commissioner's proposal depends.

2.
The argument concludes that rising sea levels caused by global warming will destroy major coastal population centers and displace millions of people. Any assumption in support of this conclusion would have to corroborate that these events will definitively take place.

(A) CORRECT. If new technological developments in the next century allow people to divert rising seas from the world's cities (i.e., population centers), cities will not be destroyed and millions of people will not be displaced. Thus, a necessary assumption is that these technologies will not be developed.

(B) A simple awareness of the steps to reduce emissions in no way undermines the argument's conclusion, as this answer choice does not describe any action being taken by individuals. Additionally, greenhouse gases are never mentioned as the primary by-product of human activity that causes global warming, and are therefore not sufficient to address the argument.

(C) The argument never suggests that all coastal population centers are similarly affected; this choice is too extreme and overreaching for the argument's conclusion.

(D) This might be true, but it is not an assumption on which the conclusion rests. Instead, this answer choice is simply an inference that might be drawn from the premises.

(E) The idea that human activity is the sole cause of global warming is neither suggested nor assumed by the argument. In addition, the wording "sole cause" is too extreme.

3.
As an advertisement, this passage attempts to entice the reader into purchasing a new HitItFar driver by touting its benefits, both implied or explicit. The key to answering this question is to be able to analyze each claim to determine whether it is implied, explicitly stated, or neither.

(A) By asking the reader rhetorically "isn't it time you added power ... and distance ... [by switching to the HitItFar driver]?", the advertisement implies that the use of the club will add "power ... and distance" and, hence, will improve one's play.

(B) CORRECT. The advertisement states that the 12 major championships winner have recently switched to the new driver. There is nothing in the passage to imply that any of them were using the driver at the time of their victories; hence, this claim is neither implied, nor made explicitly, in the passage.

(C) It is a reasonable assumption that professional golfers, particularly those skilled enough to win a major championship, are experts and know what constitutes a great club. The advertisement makes this implication and reinforces it by citing the recent decision of these golfers to switch to the HitItFar driver; this provides an implicit expert endorsement for the HitItFar driver.

(D) The point of the advertisement is to prompt the reader into purchasing a new driver to replace his or her old driver in order to "add power and distance"; this implies that the new driver is superior to the reader's existing driver.

(E) This claim is explicitly stated in the first sentence of the passage.

4.
The researchers claim that Delta-32 prevents its carriers from contracting the Plague. They support this claim by noting that a strikingly large percentage of descendants of Plague survivors carry the mutation. We are asked to find an assumption underlying the claim.

(A) The argument is specific to the relationship between Delta-32 and resistance to the Plague. Other diseases are irrelevant.

(B) Again, the argument is specific to the relationship between Delta-32 and resistance to the Plague. Other diseases are irrelevant.

(C) Delta-32 may have existed in its current form before the sixteenth century and the merit of the argument would not change.

(D) The argument does not claim that Delta-32 prevents all bacteria-caused disease.

(E) CORRECT. The researchers claim that Delta-32 prevented its carriers from contracting the Plague on the basis of its presence in descendants of Plague survivors. But it is theoretically possible that these descendants carry the mutation Delta-32 because the Plague mutated the genes of their ancestors. In order to claim that the mutation prevented the Plague, we must assume that the Plague did not cause the mutation Delta-32.

5.
The author concludes that one will only be able to determine the age of a Brazilian ash by counting its rings if the temperature in the tree's environment never exceeds 95 degrees Fahrenheit. The author bases this conclusion on the fact that the tree loses rings when the temperature exceeds that level. However, if the number of rings lost by a Brazilian ash at high temperatures can be predicted, it may be possible to determine the age of a tree even if the temperature exceeds 95 degrees.

(A) The argument says nothing about precipitation. This answer choice is out of scope since it would require a number of other assumptions to make it relevant to the argument's conclusion.

(B) Whether other trees share this feature is irrelevant; the argument focuses only on the Brazilian ash.

(C) The number of days of excessive heat needed to cause the tree to lose rings is irrelevant.

(D) The thickness of the rings is irrelevant.

(E) CORRECT. The conclusion is that the rings will be a reliable measure only if the temperature never exceeds 95 degrees. This is true only if there is no way to predict how many rings would be lost when the temperature does exceed 95 degrees. (If it were possible to predict this, one might be able to assess the age of a tree using its rings even if the temperature had exceeded 95 degrees.)

6.

The conclusion of this argument is that the national identification system ("using licenses for purposes not directly related to operating a motor vehicle") is un-American. The basis for this claim is that such a system would allow the government to restrict the liberty of its people. The necessary assumption is one that connects restrictions on liberties to the concept of "un-American" policies.

(A) The author never mentions future presidential elections, or the role of the president in such a national identification system. Therefore, the conclusion that the national identification system is un-American does not depend on this assumption.

(B) Whether the government will soon, or will ever, start curtailing the activities of dissidents is irrelevant to this argument: that the national identification system is un-American simply because it restricts the liberties of U.S. citizens. Even if the government does not abuse the power the national identification system provides, the system could still be considered un-American.

(C) CORRECT. This choice connects the concept of "un-American" policies to restrictions on liberties, essentially defining blanket restrictions on citizens as un-American.

(D) Whether Americans are willing to give up their right to travel freely is irrelevant to this argument: that the national identification system is un-American simply because it restricts the liberties of U.S. citizens. Even if Americans were willing to give up their right to move about without identification, the system could still be considered un-American.

(E) While the author may be inclined to agree that Americans should resist the government regulation of their lives that the national identification system represents, this argument does not depend on such an assumption. In fact, the author makes a distinction between the national identification system and "licenses for purposes…directly related to operating a motor vehicle," so it is possible that the author considers some government regulation reasonable.

7.
The argument presents the facts of an apparent change in a magazine's cover features since the new publisher took control. While a gossip columnist hailed the change, newspaper editorials disagreed and concluded that the publisher favored profit over reporting. The editorials are the opponents of the gossip columnist; since their conclusion is about the publisher's desires, there must be an assumption connecting the publisher to the covers.

(A) This choice is irrelevant, as it is not connected to the conclusion. The activities of celebrities have nothing to do with the publisher's interests.

(B) CORRECT. Since the conclusion concerns the publisher's desires based on the content of the magazine covers, the editorials have to assume that the publisher decides who is to be a cover subject. If not, there is no connection between the covers and the publisher's interests.

(C) This choice is the opposite of a necessary assumption. For the editorials to conclude that the publisher prefers profits to reporting, they have to assume that the two are mutually exclusive.

(D) "Some" means "at least one," so this is not a powerful statement in any direction. Furthermore, even if several such stars were running for political office, it is not at all necessary to assume that to conclude that the publisher was more interested in profits.

(E) This choice is not correct. While it is true that the editorials must assume model and movie star covers are likely to sell more copies, it does not have to be assumed that such covers will result in the sale of triple the number of copies, or any other specific number.

8.
The conclusion of the argument is that renewable sources of energy, chiefly solar and wind, will be less risky for certain utilities than nonrenewable sources, such as oil and gas. The basis for this claim is that the renewable sources will provide stable, low-cost supplies of energy, whereas the prices for nonrenewable sources will fluctuate according to availability. We are asked to find an assumption underlying this argument. In order for this argument to be valid, it must in fact be true that these renewable sources of energy will provide stable, low-cost supplies.

(A) The utility companies' claim has to do with the supply risk of the new energy sources, not with how these sources are received by the public.

(B) If no new supplies of traditional energy sources are found, then it is true that perhaps these nonrenewable supplies will continue to fluctuate in price in a risky manner. However, the argument does not depend upon any assumption about the future discovery of oil and gas supplies.

(C) CORRECT. If we assume that weather patterns are consistent and predictable, then with the stated premises, we can conclude that solar and wind power will be less risky than oil and gas. If, on the other hand, weather patterns are not consistent and predictable, then solar and wind power are not reliable

and thus will not provide "stable energy supplies at low cost." Thus, the argument's conclusion directly depends on this assumption.

(D) To reach the required conclusion, it is not necessary to assume that the conversion technology for new sources is not more expensive than the present technology.

(E) This choice does not directly affect the argument. Whether or not energy produced through combustion can be made less risky, the new energy sources might still be less risky than the older sources.

9.
We are given two premises based on survey results: first, vanilla is the best-selling flavor of ice cream and, second, those who prefer chocolate usually don't order vanilla. The author concludes that vanilla-flavored candy should sell better than chocolate-flavored candy. The author bases this conclusion on the assumption that it is valid to extend the survey's results beyond ice cream to include candy.

(A) As a stand-alone, this choice makes common sense but, in the argument, it would undermine the author's conclusion. We are asked to find an assumption upon which the author relies, which means the correct assumption should support the author's conclusion.

(B) This choice is either irrelevant at best (the survey does not address children specifically) or would undermine the author's conclusion, at worst. We are asked to find an assumption upon which the author relies, which means the correct assumption should support the author's conclusion.

(C) Preferences for flavors neither vanilla nor chocolate are outside of the scope of this argument.

(D) This choice addresses only ice cream preferences; it does not provide any information to tie ice cream preferences to candy preferences.

(E) CORRECT. This assumption supports the author's conclusion by tying ice cream preferences directly to candy preferences.

10.
The conclusion of the argument is that the media are wrong in saying that the economy is entering a phase of growth and prosperity. The basis for that claim is

that the number of people filing for bankruptcy has increased every month for the last six months and that bankruptcy lawyers are busier than they have been in years. In order for this argument to be valid, however, the author has to assume that the increase in the number of bankruptcies is a result of the state of the economy and not the result of something unrelated.

(A) This statement does not have to be true for the claim that the media are wrong about the economy to hold. Even if unemployment rates are useful indicators of growth and prosperity, the media could still be wrong about the economy (e.g., if there are other indicators that show problems in other areas).

(B) This does not have to be true for the conclusion to hold. Productivity could be a good measure of economic growth, but the media could still be wrong about the economy (e.g., if there are other indicators that show problems in other areas).

(C) CORRECT. This has to be true for the conclusion to hold. If legislation has recently been passed that makes it easier to obtain bankruptcy, then the evidence cited would be less relevant. The increased number of bankruptcies could have been the result of the easier process rather than of a poor economy.

(D) This does not have to be true for the conclusion to hold. An increase in the number of bankruptcy lawyers would not explain the increase in the number of bankruptcy filings.

(E) This does not have to be true for the claim that the media are wrong about the economy to hold. Even if the media did not often misrepresent the current state of economic affairs, the argument that the media are wrong might still hold.

12.
The correct answer is B.

The conclusion of the argument is that Michelangelo must have completed the painting between 1507 and 1509. The basis for that claim is that the painting depicts a coin that did not exist before 1507 and that it contains a pigment that Michelangelo ceased using in 1509. We are asked to find an assumption that completes the logic of this argument.

Choice A is incorrect. We do not need to assume that no stocks of the pigment existed after 1509. The argument is concerned only with the year in which Michelangelo stopped using the pigment.

Choice B is correct. In order to conclude that the painting must have been completed before 1509 on the basis of the pigment, we must assume that he did not begin the painting before 1509 using the old pigment and complete the painting after 1509 with the new pigment.

Choice C is incorrect. The fact that the general public knew of the coin in 1507 is irrelevant to the conclusion.

Choice D is incorrect. The fact that the panel cannot be tested for age does not relate to either the coin or the pigment, the two bases for the conclusion.

Choice E is incorrect. Whether Michelangelo's painting style changed during this period does not relate to either the coin or the pigment.

12.
The conclusion of the argument is that "Company X's fuel costs this year will be significantly higher than they were last year. Why? Because some of the company's plants switched from oil to natural gas when the price of gas was lower, and now the price of gas has outstripped the price of oil. We are asked to find an assumption that is necessary for the argument to work.

(A) Whether Company X has the money to cover its costs does not affect the amount of those costs.

(B) We do not need to assume that the costs cannot be offset by reducing expenditures in other areas in order for Company X's costs to be higher.

(C) We do not need to assume that gas will never be cheaper than oil in order for Company X's costs to be higher.

(D) CORRECT. The author does not take into account the fact that only "some" of the company's plants converted to natural gas. Some of the plants, then, still use oil, which is now cheaper. So in order to conclude that the company will have to spend more on fuel, the author must assume that the extra cost of the natural gas for the plants that converted is at least as much as the cost of the oil for the plants that did not.

(E) We do not need to assume that the price of oil will not suddenly rise in order for the argument to work.

13.
The advertisement discusses the merits of Avian Oculars, explaining that they are reasonably priced and contain several popular features. The advertisement concludes, however, by encouraging readers to use Avian Oculars in order to see

some of the world's rarest bird species. A proper assumption must reasonably connect these diverse ideas.

(A) The argument states that Avian Oculars are lightweight, but makes no direct comparison to traditional binoculars.

(B) Although the advertisement is geared toward bird watchers, nothing indicates that Avian Oculars should be used only by bird watchers. Even if Avian Oculars were used by individuals other than bird watchers, no information in the advertisement would be undermined.

(C) CORRECT. The conclusion of the advertisement is that, by using Avian Oculars, the reader will see some of the world's rarest bird species on his or her next bird watching trip. In order for this to be true, the reader would have to have access to these rare bird species. Even the best bird watching technology would prove useless to view a particular species of bird if the species were not present.

(D) This choice is true, but it is not an assumption. Remember, an assumption is an unstated piece of information that ties a conclusion to its premises. This particular answer choice is simply a stated premise from the second sentence of the argument.

(E) This argument presents one specific product, Avian Oculars, which is specifically designed with birding enthusiasts in mind. From this information, we cannot assume that birding enthusiasts themselves determined the specifications of Avian Oculars, nor can we make any assumptions about who determines the specifications of other products.

14.
The basic structure of this argument is fact that "mold is almost always found in places where there is substantial moisture," so therefore, to avoid mold and the resultant mold poisoning, then people should take steps to prevent wet areas. This argument assumes that wet areas occur first, causing mold to grow. Conversely, this assumption requires that the mold growth itself does not occur first, creating wet areas as a result.

(A) CORRECT. The argument depends on the assumption that the reason mold and wetness are observed together is that wet areas cause mold growth. If the reverse causation (mold causes wetness) were true, then keeping all plumbing in good condition to prevent leakage would do little to prevent the growth of mold. This choice eliminates the alternate causation.

(B) If most homeowners know enough about plumbing to determine whether theirs is in good condition, then the recommendation made in this argument would be more useful. However, this is not an assumption on which the argument depends.

(C) Even if mold could grow in dry areas, the fact that mold is almost always found in wet areas is still valid. This is the fact upon which the argument is based, so the argument does not depend on the unnecessarily absolute assertion that mold cannot grow in dry areas.

(D) Even if some varieties of mold are harmless, the conclusion of this argument, that "one should make sure to keep all internal plumbing in good condition to prevent leakage" and minimize mold growth, could still be valid. Therefore, this argument does not depend on the unnecessarily absolute assertion that no varieties of mold are harmless.

(E) Whether mold spores can be filtered from the air may be relevant to a conclusion about the health effects of mold in the home, but it is not directly relevant to this conclusion, that "one should make sure to keep all internal plumbing in good condition to prevent leakage" and minimize mold growth.

15.
The conclusion of the argument is that the majority of American citizens believe in the death penalty while the majority of Filipino citizens do not. This conclusion is based solely on the fact that the death penalty is legal in the United States while it is now illegal in the Philippines. The argument assumes that there is a link between the legal status of capital punishment and the beliefs of the majority of citizens.

(A) While the number of murders per year might influence beliefs about capital punishment, there is certainly no necessary correlation. Moreover, the difference in the number of murders per year in the United States and the Philippines has little relevance without knowing the relative populations of the two countries.

(B) CORRECT. It is possible that the legal status of capital punishment in the United States and the Philippines does NOT align with how the majority of citizens in those countries view the death penalty. For example, it may be that the governing bodies of one or both countries are out of touch with the views of the populace. The argument assumes that this is NOT the case.

(C) Even if there were strong voices opposing the death penalty in the United States, the argument might still hold. The argument is based on the views of the majority of citizens in the United States, not on all US citizens.

(D) The argument addresses whether or not citizens of the United States and the Philippines believe in the death penalty. The reasons behind those beliefs, as presented in this choice, are irrelevant to the logic of the argument.

(E) The argument is centered on whether or not citizens of the United States and the Philippines believe in the death penalty. While the legal standard used to sentence criminals to the death penalty might impact why individuals hold certain beliefs, it has no impact on the logic of the argument.

16.
Although the premises of this argument suggest only a correlation between smoking and anxiety or nervousness, the argument has a causal conclusion: it concludes that smoking causes individuals to be anxious and nervous (i.e., that A causes B). Any assumption in a causal argument must support the causal "direction" of the conclusion, that A causes B as opposed to some other explanation. Often, assumptions support a causal conclusion either by eliminating an alternate cause for the conclusion (that C did not cause B) or by demonstrating that the causation, if one exists, is in the proper direction (that B did not cause A).

(A) The argument concludes that smoking causes anxiety and nervousness. Whether these maladies lead to more serious health problems is not relevant to the conclusion.

(B) CORRECT. For smoking to be the cause of anxiety and nervousness (i.e., that A caused B) it must be true that these individuals were not more likely to be anxious and nervous before they started smoking. If smokers had these preconditions, which contributed to their decision to begin smoking (i.e., that B caused A), our conclusion – that smoking causes these maladies – would be incorrect.

(C) The argument concludes that smoking causes anxiety and nervousness. The number of survey respondents is not relevant to the conclusion.

(D) The argument concludes that smoking causes anxiety and nervousness. The awareness of the health problems related to smoking is not relevant to the conclusion.

(E) The argument is not based on the immediate impact that smoking has on anxiety and nervousness. Moreover, the argument never compares some smokers to other smokers.

17.

The argument concludes that the stock of the firm will experience rapid growth. The basis for this claim is that the firm has shown strong historical performance that is likely to continue in the future. The stock will appreciate dramatically in the future as a result only if it has not already appreciated in anticipation of the company's expected growth.

(A) The argument focused on the potential for stock appreciation rather than company weight in the industry. A company with a large market share may well experience poor stock performance, while a company with a small market share may continue to grow and increase in value.

(B) Since the conclusion of the argument is made regarding the future outlook, it is not necessary to assume that the company had been growing, or had even existed, prior to the past 5 years. A new firm that has been in existence for only 5 years may well present an excellent investment opportunity.

(C) This statement is explicitly stated in the argument and therefore does not have to be assumed.

(D) CORRECT. If this assumption were not true, i.e. if the current stock price already reflects future growth prospects, then the premise that the company will experience high growth is certainly insufficient to warrant future stock price appreciation, since all of this growth would already be reflected in the current price. It is necessary to assume that the current price of Company X stock does not yet reflect the promising growth prospects of the firm, allowing the possibility that the stock price will rise further.

(E) Note that the argument makes a claim about the absolute return of stock X rather than its return relative to the industry. Therefore, to justify the rapid growth in the stock price, it is not necessary to assume that the company will outperform its competitors. For example, if the industry itself is growing very rapidly, other companies in the industry can experience just as rapid appreciation in stock prices.

18.
Antoine is alarmed that the number of children on antipsychotic medication has increased by 73 percent. Lucy begins her reply with "but," indicating that she is about to counter either Antoine's facts or his alarm; she accepts his facts but addresses his alarm. If the number of children taking antipsychotic medication is still within the normal range, the rate at which the total number has increased is not cause for alarm. Lucy uses information about adult use of such drugs to imply that the lower rate of antipsychotic drug use in children must also be normal.

(A) Lucy's argument is about a normal level of antipsychotic drug use; how rarely or frequently that level is exceeded is outside the scope of her argument.

(B) Lucy uses the percentage of adults taking antipsychotic medication to illustrate normal levels of the use of such drugs. It happens that the percentage of children taking such medication last year was lower than the percentage of adults, but her argument does not require the assumption that that will always be the case.

(C) CORRECT. If there is no difference between children and adults on the matter of antipsychotic drug use, then Lucy can legitimately use information about adult use of such drugs to imply that the lower rate of antipsychotic drug use by children must also be normal. On the other hand, if this assumption were not valid – for example, if children responded differently to the drugs, or if the rate of the drug use by adults is considered too high for children – then Lucy's statement would not be enough to address Antoine's alarm.

(D) Lucy's argument is not based on the figure Antoine cites and does not assume its accuracy or inaccuracy. Rather, her argument uses the relative adult and child rates of antipsychotic drug use to point out that Antoine's statistic is not inconsistent with a normal rate of such use in children.

(E) The fear of random violence by adolescents is not part of Lucy's argument; this statement is irrelevant.

19.
The question asks for an assumption made by the reader. The reader's conclusion is that academic rigor is in decline, based on the percentage of colleges granting a majority of their degrees in the liberal arts mentioned in the article. To draw this conclusion, the reader must assume that degrees not in the liberal arts were not as academically rigorous.

(A) It is not necessary for the reader to assume that the percentage will continue to drop. The reader's conclusion concerns the present. Assumptions must be both unstated and necessary.

(B) This extreme statement is not a necessary assumption. The reader does not have to assume that all colleges should do so; the conclusion only relies on an assumption that 5.5% is too low.

(C) CORRECT. To conclude that the low percentage of colleges granting the majority of their degrees in the liberal arts indicates a decline in academic rigor, the reader must assume that other degree programs required less academic rigor. If not, this evidence would not indicate a decline in academic rigor.

(D) This is not a necessary assumption. The relative importance of academic rigor is irrelevant to the reader's claim. That claim only asserts that academic rigor, in isolation, is in decline. The claim has nothing to do with its importance relative to other attributes.

(E) It is not necessary to assume anything specific about the schools that do not grant a majority of their degrees in the liberal arts, as they are not the subject of the evidence or the conclusion. The reader feels that the low percentage mentioned is evidence enough; it is not necessary to assume any arbitrary level below the 50% of degrees standard that the article and the reader use.

20.
The doctor concludes that federal legislation prohibiting the sale of video games to minors would help reduce the incidence of carpal tunnel syndrome. This conclusion hinges on the assumption that the only way for adolescents to access video games is to purchase the games themeslves.

(A) Majority consensus in the legislature has no bearing on whether the recommended legislation would actually help to curb carpal tunnel syndrome.

(B) This argument states that "adolescents who play video games on a regular basis are three times as likely to develop carpal tunnel syndrome." Thus, the argument directly indicates that carpal tunnel syndrome does not affect all adolescents who play video games. Rather than an assumption, this answer choice is simply an inference drawn from the text.

(C) The fact that adolescents can develop carpal tunnel syndrome by means other than playing video games has no bearing on whether the recommended legislation would help to curb carpal tunnel syndrome.

(D) CORRECT. In order for the doctor's recommended legislation to reduce the incidence of carpal tunnel syndrome among adolescents, the prohibition from the purchase of video games must result in the actual possession of fewer video games. Thus, it must be assumed that parents will not simply purchase video games for their children.

(E) The fact that video games can benefit adolescents in other ways has no bearing on whether the recommended legislation would help to curb carpal tunnel syndrome.

21.
The management concludes that a 10% increase in gasoline prices will result in a 10% increase in revenues from the sale of gasoline. In order to reach this

conclusion, we need to assume that the amount of gasoline sold will not drop despite the higher prices.

(A) CORRECT. This assumption is critical to justify the projection that a 10% increase in gas prices will result in a 10% increase in revenues from gasoline sales. Note that if this assumption does not hold, the management's projection will collapse. For example, if consumers switch to public transportation or simply start to drive less in response to the higher prices, the revenues of the company will not increase by the same amount as the increase in the sales price. In fact, if the decline in gasoline consumption is substantial (e.g. 20%) the company will experience lower rather than higher revenues.

(B) The issue of profits is irrelevant to the management's conclusion about revenues from the sale of gasoline.

(C) Since the management's projection concerns only the sales of gasoline, revenues of other business lines are beyond the scope of the argument.

(D) Since the management's conclusion concentrates on revenues, the issue of costs is beyond the scope of the argument.

(E) It is not necessary to assume that the supply of gasoline will decline, since the price increase can be driven by a variety of other factors, such as production costs, market environment, and others.

22.
The conclusion of the argument is contained in the last sentence, that "the methods that the prospector had used to determine the size of the oil deposit must have been inaccurate." The evidence provided is that the prospector reported a large oil deposit that was later determined to be much smaller in size. We are asked to find an unstated assumption that makes the conclusion valid based upon this evidence. In order to do this, we need to assume that there is not another reason why the prospector might have reported a larger oil deposit than actually existed.

(A) It is not necessary to the conclusion that a third party affirmed the company's determination that the oil deposit turned out to be small. The conclusion accepts that the oil deposit was indeed smaller than indicated by the prospector, and focuses on the cause of the discrepancy as opposed to the discrepancy itself.

(B) CORRECT. The argument concludes that the prospector's methods resulted in inaccurate measurements of the size of the oil deposit. This assumes that the prospector did not simply misreport or misrepresent the measurements,

presumably for personal gain. This answer choice addresses the most plausible alternative explanation to the one given, and is necessary for the conclusion to stand based upon the evidence presented.

(C) The commercial feasibility or profitability of the oil deposit is not integral to the argument, or its conclusion. This statement is not an assumption that would support the conclusion.

(D) Whether or not the prospector utilized the same methods in regards to measuring the oil deposits in other locations is not relevant to the argument, or the conclusion.

(E) The fact that the company had a long operating history and experience in drilling oil wells is not relevant, in that the company's measurements of the size of the oil field are accepted as given in the argument.

The correct answer is B.

23.
This argument concludes that the city needs educational leadership that can solve problems, not create them. It illustrates this claim by discussing the prohibition on cell phones. This prohibition is given as an example of the leadership creating problems where none exist. The necessary assumption is one that bridges the logic gap between the premise and the conclusion.

(A) CORRECT. In order to use the issue of students having cells phones as an example of how the educational leadership creates problems where none exist, the author must assume that students having cell phones is not an important problem.

(B) The argument and its conclusion are not about students' needs. They concern the quality of educational leadership. Thus, this choice is irrelevant; it is not necessary for the argument to assume anything about students' needs.

(C) This choice is irrelevant; the argument does not concern faculty and staff cell phones, and thus no assumption about them is necessary. Assumptions must be both unstated and necessary to the conclusion.

(D) The argument and its conclusion are not about students' needs. They concern the quality of educational leadership. Thus, this choice is irrelevant; it is not necessary for the argument to assume anything about students' needs.

(E) The argument does not rank the various attributes of good educational leadership. It only discusses one quality. Thus, no assumption about the relative importance of attributes is necessary, and this choice is irrelevant.

24.
The argument proposes that directing chiropractic treatment toward adults with severe back problems is the best way to minimize the proportion of the population that suffers from back pain. The argument assumes a high degree of overlap between those adults who suffer from severe back problems and all people who suffer from back pain, where the former group may comprise only a subset of the latter group. It also assumes that there is not another recommendation that could better accomplish the goal of minimizing back pain for a larger segment of the population than treating just those adults with severe back problems.

(A) The argument does not depend upon whether or not chiropractic treatment can or cannot be used in conjunction with other medical treatments. The fact that people could benefit from other forms of treatment aside from chiropractic care weakens the argument to a slight degree, and does not act as a supportive assumption.

(B) The relative degree of insurance coverage of chiropractic care compared with other medical treatments is not vital to the argument. Also, that insurance carriers cover chiropractic care to a lesser degree weakens the argument marginally, and does not act as a supportive assumption.

(C) CORRECT. This statement rules out the possibility that chiropractic care or other medical treatments could effectively prevent or lessen back pain among those people who have not yet developed severe back problems.

(D) That chiropractic treatment is more effective over time is irrelevant to the argument.

(E) The economic impact of severe back pain and other problems is not addressed in the argument. Instead, addressing back pain is treated as an intrinsic goal, with no mention of economic externalities.

25.
The argument presents the facts of an apparent change in a magazine's cover features since the new publisher took control. While a gossip columnist hailed the change, newspaper editorials disagreed and concluded that the publisher favored profit over reporting. The editorials are the opponents of the gossip columnist; since their conclusion is about the publisher’s desires, there must be an assumption connecting the publisher to the covers.

(A) This choice is irrelevant, as it is not connected to the conclusion. The activities of celebrities have nothing to do with the publisher's interests.

(B) CORRECT. Since the conclusion concerns the publisher's desires based on the content of the magazine covers, the editorials have to assume that the publisher decides who is to be a cover subject. If not, there is no connection between the covers and the publisher's interests.

(C) This choice is the opposite of a necessary assumption. For the editorials to conclude that the publisher prefers profits to reporting, they have to assume that the two are mutually exclusive.

(D) "Some" means "at least one," so this is not a powerful statement in any direction. Furthermore, even if several such stars were running for political office, it is not at all necessary to assume that to conclude that the publisher was more interested in profits.

(E) This choice is not correct. While it is true that the editorials must assume model and movie star covers are likely to sell more copies, it does not have to be assumed that such covers will result in the sale of triple the number of copies, or any other specific number.

26.
The argument concludes that for-profit colleges enroll a greater proportion of financially disadvantaged students than do non-profit colleges. This conclusion is based on the fact that students at for-profit colleges draw a disproportionate share of federal and state financial aid. The argument assumes a link between the proportion of aid received and the proportion of financially disadvantaged students enrolled. In so doing, it assumes that there are not other possible reasons for the disproportionate aid distribution.

(A) The conclusion makes a claim about the differences between for-profit and non-profit colleges. Differences among non-profit colleges – such as public vs. private – are irrelevant to the argument.

(B) CORRECT. One alternative reason that might explain the disproportionate aid distribution is that for-profit colleges engaged in fraudulent practices to obtain unneeded financial assistance for their students. If this were true, then much of the aid was distributed based not on the actual financial situation of the students but on the ability of colleges to defraud federal and state governments. This answer choice asserts that this was NOT in fact the case, thereby eliminating this alternative explanation and highlighting a key assumption upon which the argument rests.

(C) The argument's claim is centered on proportions. The actual number of students receiving aid at for-profit vs. non-profit colleges is irrelevant to the conclusion.

(D) The relative educational quality of for-profit vs. non-profit colleges lies outside the scope of the argument, which is focused solely on differences in financial aid distribution.

(E) The issue addressed by the argument is the amount of financial aid distributed to students at two types of institutions. Whether students successfully repay their loans after college is immaterial to the claim made in the argument.

27.
Research indicates that there is a connection between being married and being happy and healthy. Media commentators have concluded that marriage causes happiness and health. However, one could reasonably conclude from the research that the cause and effect are the reverse: being happy and healthy makes a person more likely to get married.

(A) The research compared married people to unmarried people. Neither the researchers nor the media commentators made any distinction between newlyweds and those who had been married a long time, so this assumption is not necessary.

(B) The type of wedding is outside the scope of this argument. The research compared married people to unmarried people, but made no distinction based upon the type of wedding. Thus, this assumption is unnecessary.

(C) At first, this statement may seem necessary—after all, if the commentators conclude that marriage causes happiness, a lack of depression in married people would certainly support that conclusion. However, the statement is too extreme. One depressed married person does not invalidate the research indicating that, on average, married people are healthier and happier than non-married people.

(D) CORRECT. This statement eliminates the alternative interpretation of the research findings—that being happy and healthy makes a person more likely to get married.

(E) The research compared married people to unmarried people. Neither the researchers nor the media commentators made any distinction between harmonious marriages and combative marriages, so this assumption is not necessary.

28.
The text tells us only that Country X imposes heavy tariffs on imported goods and that Company Y believes it can increase long-term profits by opening a factory in Country X so it can avoid having to import its goods into Country X. We are asked to select an answer choice that is an assumption required for Company Y's belief to be valid.

(A) While this is a tempting answer, it is not necessary to assume that Company Y will be able to obtain all necessary permits. The text does not indicate whether Company Y will actually be able to implement the plan, only that the plan could increase profits if implemented.

(B) We are given no information about Company Y's activities in other countries.

(C) CORRECT. In order for Company Y to conclude that it can increase long-term profits by opening a factory in Country X, it must believe that a sustainable market exists for its products in that country. Otherwise, the new factory would not generate revenue and the company could not recoup the cost of the new factory.

(D) We are given no information about tariffs in Company Y's home country.

(E) We need not assume that labor costs are lower in Country X. It could be that labor costs in Country X are higher than those in Company Y's home country but the increased cost of labor is still less than the tariffs. This would result in a net savings for Company Y in Country X.

29.
The text tells us only that Country X imposes heavy tariffs on imported goods and that Company Y believes it can increase long-term profits by opening a factory in Country X so it can avoid having to import its goods into Country X. We are asked to select an answer choice that is an assumption required for Company Y's belief to be valid.

(A) While this is a tempting answer, it is not necessary to assume that Company Y will be able to obtain all necessary permits. The text does not indicate whether Company Y will actually be able to implement the plan, only that the plan could increase profits if implemented.

(B) We are given no information about Company Y's activities in other countries.

(C) CORRECT. In order for Company Y to conclude that it can increase long-term profits by opening a factory in Country X, it must believe that a sustainable market exists for its products in that country. Otherwise, the new factory would not generate revenue and the company could not recoup the cost of the new factory.

(D) We are given no information about tariffs in Company Y's home country.

(E) We need not assume that labor costs are lower in Country X. It could be that labor costs in Country X are higher than those in Company Y's home country but the increased cost of labor is still less than the tariffs. This would result in a net savings for Company Y in Country X.

30.
The conclusion of the argument is that companies should allow other manufacturers to license patented technology. The basis for that claim is that not doing so keeps prices high and harms the consumer. We're asked what the argument assumes ("presupposes") in drawing its conclusion. The correct answer will fill the logic gap between the idea that keeping prices high harms the consumer and that companies should allow other manufacturers to license patented technology. The conclusion is based on the assumption that companies have an obligation of some kind to do what's best for the consumer.

(A) This does not address the moral obligation to the consumers (i.e. "should") of the companies who produced the patented technology, the main point of the conclusion. Furthremore, even if companies could find legal ways to produce similar technologies, the patented technology could still command exorbitant prices, thereby harming the consumer.

(B) CORRECT. The conclusion only makes sense if companies have an obligation to act in the best interest of the customer, as this choice states.

(C) This generally follows along with the author's claim, but we are not required to assume this in order to reach the conclusion that companies who are granted patents are obligated to look out for the best interests of their customers.

(D) This addresses a tangential issue of whether or not consumers could notice the difference between a new patented technology and a possible imitation. This does not address the core issue of the obligation to the consumer.

(E) This does not address the obligation of the companies toward the consumers, or indeed the companies at all.

31.
The conclusion of the argument is that one need not worry about ingesting pesticides when purchasing produce from farms that use only organic pesticides. The basis for that claim is the fact that organic pesticides leave the surface of produce within a few hours of spraying. In order for this argument to be valid, we must assume that the organic pesticides do not harm the produce in any lasting way.

(A) This is unrelated to the argument since the conclusion speaks about not having to worry about ingesting produce on which only organic pesticides were known to be used.

(B) If anything, this statement runs counter to what the argument is saying. If produce that has been sprayed with organic pesticide reaches the final consumer within hours after it is picked, it is possible that the consumer does need be concerned about the pesticides.

(C) The conclusion of the argument is already limited to those farms which use "only organic pesticides."

(D) CORRECT. If a pesticide is capable of penetrating the skin of a fruit or vegetable then, while the organic pesticide will dissipate from the surface of the fruit in a few hours, it may remain inside the fruit. The author of this argument assumes that the pesticides cannot penetrate the skin.

(E) The issue of cost is unrelated to the argument's conclusion about pesticide residues.

32.
The conclusion of the argument is that the prediction of decreased consumer spending has not come to pass. The evidence for this is that there has been no corresponding increase in the amount of money set aside in savings accounts by the general public. This question asks us to find an assumption on which this argument is based. The author assumes that the mere fact that people generally have not been adding more money to their savings accounts means they have not cut down on their discretionary purchases (i.e., non-essential items). In order for this to be valid, we must assume that a savings account is the only mechanism by which someone would save any extra money when reducing discretionary spending.

(A) The state of the economy in the last few months has no bearing on the claim that a lack of extra money deposited in consumer savings accounts is evidence that consumer spending has not decreased.

(B) CORRECT. If there was an alternate explanation for the lack of increase in savings accounts, the claim that the decrease in spending has not taken place would be greatly weakened. This assumption guarantees us that at least one other possible explanation for the lack of increase in savings (i.e. an increase in stocks, certificates of deposit, or other savings vehicles) is NOT true.

(C) Assuming that salaries decreased would actually weaken this argument. If salaries decreased, that may explain the decrease in the amount of money being put aside in savings without necessarily implying a decrease in spending. People could be making less, spending the same, and therefore saving less.

(D) The lack of growth in business sectors has nothing to do with what consumers are doing with their money during the same time period.

(E) The argument says the prediction was made "even [for those whose] jobs were secure." People who find other employment, therefore, would still fall under the economists' prediction and would, if the prediction were true, be expected to cut discretionary spending and save more money.

33.
The conclusion is that nurses should examine patients to determine which deserve to be seen first by the doctors. The basis for this claim is that hospitals lack adequate numbers of physicians.
(A) The idea of having nurses make the initial examination does not depend on increasing the medical staff.
(B) The main premise for the conclusion was that patients ended up waiting due to an undersupply of doctors. There weren't enough doctors to perform the initial examination. If the doctors perform the initial examinations there will be no time saved.
(C) The conclusions rests on whether or not the nurses would be able to perform the examinations, not on what the result of them doing the examinations would be.
(D) The hospitals don't need to be fully staffed with nurses for the nurses to perform the initial examination.
(E) CORRECT. This argument is valid only if we assume that nurses are competent to determine which patients merit immediate treatment.
The correct answer is E.

34.

The correct answer is B. The conclusion of the argument is that "the scientists must have discovered the butterfly at night." Why? Because the butterfly's color matches the green of the foliage, and the butterfly is active only at night. In order for this argument to work, one has to assume that there is no way for the scientists to detect the butterfly during the day, despite its camouflage. If there is a way for the scientists to detect the butterfly during the day, the conclusion is no longer logical.

WEAKEN

1.

On average, the team hit more home runs playing in front of larger crowds than in front of smaller crowds. The argument attributes this statistic to the motivation that comes from playing in front of larger crowds. In order to undermine this conclusion, look for another reason to explain why more home runs were hit in front of larger crowds.

(A) The argument makes a claim about the collective behavior of the team. This collective claim does not preclude certain individuals from hitting fewer home runs in larger stadiums.

(B) The claim made in the argument is based on the size of the crowd in each stadium. For whom the fans cheered is irrelevant to the argument.

(C) Similar to answer choice A, this choice cites one specific example of contradictory information, while the argument is based on the average behavior of the team throughout the entire season. The does not strongly undermine that, on average, the team was motivated by larger crowds.

(D) CORRECT. This choice explains that the larger stadiums actually have different dimensions from the smaller stadiums. In order to accommodate a larger number of fans, the outfield walls are closer to the batters. Thus, it is very possible that the greater number of home runs is due to the fact that the ball does not have to travel as far in larger stadiums.

(E) The announcer's opinion is not relevant to the argument, and, even if it were, this choice would strengthen the argument.

2.

The conclusion is that "if major industries increase their capital reserves, the employment rate will not decline in the future." Why? Because major industry did not have capital reserves. The author assumes that having capital reserves is

sufficient to prevent a decline in the employment rate. We are asked to cast doubt (i.e., weaken) the author's claim.

(A) Whether the drop in employment was foreseen does not relate to the core of the argument, which is that capital reserves will prevent another decline in the employment rate.

(B) The fact that some major industries had appreciable capital reserves does not contradict the claim that an increase in these reserves would prevent a future drop in employment rates.

(C) CORRECT. The author neglects to take into account the fact that other factors, such as an increase in labor costs, could adversely affect the employment rate. For example, if the cost of labor becomes prohibitively expensive, even with increased reserves, the employment rate could decline.

(D) Legislation mandating a certain level of reserves does not contradict the claim that increased reserves would prevent a drop in employment rates.

(E) The fact that the employment rate was more severe this year than last does not contradict the claim that an increase in reserves would prevent a drop in the employment rate.

3.
Farmers in developing countries claim that the global price of wheat is low because American farmers produce too much of the grain. They also claim that American farmers produce too much wheat because they have no incentive to manage their crops, since the U.S. government will buy whatever wheat American farmers cannot sell on the open market. We are asked to find a choice that weakens the claims of the farmers in developing countries that removing the American subsidy would cause the price of wheat to rise.

(A) That there are uses for wheat that is not eaten is irrelevant here. This does not address any aspect of the farmers' claims.

(B) The fact that buyers of wheat can predict their needs in advance is irrelevant here, because the text indicates that American farmers do not pay attention to actual demand for wheat.

(C) In this argument, the global market for soybeans is irrelevant to the global market for wheat, which is a different commodity with different demand, supply, and pricing structures.

(D) CORRECT. The farmers assume that the sole cause of the wheat surplus is the United States. This answer choice suggests that other countries would modify their output to counterbalance any reduction on the part of the United States, keeping prices constant instead of allowing them to rise.

(E) The price of another crop is largely irrelevant. Moreover, the fact that the price of sorghum, a non-subsidized crop, is lower tends to support, rather than weaken, the claims of the farmers.

4.
This argument concludes that "Hollywood studios have little chance of making money this year by exporting their films worldwide," based on the premise that profits from piracy overseas rose sharply last year. The argument assumes that no other relevant conditions have changed for the better since then. The question asks for a choice that does not weaken the argument, which means that the correct answer will either strengthen it or is irrelevant.

(A) This choice weakens the argument. It attacks the necessary assumption that $500 million is a large enough amount to destroy Hollywood profits.

(B) This choice weakens the argument. It attacks the necessary assumption that there would not be a heightened and effective law enforcement campaign against piracy.

(C) This choice weakens the argument. It attacks the assumption that there are no other ways for Hollywood studios to profit from export of its films than DVDs.

(D) CORRECT. This choice is irrelevant. The conclusion (and premise) concern money. That all of the Academy Award-nominated films were pirated last year does not increase or diminish the probability of Hollywood studios making money this year. Thus, this does not weaken the argument.

(E) This choice makes the conclusion less likely by providing a premise that suggests that this year's profits internationally will rise.

5.
The analyst argues that the mayoral candidate who opposes the deportation plan will win the governor's race because 60% of city residents also oppose the plan. The analyst assumes that a majority of residents will vote for this candidate based on his position on illegal immigration. Any statement that calls this assumption into question will weaken the argument. We are looking for the one statement that does NOT call this assumption into question.

(A) This statement calls into question the assumption that voters will cast their ballots based on the illegal immigration issue. Therefore, this statement weakens the analyst's argument.

(B) CORRECT. This does not weaken the argument. In fact, if some of those who support the plan are willing to reconsider, they may ultimately oppose the original plan and decide to vote for the candidate who is also in opposition. If anything, this would help justify the analyst's claim that the candidate who opposes the plan will win the election.

(C) This statement calls into question the assumption that a majority of residents will vote for the candidate who opposes the plan. If many of these residents are not registered voters, they will not be able to vote, regardless of their position on the immigration issue. This weakens the argument.

(D) This calls into question the assumption that the residents will vote based on the illegal immigration issue. This statement shows that voters have a history of voting for the incumbent despite his controversial position on important issues. It is possible that the voters will again vote for the incumbent, even if he has taken an unpopular position on the illegal immigration issue. This weakens the argument.

(E) If just under 30% of the residents are illegal immigrants, it is likely that many of the 60% in opposition to the plan are actually illegal immigrants themselves. If these people can't vote, it is less likely that the candidate who opposes the plan will win.

6.
Adam concludes that to cover the $4,000 cost of a booth at the fair, he will need to sell 400 sandwiches at $10 each. He relies on information about the number of customers served by the average booth in previous years. The question asks what most weakens Adam's conclusion. The correct answer will either show that Adam has overlooked other important costs, or that his logic is fundamentally flawed. There could be more than one choice that seems to suggest that Adam might not break even; the correct answer will be the one that eliminates any possibility that he will break even.

(A) Though this is certainly true in a practical sense, it does not show that Adam's plan will not work and that he will not stay within his budget. In fact, if he could sell more than 400 sandwiches, it is likely that this would help him break even.

(B) CORRECT. Each sandwich costs some amount of money to make and sell, so even if Adam sells the 400 sandwiches as planned, his net income will certainly be less than $4,000. Based on this statement, Adam definitely will not break even.

(C) Though it is true that an average number of customers means some booths served more and some served fewer, this statement does not tell us that Adam will have fewer than 400 or that his plan cannot work. Consider also that each customer might buy more than one sandwich, so Adam could have fewer customers but still sell enough sandwiches to cover his costs.

(D) Although some people will buy other types of food at the fair, this statement fails to conclusively weaken Adam's logic. Adam relied on information about the average number of customers for food booths in previous years, but those booths may have sold sandwiches or other foods – we simply don't have enough information to judge whether this statement strengthens or weakens Adam's conclusion.

(E) Sharing the booth would actually make it more likely that Adam would break even. If he shares the cost of the booth rental, then he is more likely to sell enough sandwiches to cover his costs.

7.
The argument concerns the economic impact on restaurants in Prohibitionland if the service of alcoholic beverages is banned. It presents evidence that, despite restrictions on the service of alcohol in certain areas of Prohibitionland, sales taxes in restaurants in those areas rose at a higher rate than for those in other parts of Prohibitionland, suggesting that the ban would not have any adverse economic impact. We are asked to support the restaurant proprietors' claim , so the correct answer choice will call the relevance of the seemingly contradictory evidence into question.

(A). This answer choice may seem to strengthen the argument that banning the service of alcoholic beverages would have an adverse impact on restaurants. However, as the evidence involves data for the entire year, citing a short-term negative impact on restaurant visitation at the beginning of the year does not measurably strengthen the argument.

(B) The relative tax rate on food and beverages as compared to other consumer good is irrelevant here.

(C) A gradual decline in alcohol consumption over the past 20 years would suggest that over time, any ban on alcohol would have an increasingly small impact on restaurant visitation, weakening the proprietors' argument.

(D) CORRECT. This statement calls the evidence into question by indicating that any measured increase in sales taxes and, presumably, revenues for restaurants that have been operating under the restrictions last year enacted is irrelevant, as the restrictions could be argued to be completely different than the total ban that is being proposed. This answer choice substantially strengthens the proprietors' argument by threatening to make the cited evidence irrelevant.

(E) The fact that overall sales tax revenue did not increase at a higher rate in the provinces that enacted the restrictions on alcoholic beverages weakens the proprietors' argument, as it makes the cited evidence more compelling by ruling out the possibility of different growth rates in the different areas.

8.
The official's conclusion is that people who claim that the U.S. is more vulnerable than other nations because of the country's lack of a national vaccine laboratory are disloyal and incorrect. His basis for that conclusion is that the U.S. has generally long life span and low infant mortality relative to all UN countries. Moreover, he cites the high quality of American hospitals, and he adds that many people he knows from around the world come to the U.S. for medical care. We are asked to find the choice that does NOT point out a weakness or potential weakness in the official's argument.

(A) CORRECT. This choice states that the high quality of hospitals is not a factor affecting the public's vulnerability to infectious disease. However, the quality of hospitals very arguably does affect how vulnerable the public is to such disease.

(B) This choice highlights the official's logical jump from "disloyal" to "wrong" in the phrase "these critics are disloyal and thus wrong about the public's vulnerability." There is no necessary connection between disloyalty and wrongness.

(C) If the Europeans that the official cited overwhelmingly consist of wealthy men over the age of fifty, then the official relied on an unrepresentative sample to justify his claim. What is true of wealthy older European men is not necessarily true of Europeans or non-Americans generally.

(D) If the average life span of Americans is determined by causes other than infectious disease, then the official is not limiting his evidence to cases relating to vaccines. Other causes of death are not relevant to the critics' argument.

(E) The ranking of the United States relative to all UN countries is misleading, since it does not compare the U.S. to other "advanced industrialized" or "developed" nations, as the critics' claim does.

9.
The conclusion of the argument is that insurance companies do not have a significant economic incentive to delay claim payments to doctors. To weaken this conclusion, an answer choice must provide some significant economic incentive for insurance companies to be tardy in paying doctors for legitimate medical claims.

(A) While the fact that some doctors who submit accurate bills to insurance companies still receive tardy payments seems to indicate that there must be something other than errors causing delayed payments, it fails to prove that the insurance company has an economic incentive to deliberately delay claim payments to doctors. For example, this fact could simply indicate that the insurance companies are inefficient at handling all of their paperwork.

(B) This choice compares costs insurance companies must absorb due to incorrect bills to costs physicians must absorb due to tardy payments. However, this information is irrelevant to establishing an economic incentive for insurance companies to delay claim payments to doctors.

(C) The argument is focused on the payment of legitimate claims; the rising proportion of illegitimate claims does not establish a clear economic incentive for insurance companies to delay payments of legitimate claims.

(D) The types of billing errors made by doctors' offices does not establish any economic motive for insurance companies to make a practice of delaying payments to doctors.

(E) CORRECT. This choice articulates a logical chain that establishes a clear economic motive for insurance companies to be tardy in paying doctors for legitimate medical claims. If insurance companies delay payments to doctors, this results in a 10 percent increase in overhead costs for physicians. These costs ultimately result in higher fees that doctors charge to insurance companies. Insurance companies, in turn, raise the premiums they charge consumers for health coverage. This choice states that the insurance companies increase their fees to consumers far more than the doctors increase their fees to insurance companies, enabling the insurance companies to pocket the difference; therein lies the economic motive for insurance companies to be tardy in paying doctors for legitimate medical claims.

10.
This argument concludes that a decline in the percentage of retirees who relocate to SunState will have a negative impact on businesses there that cater to retirees. However, a decline in this percentage would only have a negative impact on businesses if it indicated a decrease in the actual number of retirees. If the actual number of retirees is steady or increasing, then a decrease in the percentage wouldn't matter. As we are looking for a statement that weakens the argument, we should look for an answer choice that somehow mitigates the effect of this percentage decrease.

(A) The fact that SunState attracts more retirees than any other state does not address the impact of the declining proportion of retirees moving to SunState.

(B) The existence of other businesses in SunState that do not cater to retirees is not relevant.

(C) Any increase in departure of retirees from SunState to accept re-employment would further damage businesses that serve retirees. However, the argument explicitly discusses the impact of the declining percentage of retirees relocating to SunState, and no other factors, making this answer choice irrelevant. In any case, this answer choice suggests that such businesses will indeed lose business, which would strengthen the conclusion, not weaken it.

(D) Low property taxes provide one reason why SunState is an appealing destination for retirees, but this is not relevant in determining the economic impact of the smaller proportion of retirees moving to SunState overall.

(E) CORRECT. If the total number of retirees that relocated to other states increased significantly, a 10 percent reduction in the proportion of retirees that moved to SunState may not result in a reduction in the actual number of people who moved to SunState. This choice weakens the contention that businesses that cater to retirees in SunState will suffer from a drop-off resulting from the percentage decrease.

11.
The market analyst concludes that the market for breath freshening products will decline as the effectiveness of the tongue scraper becomes more widely known. To show that this argument is flawed, we must attack one of two assumptions: that consumers are primarily interested in products that are most effective in fighting bad breath, or that consumers are currently unaware of the effectiveness of the tongue scraper.

(A) This statement does not attack either one of the assumptions. In fact, it may actually strengthen the argument by pointing out that some breath freshening products are less effective than tongue scrapers at eliminating bacteria.

(B) This statement could weaken the argument by attacking the second assumption (consumers are currently unaware of the tongue scraper). If the tongue scraper has been on the market for a while, maybe consumers are already aware of its effectiveness. However, just because the product is on the market doesn't mean consumers are aware of its effectiveness. The analyst's conclusion states that as consumers learn about tongue scrapers, the market for breath freshening products will decline, regardless of whether the tongue scraper has already been on the market.

(C) While this certainly doesn't help the market analyst's case, we don't know what percentage of dentists recommend flossing over the tongue scraper, and we can't be sure how this recommendation affects the consumption of breath freshening products.

(D) CORRECT. This statement weakens the argument by attacking one of the main assumptions of the argument: people who use breath freshening products don't already know about the effectiveness of the tongue scraper. If 94% of those who consume breath freshening products already know about the tongue scraper, and if these consumers have continued to purchase breath freshening products, then only 6% of those who consume breath freshening products could decide to stop purchasing these products upon learning about the tongue scrapers effectiveness in fighting bad breath. Even if all 6% stopped purchasing the products, this would hardly create a "significant decline" in the market.

(E) This statement could weaken the argument by attacking the first assumption (consumers are primarily interested in products that are most effective in fighting bad breath). These particular consumers would not necessarily stop consuming breath freshening products upon learning of a more effective product, such as the tongue scraper. However, we have no information on what percentage of the market these people represent.

12.
Last year, firms in the manufacturing sector that offered employees employer sponsored insurance (ESI) plans found that their worker absentee rates were significantly lower than at firms that did not offer ESI. What could have caused the decrease? The argument is made that the existence of the ESI plan caused the decrease in worker absenteeism, but that conclusion would be weakened if another cause were identified.

(A) Similar findings in other sectors of the economy strengthen rather than weaken the argument.

(B) If workers have access to preventative health care as a result of the ESI plan, they might be healthier and would miss fewer days of work due to illness. This point supports the argument.

(C) The difficulty of initiating an ESI plan is irrelevant to a conclusion about what happens after the plan is established.

(D) CORRECT. If there are fewer on-the-job injuries, then workers will miss fewer days of work. This is an alternate explanation for the decrease in absenteeism, and thus weakens the argument that the decrease in absenteeism must have been due to the availability of ESI.

(E) The higher productivity of workers covered by ESI plans is consistent with the fact that they miss fewer days of work. This statement does not weaken the argument.

13.
The legislators want to promote ethanol production in order to lessen our dependence on foreign oil. Any evidence that ethanol production would not lessen our dependence on foreign oil would undermine the legislators' conclusion.

(A) CORRECT. If it takes 1.5 gallons of oil to make 1 gallon of ethanol, it is not clear that producing ethanol can help us to reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

(B) As long as many drivers prefer not to switch to electric cars, it is possible that the ethanol fuel mix will come into widespread use.

(C) Although it may be expensive to retrofit a non-ethanol vehicle, ethanol-ready new vehicles might constitute a large potential market for subsidized ethanol.

(D) This answer choice is irrelevant because the argument does not mention pollution.

(E) Without any information as to why the ethanol/gasoline blend has not been widely adopted in Europe, we cannot reach any conclusions that are relevant to the United States.

14.
This argument states that the United States created the Fourth Amendment to protect against unreasonable intrusions. It observes that such intrusions are

often committed by dictatorships. It then makes a rather sweeping conclusion that any country without similar protections will suppress dissent. Such a broad conclusion could be weakened by citing one case in which that pattern does not hold.

(A) CORRECT. This choice cites a country without such protections that does not suppress dissent. One example weakens the conclusion, which said no country would refrain from suppressing dissent without such protections.

(B) This choice is irrelevant, as the conclusion does not address the effectiveness of different types of government. In fact, as it is limited to democracies; any information about dictatorships is irrelevant.

(C) This choice does not weaken the argument. The conclusion said "systematically suppress dissent" and this statement talks about "haphazard" suppression under special circumstances. Furthermore, we do not know if these democracies had equally extensive protections.

(D) Whether or not the United States supported a dictatorship is irrelevant to the conclusion that democracies without extensive protections will eventually suppress dissent.

(E) This choice, if anything, strengthens the argument. It presents the example of democracies without such protections that do suppress dissent.

15.
Consider how the researcher reached the conclusion that having a more "take charge" personality makes a person more likely to become a corporate executive. Only one justification is given for this proposed cause and effect: the observation that a "take charge" personality tends to be observed in people who are corporate executives. However, it could be the case that the cause and effect relationship flows in the opposite direction than that proposed in the argument, as it is possible that a person first becomes a corporate executive and then develops a more "take charge" personality as a result.

(A) CORRECT. If a "take charge" personality is observed in people who are corporate executives because the job itself causes those traits to emerge, then the researcher's conclusion that the personality traits lead to the job would be weakened.

(B) The behavior of corporate executives outside of the corporate world is not relevant to the argument.

(C) The fact that some non-executives have stronger "take charge" personalities than some people who are corporate executives does not substantially weaken the argument, as the existence of people who embody the extremes of a "take charge" personality does not disprove that those with a "take charge" personality are more likely to move into the role of corporate executive. Moreover, the personalities of non-executives are not relevant as counterexamples to the researcher's argument about executives.

(D) The argument concerns "take charge" personality traits, not other management styles. It is possible that the people who aspire to become executives have "take charge" personalities, but have to adjust their management style according to the demands of their current jobs. Thus, this statement does not weaken the researcher's conclusion.

(E) The success or failure of the executive's management style, particularly outside of the corporate world, is not relevant to the conclusion.

16.
The conclusion of the argument is that "the retail price of chocolate is certain to increase within six months." This claim is based on the fact that the wholesale price of cocoa solids and cocoa butter has increased significantly and is likely to stay high. The argument assumes that the current retail price of chocolate reflects the current wholesale price of cocoa. The correct answer will weaken the conclusion by contradicting this assumption.

(A) The argument concludes that the retail price of chocolate is certain to increase - what consumers will or will not do in response to the predicted price increase is not relevant.

(B) If researchers have discovered a method to kill the fungus, then the cacao bean crop might recover, although this statement does not provide any indication that that will happen. This statement does not mention anything about when the fungicide method would be implemented, or how long the supposed cacao bean crop recovery would take. Therefore, this statement fails to weaken the conclusion that the retail price will increase within six months.

(C) The argument does not discuss the differences between types of chocolates, so the statement that dark and bittersweet varieties will be more seriously affected than milk varieties is irrelevant.

(D) The price of chocolate in the past is irrelevant to the conclusion about the price of chocolate in the next six months.

(E) CORRECT. This statement contradicts the assumption that the retail price of chocolate immediately reflects the wholesale price of cocoa solids and cocoa butter. If the chocolate currently sold in stores was made from cocoa purchased two years ago, then it may be quite some time before the current wholesale price increase is passed on to retail chocolate consumers.

17.
In this argument, the editor makes an inference about broad market trends based on the results of the survey conducted in the New Homes magazine. The argument will be weakened if it is shown that the results of the survey are not representative of the public in general and thus cannot serve as a basis for far-reaching, market-wide conclusions.
(A) This answer choice would simply demonstrate that the survey was based on a large sample size representative of all age groups. This information, if anything, would support the integrity of the survey.

(B) While the approach described in this answer choice would likely facilitate obtaining higher response rates for the survey, it provides no information that would question the conclusion of the editor.

(C) CORRECT. This answer choice demonstrates that the data collected from the survey are unlikely to be representative of the general population, thus weakening the editor's conclusion about the trend in the broad market. Naturally, if the magazine maintains a strong focus on new homes, its readers are, by definition, interested in buying or building a home; therefore, their responses cannot be used to make conclusions about the overall market trends.

(D) The fact that the number of readers of the magazine has more than doubled does nothing to weaken the argument of the editor. In fact, a greater number of readers may indicate higher interest in real estate, thus supporting rather than weakening the argument of the author.

(E) While receiving modest compensation for filling out the survey could potentially increase the response rate, this factor is unlikely to affect the results of the survey and is therefore outside the scope of the argument.

18.
The dentists argue that adding fluoride to tap water lulls people into a false sense of dental security because they rely too heavily on the fluoride to do work they should do for themselves. The dentists rely on the assumption that people are aware that fluoride is added to the water. The correct answer will weaken the conclusion by contradicting this assumption.

(A) The ingredients in commercially available dental care products are irrelevant to the dentists' argument about whether adding fluoride to tap water is ultimately beneficial.

(B) CORRECT. If most Americans are not aware that fluoride is added to tap water, then they must not be relying on it to protect their teeth. Poor dental hygiene might just be due to laziness or apathy, and this behavior would remain unchanged even if the water companies stopped adding fluoride to tap water. If anything, tooth decay would be likely to increase, since people would no longer get any protection from the tap water.

(C) The most effective means of controlling tooth decay, whether by annual dental exams or some other means, is irrelevant to the dentists' argument about whether adding fluoride to tap water is ultimately beneficial.

(D) How the United States ranks in terms of tooth decay is irrelevant to the dentists' argument about whether adding fluoride to tap water is ultimately beneficial.

(E) The current dental hygiene routine of most Americans is irrelevant to the dentists' argument about whether adding fluoride to tap water is ultimately beneficial.

19.
The conclusion of the argument is that "there must be fewer new residents moving to City X than there were previously." Why? Because of several observed factors (e.g., developers not buying land, contractors without work, banks issuing fewer mortgages) that the author assumes result from the fewer people trying to buy new homes. We are asked to find a flaw in the reasoning of this argument.

(A) CORRECT. This suggests that there might be another reason for the decline in home construction: the supply of available housing has been increased through the release of many previously built homes. Therefore, the reasoning in the argument is flawed.

(B) The size of homes, by itself, does not point to any flaw in the argument.

(C) The argument centers on new homes, so re-sales of condominiums are not directly related.

(D) If materials cost less, it seems more likely that any decrease in new home construction could be attributed to the stated causes.

(E) Sales of cars and boats are not related to construction of new homes.

20.
The author concludes that the number of people who exceed the speed limit in County X must be higher than the number who exceed the speed limit in County Y on the grounds that the number of tickets issued in County X is higher. The author wrongly assumes that every ticket corresponds to a different individual. It is possible, for example, that a handful of people routinely exceed the speed limit and are thus responsible for a disproportionate share of the tickets issued in the county.

(A) Any difference in speed limits is irrelevant to the conclusion.

(B) The conclusion is about actual numbers, not percentages.

(C) CORRECT. This points out the author's unwarranted assumption that every ticket corresponds to a different individual.

(D) Whether the residents of County Y break other laws is irrelevant to this specific issue.

(E) Whether the residents of County X are aware that they are exceeding the speed limit is irrelevant to this specific issue.

21.
The principal of School X argues that giving students more time to complete their math homework would increase the school's average math score on the state assessment. To weaken this argument, we need a statement that questions the connection between math homework and state assessment scores.

(A) This statement does not question the connection between math homework and state assessment scores. In fact, it could possibly support the argument by providing data that show there is a need for dedicated study time.

(B) While the lack of improvement at School Y seems to be compelling evidence against the argument presented, we don't have enough information about School Y's initiative to know whether School X would experience the same outcome. For example, it's very possible that School Y used its additional time for activities other than math study, in which case the initiatives would not be comparable.

(C) The faculty members' desire to have more time dedicated to the music curriculum has no bearing on whether more time to complete math homework would lead to higher test scores.

(D) The parents' concerns about the extended school day interfering with extracurricular activities has no bearing on whether more time to complete math homework would lead to higher test scores.

(E) CORRECT. This statement weakens the argument by attacking the argument's main assumption: if students do more math homework, they will score higher on the assessment. If the core curriculum is not aligned with the topics tested on the state assessment, then the amount of homework done by students is irrelevant.

22.
This argument concludes that the city should convene a conference of relevant parties to create opportunities for out of work young people. The argument's premise is that the retirement of the baby boomers will create shortages. The argument assumes the efficacy of its conclusion -- in other words, that the conference will actually be effective in creating job opportunities. Attacking an assumption is an effective way to weaken an argument.

(A) If anything, this choice strengthens the argument. If immigration does not provide a labor pool, it is more likely that a shortage will ensue.

(B) CORRECT. The argument assumes that it is feasible to affect employment patterns by government encouragement and/or action. If that assumption is denied, the conclusion is weakened, as the conference would be pointless.

(C) This choice makes an irrelevant distinction. It doesn't matter if the best positions require skills, as long as the majority are available to the unskilled unemployed in question.

(D) Knowing that a small proportion of baby boomers will not retire on schedule does not significantly weaken the argument. The argument relies on general estimates, not on exact numbers.

(E) If anything, this choice strengthens the argument. If these people are unaware of these opportunities, it would be positive to convene to plan how to reach them.

23.
The argument concludes that children are more likely to attend college if they are sent to private high schools instead of public high schools. The basis for this claim is the higher percentage of graduates of private schools pursuing college education. It is assumed that public schools are inferior to private schools as a training ground for college. Any statement that provides an alternate explanation

for the fact that public school graduates attend college at lower rates than private school graduates would weaken the argument.

Another way to interpret this question involves the concepts of correlation and causation. The argument's premise states that private school attendance (vs. public school attendance) is highly correlated with college attendance. The conclusion of the argument is essentially that private school attendance CAUSES college attendance (and therefore, parents ought to send their children to private schools to ensure eventual college attendance). This conclusion depends on the assumption that the causation does NOT work the other way – in other words, that "readiness or desire to attend college" does not influence the choice of public or private school. Any evidence that readiness or desire to attend college DOES influence the choice of public or private school will weaken the argument.

(A) While higher test scores might increase students' chances of admission to college, they are unrelated to whether students will actually attend college. Even if one could prove that earning higher test scores makes a student more likely to attend college, this statement would not weaken the argument, but rather strengthen it.

(B) Since the conclusion centers on the likelihood of attending college, economic and financial considerations are outside the scope of the argument.

(C) Since the amount of need-based aid is not directly related to whether a student will attend college, this statement is outside the scope of the argument.

(D) While better athletic opportunities could increase students' chances of admission to college, they are unrelated to whether students will actually attend college. Also, even though the advantages of public school mentioned in this statement were taken into account by the study, the proportion of graduates of public schools attending colleges remains substantially lower than the proportion of graduates of private schools.

(E) CORRECT. This answer choice demonstrates that the difference in the percentage of graduates attending colleges stems not from any advantage provided by private schools but from the fact that a subset of the graduates of public high schools simply choose to pursue a different career path. In other words, 30% of the graduates of public schools voluntarily choose not to pursue a college education. Yet 65% - out of the 70% of graduates remaining - end up in colleges. This statement indicates extremely high college matriculation rates for students who want to attend college after graduation from public high schools.

Using the concepts of correlation and causation, this answer choice provides the alternative causation for the correlation observed. In other words, "desire to

attend college" is ALREADY lower in the rural areas where public schools happen to be located. According to this evidence, attendance at private or public school is the effect, not the cause, of "desire to attend college."

24.
The head of engineering has concluded that the one-time doubling of costs for the raw material caused the steady decline, over two years, of profit margins. The engineer's conclusion rests on the assumption that there is a connection between the one-time raw material price increase and the two-year steady decline in profit margins. Alternatively, something else could have caused either a steady two-year decline in revenues or a steady two-year increase in costs; if so, this event is more likely to be the cause of a steady decline in profit margins over the same two-year period. As a result, this would weaken the engineer's conclusion that finding a new source for the raw material will improve profit margins.

(A) CORRECT. New competitors have caused a steady two-year decline in revenues. This weakens the engineer's contention that the one-time doubling of costs for the raw material is the cause of the steady two-year decline in profit margins.

(B) The fact that the region's mines are producing less than they did before the earthquake does not indicate anything about the cost of the raw material; it would be necessary to show that cost is not reduced in order to weaken the engineer's conclusion.

(C) The amount of raw material produced by other regions does not indicate anything about the cost of the raw material; it would be necessary to show that cost is not reduced in order to weaken the engineer's conclusion.

(D) The use of a different raw material does not indicate anything about the cost of that raw material; it would be necessary to show that cost is not reduced in order to weaken the engineer's conclusion.

(E) Although mining the raw material may become more cost-effective for the mine (that is, cheaper), this does not tell us what will happen to the price they charge for the material when selling to the company producing the product in question. It would be necessary to show that the company’s cost is not reduced in order to weaken the engineer's conclusion.

25.
The conclusion is that the government has “practiced bad public policy in failing to increase Pell grants or at least limit their reduction for next year's budget."

The basis for that claim is that Pell grants improve access to higher education, which allows lower-income students to improve their economic standing. The main assumption this argument relies on is that Pell grants are the only means available to lower-income students who wish to access higher education. The correct answer will weaken the conclusion by contradicting this assumption.

(A) CORRECT. If total spending on access to higher education will increase, then the federal government has addressed the issue that the author cites, albeit through means other than Pell grants.

(B) Whether candidates for Pell grants are aware of their eligibility is irrelevant to the claim that the government has practiced bad public policy.

(C) This choice may sound like a counterargument (that Congress is somehow practicing good public policy by authorizing a bill that will increase after-school programs in urban communities) to the argument presented (that the government is practicing bad public policy by failing to safeguard Pell grants). However, we have no evidence that after-school programs in urban communities help low-income students afford higher education, so this does not weaken the argument presented by the author.

(D) The dollar amount of the Pell grants is irrelevant. To this argument, it matters only that they provide some help at all.

(E) Increased spending on education as a percentage of the total budget does not necessarily imply that low-income students will have better access to higher education. In fact, it does not even imply that education spending (in dollars) will increase.

26.
The strategy of the investment advisor is based on selecting the fund that has delivered the highest returns within the peer group that meets the client's objectives. One of the major assumptions underlying this strategy is that the funds that have delivered the best returns will continue to do so in the future. If this assumption is inaccurate, the strategy of the investment advisor will be seriously weakened.

(A) CORRECT. This answer choice demonstrates a serious flaw in the logic of the investment advisor. If it is true that the best-performing fund managers have already used their strongest ideas and are unlikely to sustain this level of performance in the future, then the advisor's winner-oriented strategy is unlikely to deliver high returns.

(B) Since the investment advisor selects the fund from the group that meets the client's objectives, this statement does not weaken the advisor's strategy.

(C) Since the advisor's strategy is oriented only towards her clients rather than the public in general, the fact that many investors choose to manage their own portfolios is outside the scope of the argument.

(D) This statement, if true, would support rather than weaken the advisor's strategy. If the funds with strongest past performance continue to outperform others, the advisor's strategy is likely to yield high future returns.

(E) Since this answer choice does not provide any specific reason for the decline in the advisor's clientele, it is not relevant to the effectiveness of the advisor's strategy. This decline could have occurred for a variety of reasons unrelated to investment returns. For example, the decline in the clientele could have resulted from the fact that the advisor moved from a larger metropolitan area to a smaller town with fewer active investors.

27.
Sally makes a claim that picking one flower will not cause any harm. Joe replies that her claim is not true and supports his response by citing the consequence of everyone picking a flower. By doing so, Joe attempts to shift the focus away from Sally's actual claim.

(A) Whether there are circumstances under which destroying the garden is justified is irrelevant to Sally's claim that picking one flower is not harmful and Joe's argument refuting that claim.

(B) A circular argument assumes that which it is trying to prove. The following is a circular argument: "Only an untrustworthy person would run for office. The fact that politicians are untrustworthy is proof of this." Joe's argument is not circular: Joe does not rely on the assumption that Sally's statement is not true in order to argue that Sally's statement is not true.

(C) While Joe does point out that the consequence of the collective action is different from that of Sally's individual action, his argument is questionable because in doing so he attempts to shift the focus away from Sally's actual claim, not because he contradicts himself. There is no contradiction here.

(D) CORRECT. Joe attempts to refute Sally's claim by asserting that the collective action of "everyone" would destroy the garden. This argument is questionable because Sally merely made a claim about the consequence of picking just one flower, not about the consequences of everyone doing so. By using the consequences of everyone picking a flower to refute Sally's claim on the

consequences on picking just one flower, Joe implies that Sally's picking of the one flower will necessarily lead to everone picking a flower (hence, leading to the destruction of the garden). Not only is this assumption not necessarily true, but it is also not supported by anything Joe says in his response: he merely states a premise based on a hypothetical ("If everyone thought that way and picked a flower...."). This questionable argumentive technique of shifting the focus from the consequence of a single action to the consequence of a much larger collective action without proving a cause-and-effect link between the single and collective actions is known as the "fallacy of the slippery slope assumption."

(E) Joe says nothing that attacks Sally's character.

28.
The claim of the manufacturer is that no special precautions need be taken when using the cookware. The basis of this claim is that the cookware is dangerous only when it reaches a temperature much higher than normally reached during cooking. We are asked to find a choice that weakens this claim; since the danger comes only at high temperatures, the correct choice will likely have something to do with temperature.
(A) The fact that chemicals can linger for days does not affect the claim; if the chemicals are not released in the first place, this is irrelevant.
(B) CORRECT. If "empty cookware left on the flame often reaches exceptionally high temperatures," then there may indeed exist circumstances under which the cookware will pose a danger. The manufacturer's claim that no precautions need be taken is greatly weakened.
(C) The fact that several consumers have claimed illness as a result of using the cookware does not mean that their illnesses were in fact from the cookware; the food may have been contaminated or the illness may have resulted from something entirely unrelated to cooking. Without proof of the claim, this choice is not relevant.
(D) The fact that the manufacturer did not test the issue ahead of time is irrelevant to the claim that no special precautions need be taken.
(E) The existence of other non-stick coatings that do not release toxins has little to do with the manufacturer's claim here about a non-stick coating that could release toxins.

29.
The conclusion of the argument is that the government should educate the public about the dangers of inactivity and poor diet in order to stop the spread of type-2 diabetes. The basis for the claim is that inactivity and poor diet are the main factors in developing type-2 diabetes. We are asked to find a choice that will show that this plan likely will not work.

(A) The fact that schools educate middle school students about a disease that is generally "acquired in adulthood" does not address the effectiveness of an adult education plan sponsored by the government.

(B) The fact that the public already has access to this information through the Internet, does not say anything predictive about the effectiveness of the plan. Even with access to the information, there is a good chance that most people are not exposed to the information.

(C) Just because food companies encourage the public to indulge in unhealthful snacks, does not mean that a program that teaches them to do otherwise would not be successful.

(D) The fact that the government has not set aside money for such a program, does not say much about the projected program's effectiveness.

(E) CORRECT. Choice E states that healthful foods and exercise programs are beyond the financial means of many people. This suggests that even with the best planning, the program might not achieve its goals simply because people cannot afford to follow the program's advice.

30.
The correct answer is E. The conclusion is that the cause of the lower rate of absenteeism is fear of losing money. The basis for that claim is that two other possible explanations – improved health insurance and improved working conditions – are not present in every case. This argument falsely assumes, however, that these three factors are the only possible explanations.
(A) This answer choice does not address the fact that there may be other factors causing absenteeism to go down. If anything, it simply strengthens the idea that not having health insurance should contribute to more absenteeism.
(B) This answer choice does not address the fact that there may be other factors causing absenteeism to go down. Furthermore, the argument concludes that absenteeism has gone done across the board, for all types of companies and that the reason is fear of reduced pay. This choice seems to suggest that somehow that this fear is more of an issue for those companies with poor working conditions.
(C) Employees being honest about the reasons they miss work has little to do with the claim of the argument about why employees are missing work. The premises cited to do not rely on employee disclosure.
(D) The definition of absenteeism has little to do with the explanation of why it is occurring. Furthermore, there seems to be little ambiguity here with the definition.
(E) CORRECT. This addresses the argument's primary assumption that these three are the only possible explanations for absenteeism.

31.
The official's conclusion is that people who claim that the U.S. is more vulnerable than other nations because of the country's lack of a national vaccine laboratory are disloyal and incorrect. His basis for that conclusion is that the U.S. has prominent doctors, ranks in the middle in terms of life span, infant mortality, and nutrition, and people from around the world come to the U.S. for medical care. We are asked to find the choice that does NOT point out a flaw in the official's logic.
(A) CORRECT. This choice states that the official accepts that the quality of physicians and hospitals is a major factor, albeit not the only one, affecting the public's vulnerability to disease. This does not contradict anything in the official's argument, nor does it make light of any flaws in the official's logic.
(B) This choice highlights the official's logical jump from "disloyal" to "wrong" in the phrase "these critics are disloyal and thus wrong about the public's vulnerability." There is no connection between disloyalty and wrongness. This is a flaw.
(C) If the Europeans that the official cited are overwhelmingly wealthy men over the age of fifty, the official relied on an unrepresentative sample to justify his claim. What is true of wealthy older European men is not necessarily true of Europeans or non- Americans generally. This is a flaw.
(D) The fact the official relies on health statistics that are based on a complete accounting of deaths, injuries, and illnesses suffered by the American public from all causes, including the ten percent attributable to infectious diseases means that the official is not limiting his evidence to cases relating to vaccines. Other causes of death are not relevant to the argument. This is a flaw.
(E) If the U.N. health ranking that the official cited is based on an almost complete survey of its members, the ranking of the United States may be misleading, since it may not compare the U.S. to nations of similar economic standing. This is a flaw.
The correct answer is A.

32.
The correct answer is A. The conclusion of the argument is that dousing the roofs with water was a wasted effort. The basis for this claim is that the houses of those who doused their roofs still suffered fire damage. We are asked to weaken this conclusion.
Choice A states that the houses of owners who did not douse the roofs with water suffered appreciably more fire damage than did those of owners who did douse the roofs with water. This weakens the conclusion because it suggests that dousing the roofs was not a wasted effort. **Correct.**

33.

The correct answer is E. The conclusion is that the only way to fix our school systems is to inject new ideas and approaches. The author rejects the notion that spending more money can improve education. We are asked to weaken this argument.
Choice A states only that students that perform highly already are attracted to schools with new approaches. This does not weaken the argument. Incorrect.
Choice B states that schools with playgrounds have better students than schools without them. This is irrelevant. Incorrect.
Choice C states that student performance corresponds closely with the level of their family's education. This does not address the issue of spending. Incorrect.
Choice D states that school employees are generally pleased with the school system. This does not address the core of the argument: that money does not improve student performance.
Choice E states that students from schools that spend more money tend to perform better on standardized tests. This suggests that the claim that money does not improve performance may be wrong. Correct.

34.
The correct answer is C. The conclusion of the argument is "Company X has a good chance of commercial success with its new soft drink." Why? Because most consumers in the taste test preferred its flavor to that of an established brand. In order to weaken this argument, all we need to do is show that there may be some reason to doubt that the flavor will be enough for the drink to be successful. Choice C states that the new drink will be much more expensive than any other on the market. This does not prove that the drink will not be successful, but it does give a reason to suspect that it might not be.

35.
The correct answer is E. The conclusion of the argument is that "math education in this country does a disservice to our children." Why? Because math teachers emphasize "in higher grades the same narrow, skills-based approach that students learned in lower grades rather than the analytical tools they will need to solve complex math problems." In order to weaken the conclusion, we need to show that this approach has not had a negative effect on children's math skills. Choice E states that an increasing percentage of native first-year students qualify to take advanced math courses in college. This would seem to suggest that more children are prepared for advanced math than had previously been the case, thus weakening the conclusion of the argument.

36.
The correct answer is A. The conclusion of the argument is that "people must not be as interested in buying new homes as they were even six months ago." Why? Because of several factors (developers not buying land, contractors without work, banks issuing fewer mortgages) that the author assumes result from the

supposed lack of interest in buying new homes. Choice A suggests, though, that there may be an alternative explanation for all of those factors: interest rates are too high for most people. So even though they remain interested in buying homes, they simply cannot afford to do so and the whole housing market has slumped accordingly.

37.
The correct answer is C. The researchers recommend a diet high in calcium to prevent laryngeal polyps. Why? Because people with low calcium levels usually have these polyps. But the researchers assume that the low levels of calcium cause the polyps rather than the reverse: that the polyps somehow prevent the body from absorbing calcium. So if it were true that the causal relationship was reversed, eating calcium-rich foods would not have the desired effect.

STRENGTHEN
1.
The conclusion of the argument is that the government's calculation methods must be altered in order to provide statistics that measure true poverty. To support this position, the author first explains how the government's method works and then introduces a hypothetical example that would return a "false positive" - that is, a person who has a large income, yet is classified by the government as living in poverty. One example, however, is generally not enough to invalidate an entire method; no method is perfect and there are always a few results that are not consistent with the overall conclusion. In order to validate, or strengthen, the conclusion, we need to show that the government's method is fundamentally inferior to some alternative that would produce more valid results.

(A) This choice weakens the argument by minimizing the importance of the author's evidence (the hypothetical retiree with capital gains). According to this choice, the use of cash income to designate poverty levels is a very sound method because it provides valid results for more than 99% of those classified as living in poverty.

(B) This choice shows that the government's method provided a wide range of results for the poverty rate over a certain period of time, but it is irrelevant to the argument at hand. It tells us nothing about whether the method provides relevant statistics in any given year.

(C) CORRECT. If this statement is true, then the government's calculation method seems to overstate the number of people living in poverty, while the various private sector studies generally agree with each other that the number of people is lower. Thus, the methods used in the private sector are likely to be more valid than the government's method, lending credence to the author's contention that the government's method should change.

(D) Although this choice provides an example of people who might agree with the conclusion (several prominent economists), this choice provides no evidence that the alternate method they endorse would provide more relevant statistics than the government's method.

(E) This choice adds another hypothetical example of how the current method could include someone in the poverty count who does not actually live in poverty. It does not, however, address whether there are other calculation methods that are more accurate than the government's method.

2.
The public health advocates are concerned that patients are subjected to advertisements about prescription drugs, and may pursue these drugs even though the drugs may not be clinically appropriate. It is argued that, because physicians must prescribe the drugs in question, patient pursuit of these prescription drugs is irrelevant. However, patients who pursue and request particular prescription drugs may be able to encourage or induce a physician to prescribe drugs that he or she might not have in the absence of such encouragement.

(A) The clinical efficacy of certain over-the-counter medications does not address the public health advocates' concern regarding patient pursuit of inappropriate prescription drugs.

(B) The public health advocates' concern does not rely on every possible consumer to see the advertisements for prescription medications. It is enough that some consumers see the advertisements.

(C) This answer choice states the obvious possibility that physicians may also see the advertisements for prescription drugs directed toward consumers. This is irrelevant to the concern expressed by the public health advocates.

(D) CORRECT. This answer choice directly addresses the public health advocates' concern by establishing that physicians are not susceptible to patient pressure in prescribing inappropriate drugs. As a result, drugs will be prescribed according to the objective clinical judgment of the prescribing physician, mitigating the danger of inappropriate use.

(E) That certain prescription medications are safe and effective treatments for many conditions does not address the concern of inappropriate use expressed by the public health advocates. Prescription drugs can be safe and effective when used for certain conditions by various individuals and still be subject to unhealthy use by other patients.

3.
This argument concerns a potential explanation for larger tips on the part of restaurant patrons. The explanation provided is that customers are more generous toward servers that leave their hand-written name on the bill due to a greater degree of personal identification with the server, which encourages larger tips. The correct answer will either support the fact that a hand-written name strengthens personal identification, or that personal identification encourages larger tips.

(A) The fact that the effect applies equally regardless of the method of payment is not relevant to the conclusion.

(B) The argument does not address the size of the bill; rather, it addresses the size of the tip. This choice is irrelevant.

(C) CORRECT. This answer choice provides further evidence that a hand-written name or signature generates a greater form of personalization and emotional connection among recipients, leading to more donations.

(D) The impact of alcoholic beverages on tipping behavior is irrelevant.

(E) The location of the restaurants and leisure pursuits of the patrons are irrelevant to the argument.

4.
The conclusion is that a company should wait until purchases of an old device have begun to decline before announcing a new device. The basis for this claim is that consumers stop buying the old device. We are asked to strengthen the argument.

(A) The typical drop in the price of new technology does not influence whether a company should wait until sales of an old technology begin to decline before introducing a new one.

(B) CORRECT. This choice states that media outlets such as television and magazines often report on the planned introduction of new devices while sales of old devices are still strong. The argument requires that consumers "hear about the new device"; stories in the media provide a means for consumers to do so.

(C) If many consumers are unable to determine the superiority of new technology, then they might be less swayed to wait for a new, recently announced device than otherwise. As a result, this claim may be seen to weaken the analyst's assertion.

(D) The number of technology purchases per year does not directly relate to this argument. The argument is about waiting until the consumer demand declines before announcing a new technology. However frequently consumers typically purchase technology, some will be ready to buy the old device when news of the upcoming device gets out -- and according to the argument, this news will cause some of those consumers to wait.

(E) The passage makes no mention of whether the technologies belong to the same company or different companies.

5.
The argument claims that federal incentives should be provided to encourage energy efficiency. The argument also notes that companies are already working in this direction and that this trend will ease the environmental and energy pressures that currently trouble the world. Supporting this argument could involve providing evidence of possible success for these efforts toward their goals.

(A) This choice is an irrelevant comparison. That Canadian companies are more efficient has no bearing on efforts in the United States or the role of government incentives.

(B) This choice does not strengthen the claim. Experts' claims are not the same as reality. Furthermore, the choice does not say whether reducing energy use to the 1995 level is a significant decrease, nor does it provide any information to strengthen the link between government incentives and reduced energy use.

(C) CORRECT. This choice provides evidence that government incentives are effective. Thus, this choice confirms an assumption that the conclusion is feasible.

(D) This choice is an irrelevant distinction. It does not matter to the argument's conclusion if one of these issues is a greater problem than the other in the present.

(E) The passage asserts that the United States should be at the forefront of an emerging market for cleaner technologies; i.e., the market will be significant in the future. The size of the market at present is irrelevant to the argument.

6.
The director concludes that the fee hike has helped to counteract the cut in state funding. In other words, the director believes that increasing the late fees has

led to increased revenue from late fees. While the size of the fee itself is one important factor, there are other factors that also have an effect on the amount of revenue generated from late fees: the number of overdue books and the number of days that books are overdue before they are returned. It's very possible that the fee increase would prompt more borrowers to return their books on time; this would reduce the number of late fees being paid, reducing revenue from late fees. Further, it's possible that the fee increase would prompt more borrowers to return their already overdue books sooner than they would otherwise. This would reduce the average amount of each late fee, reducing revenue from late fees. The argument explicitly states that there has been no decline in the number of overdue books, but it says nothing about the number of days that books are overdue before they are returned. A statement that rules out the possibility that borrowers are returning their already overdue books sooner than they would have if they were still being charged the original lower overdue fee would strengthen the director's claim.

(A) A decrease in the number of borrowed books has no bearing on the revenue generated from late fees if the number of overdue books remains unchanged. The question explicitly states that the number of overdue books has not changed.

(B) If anything, this statement weakens the argument. The costs incurred to implement the new fees would cut into the revenue generated from these new fees.

(C) CORRECT. This statement rules out the possibility that the library system is losing revenue as a result of borrowers returning overdue books earlier than they would otherwise.

(D) The argument has explicitly stated that the number of overdue books has not changed. This is a stated premise that we must take as factual information, regardless of the quality of the database being used to track such information.

(E) The elimination of other unrelated costs has no bearing on whether the library system has successfully increased revenues through late fees.

7.
The conclusion is that a developer who wishes to make a large profit would be wise to buy urban waterfront lots and erect residential buildings on them. The basis for that claim is that people pay large sums for beach front homes. We are asked to strengthen this argument.

(A) This choice states that people have more buying power today than in previous centuries. This does not strengthen the claim that a developer will make money on urban waterfront properties.

(B) CORRECT. This choice states that homeowners will be willing to spend large sums of money on residential properties in traditionally industrial or commercial districts. Since we know from the argument that urban waterfronts have traditionally been industrial, this fact strengthens the claim that a developer can make a profit on urban waterfront properties.

(C) This choice states that many urban waterfront lots are available for purchase. This does not suggest, however, that a developer will be able to sell them after he or she builds on them.

(D) This choice states that many coastal cities are giving tax breaks to developers who rehabilitate the waterfront. But this does not suggest that anyone will buy the developed properties.

(E) This choice states that properties in the interior of cities are more expensive than those on the waterfront. Although waterfront properties are therefore cheaper to acquire, this does not necessarily mean that a developer can make a profit after buying such properties.

8.
The question asks for information that will support the conclusion that students attending charter schools will, on average, perform better on assessments of writing ability than students attending traditional public schools. The passage specifies that charter schools differ from non-charter public schools in that charter schools have more freedom to innovate and that they are held accountable for meeting specific educational outcomes. One way to support the conclusion is to demonstrate that one of the two differences cited between charter and non-charter public schools is somehow tied to higher performance on writing assessments.

(A) While the passage mentions that charter schools themselves are freed from many regulations, no information is presented about any difference in emphasis with respect to order and discipline between charter and non-charter public schools. As such, it is impossible to tell whether this information would support the conclusion in the question.

(B) This choice presents information only about those students who score at the very highest level of the writing assessments. However, this presents no information about the difference, on average, between all charter school students and non-charter public school students. It is possible, for example, that

while the students who perform at the highest level on writing assessments are those who attend charter schools, on average non-charter public school students perform better.

(C) There is no necessary link between the amount of time spent teaching writing and student performance on writing assessments. For example, a good teacher who spends one hour teaching writing may have a more positive impact on student performance than a poor teacher who spends three hours teaching writing.

(D) CORRECT. The passage specifies that charter schools have more freedom to pursue innovative educational ideas than non-charter public schools. It follows that charter schools are allowed to experiment with their curricula to a greater degree than non-charter public schools. This choice links this difference to higher student achievement on assessments of writing ability.

(E) The number of students attending charter vs. non-charter schools has no bearing on the conclusion. The conclusion focused on student performance on average, thereby eliminating raw numbers of students as relevant to this measure.

9.
League officials plan to reduce the number of flagrant fouls by implementing mandatory suspensions for players who commit such fouls. This plan will work only if the punishment serves to deter players from committing flagrant fouls.

(A) The cause of injuries has no bearing on whether suspensions will deter players from committing flagrant fouls.

(B) While the referees' effectiveness in recognizing and reporting flagrant fouls will surely aid in the implementation of the new policy, this has no bearing on whether the policy will deter players from committing flagrant fouls.

(C) The parents' opinion has no bearing on whether the suspensions will deter players from committing flagrant fouls.

(D) While we might conclude that the other, similar league has a low incidence of flagrant fouls because it suspends players who commit such fouls, we have no evidence to show that the suspensions actually deter players from committing fouls. It is entirely possible that the other league has a low incidence of flagrant fouls for other reasons. For example, maybe the players in the other league are just inherently less aggressive.

(E) CORRECT. If players want to make the All-Star team, and if a record of suspension precludes these players from being selected for the team, then players are less likely to commit fouls that will lead to suspensions.

10.
The passage makes the premise that microwave ovens are not completely safe. This is followed by a conclusion by the consumer advocates that microwave ovens should not be accepted as standard appliances. Since there is nothing in the passage that provides an explicit link between the safety of microwave ovens and their acceptability as standard appliances, the consumer advocates' conclusion is based on an assumption (i.e., an implied premise) that "an appliance should be accepted as standard only if it is found to be completely safe." The most effective way to strengthen such a conclusion is to show that such an assumption is indeed true.

(A) The strength of the consumer advocates' argument hinges upon the link between the level of safety of microwave ovens and the rationale for their acceptance in the home. Any lack of joy in microwave cooking is not relevant to the argument.

(B) Providing a specific example of how a person might be injured, even seriously, by a microwave oven may provide emotional support for the consumer advocates' position, but does little to strengthen the argument logically: the possibility of injury has already been stipulated as a premise.

(C) CORRECT. This choice best strengthens the argument by making explicit the assumption upon which the consumer advocates' argument was based.

(D) If no appliance is completely safe, then the consumer advocates' argument is absurb: no appliance is, or ever will be, acceptable as "standard" in a modern kitchen. This choice weakens the conclusion.

(E) The relative energy efficiency of gas vs. microwave cooking is not relevant to this argument.

11.
The argument explains that certain domestic foods are exported to certain countries and then imported from others, a practice that is seemingly redundant. The argument then concludes, however, that there is a justifiable economic rationale for this practice. The best answer must bolster this economic rationale.

(A) CORRECT. This choice explains that redundant trade allows for easier access to other desired goods that are more efficiently produced abroad. This is an explicitly economic rationale for redundant trade.

(B) This choice offers a political rather than an economic rationale for redundant trade.

(C) This choice offers a political rather than an economic rationale for redundant trade.

(D) This choice states that domestic growers would benefit economically from selling their products locally. This choice weakens the conclusion.

(E) This choice offers a cultural rather than an economic rationale for redundant trade.

12.
The argument claims that wide dissemination of wireless access is now a practical way to meet urban needs, based on the evidence of its successful use in rural areas. The author then must assume that urban areas provide no additional problems for wireless use.

(A) CORRECT. This choice confirms an assumption of the argument and thus strengthens the conclusion.

(B) This choice weakens the argument because it damages the assumption that urban areas pose no extra problems for wireless use.

(C) This choice is irrelevant because it provides information about another rural area; however, the conclusion concerns urban areas.

(D) This choice weakens the argument because it damages the assumption that urban areas pose no extra problems for wireless use.

(E) This choice is an irrelevant distinction. The argument mentioned all three groups as in need of this service. The suggestion that one group needs it more than the others is irrelevant to the conclusion.

13.
Hotel T wants to increase profitability by eliminating in-room mini-bars and replacing them with empty refrigerators. To increase Hotel T's profitability, the information provided must demonstrate that the difference between Hotel T's revenues and costs will increase as a result of the plan.

(A) The fact that there is space available in Hotel T's in-room mini bars for guests to put their own items has no relationship to Hotel T's plan to increase its profitability.

(B) Since the survey discussed in the passage discussed hotel guests in the United States, it has relevance for Hotel T. However, this fact has no bearing on whether Hotel T's plan will increase its profitability.

(C) Since some guests of Hotel T do not make any purchases from their in-room mini-bars, eliminating these mini-bars will not result in any lost revenue from these guests. However, this information tells us nothing about the purchasing habits of other guests of Hotel T and it has no obvious relationship to Hotel T's plan to increase profitability.

(D) CORRECT. This fact establishes that Hotel T is currently losing money on the mini-bars. While it makes money on the mini-bar purchases of its guests, Hotel T actually loses more money because it must discard mini-bar items that have not sold by their expiration dates. By eliminating the mini-bars in favor of refrigerators, Hotel T will lose the income from mini-bar purchases but save even more money because it no longer will have to discard old mini-bar items. This will increase Hotel T's profitability.

(E) Hotel T will reduce its costs by switching from stocked mini-bars to empty refrigerators. However, this may or may not increase Hotel T's profitability. For example, if the lost revenue from the elimination of the mini-bars exceeds the reduction in costs, then the switch will actually decrease Hotel T's profits.

14.
Since construction of new roads between County X and County Y is severely restricted, this argument claims that building a commuter train between the counties is a more cost-effective way to reduce congestion on Freeway Z than expanding the existing freeway or building a new one. This plan will work only if people currently driving on the freeway are likely to use the new commuter train. If the congestion is caused largely by people driving between the two counties, then some of these people would likely choose to use the train instead, decreasing traffic congestion on the freeway.

(A) The cost associated with funding necessary mass transit in both counties, in addition to the expense of the tunnel itself, is an argument against, not for, the proposed commuter train tunnel.

(B) This plan addresses a very specific situation: traffic between two counties on a certain freeway. Information about the nation's freeways in general is not relevant to this argument.

(C) CORRECT. This statement shows that a majority of the cars on Freeway Z are driven by commuters. Commuters are more likely than other groups to use the proposed train tunnel; if so, fewer cars would travel on the freeway, and traffic congestion would decrease.

(D) This plan addresses a very specific situation: traffic between two counties on a certain freeway. New freeways that are being built elsewhere are not relevant to this argument. Even if this information were relevant to this situation, it would be an argument against the proposed commuter train tunnel, indicating that new freeway construction is necessary despite the existence of commuter trains.

(E) The information that Freeway Z is congested largely because of transcontinental shipments in commercial trucks, rather than commuters between the two counties, is an argument against the proposed commuter train tunnel. A large proportion of the vehicles on Freeway Z are commercial trucks, which will still travel that route even if the commuter train tunnel is built, so traffic congestion will be largely unaffected.

15.
This argument concerns the impact of the change in cooking oil used by Fastfood King, and whether or not this change had an adverse impact on sales. It is given that sales of Fast Fries increased by 10 percent subsequent to the change. The issue is whether or not this 10 percent increase compares favorably to the increase one would expect taking other factors into account, including in particular the percentage increase enjoyed by Fastfood King's other offerings.

A. CORRECT. This statement indicates that Fastfood King's total food sales increased by less than 10 percent. As the sales of Fast Fries increased at a higher rate of 10 percent, this strongly suggests that the change to lowfat oil did not adversely impact the sales of Fast Fries.

B. The profit margins of different Fastfood King offerings are not relevant to the argument.

C. Any preference for the taste of corn oil over the new lowfat oil would damage, not support, the conclusion that the change has not negatively impacted the sales of Fast Fries.

D. The fact that Fastfood King was visited by 20 percent more people last year suggests that consumption of Fast Fries, which increased by only 10 percent,

may have been adversely affected by the change. This would weaken the conclusion, not strengthen it.

E. That the sales of Fast Fries increased by 20 percent in the previous year suggests that the rate of increase was slowed last year, possibly as a result of the cooking oil change. This would weaken the conclusion that the change did not have any negative impact on sales, rather than strengthen it.

16.
The argument concludes that, despite numerous protections, none of the manatees can be considered safe. The correct answer choice must support the assertion that all manatees are threatened.

(A) The deaths of several manatees from a specific toxin in no way indicates that all manatees are unsafe.

(B) CORRECT. This choice explicitly states that all manatees put themselves in harm's way by swimming at depths that make them vulnerable to the blades of motorboat engines.

(C) The awareness of programs to save the manatee is irrelevant to the argument.

(D) The simple fact that a limited number of manatees remains in the wild in no way suggests that every one of the 2,500 remaining manatees is threatened.

(E) The deaths each year of a number of manatees, whether documented or undocumented, do not indicate that all living manatees are threatened.

17.
The conclusion of the passage is that no police officer should bet on sports. The premise is that betting on sports is a form of gambling. In order for this conclusion to follow logically from this premise, there must be an assumption identifying gambling as something that no police officer should ever do. The most effective way to strengthen the conclusion is to show that this assumption is true.

(A) This does not provide support for the conclusion that no police officer should ever bet on sports. Some police officers are in places where gambling is legal.

(B) The fact that some criminals bet on sports does not imply that police officers should not bet on sports. Some criminals brush their teeth, but it's still OK for a police officer to brush her teeth.

(C) This answer choice may provide a reason why some people should be cautious about betting more than they can afford to lose. It does not imply, however, that no police officer should ever bet even a penny on sports.

(D) CORRECT. This choice best strengthens the argument by making explicit the assumption upon which the conclusion is logically dependent.

(E) In order to get from this assumption to the conclusion that no police officer should ever gamble, one would have to assume that: (1) these philosophers are correct in their belief that gambling is immoral, and (2) no police officer should ever do something immoral. This would be assuming too much for a Critical Reasoning problem.

18.
The environmentalists claim that ethanol is superior to gasoline because it emits lower levels of carbon monoxide, a known pollutant. This claim, however, assumes that ethanol does not release any other pollutants at levels greater than does gasoline. If ethanol released twenty times more sulfur into the environment than does gasoline, for example, perhaps it would be a less attractive alternative.

(A) CORRECT. This establishes that ethanol is less polluting than gasoline.

(B) The price of the fuels is not the issue in the argument. The environmentalists' claim is based on the levels of pollution that the fuels create.

(C) Whether there is enough corn to produce ethanol is irrelevant to whether it is less polluting than gasoline.

(D) Whether companies already possess the technology to produce ethanol is irrelevant to whether it is less polluting than gasoline.

(E) Whether ethanol can be used as heating fuel is irrelevant to whether it is less polluting than gasoline.

19.
The conclusion is that medical schools are misguided. The basis for this claim is that they pay little attention to preventive medicine. The argument would be made stronger by a statement concerning the benefits of preventive medicine.
(A) CORRECT. Vaccines are a type of preventive medicine that have known benefits, i.e., preventing contagious diseases.
(B) This statement supports the idea that the more time and money are spent on curative medicine than on preventive medicine. However, it does not speak to the benefits of preventive medicine.

(C) The number of students enrolled in medical school has nothing to do with the benefits of preventive medicine.
(D) Accidental causes have nothing to do with the benefits of preventive medicine.
(E) The number of doctors in certain specialties has nothing to do with the benefits of preventative medicine.

20.
The conclusion of the argument is that humans and primates are not the only animals capable of communicating with language. The basis for this claim is that a parrot named Alex becomes upset when he is not given the gesture he verbally requests. We are asked to strengthen the claim.

(A) The conclusion is about non-primates or non-humans being able to use language to communicate. Assisting divers in ocean rescues is not relevant.

(B) The conclusion is about non-primates or non-humans being able to use language to communicate. Gorillas are primates, as stated in the first sentence of the argument.

(C) Sensing the mood of one's owner and exhibiting concern is not a form of language communication.

(D) The conclusion is about non-primates or non-humans being able to use language to communicate. Chimpanzees are primates, as stated in the first sentence of the argument.

(E) CORRECT. If Alex does not exhibit aggression when offered a gesture that he specifically requested, it suggests that Alex can tell the difference between the gestures that he requests and those that he does not. In other words, he is a non-primate / non-human but he is communicating via language. If he also exhibited aggression when offered the gestures he requested, it would be more difficult to claim that he was communicating via language.

21.
The correct answer is D. The plan limits the number of new buildings that can be constructed in the town in any given year. The rationale for the plan is that it will preserve open spaces and relieve the pressure on schools and other municipal resources. Critics claim that the plan will backfire or fail. We are asked to support this prediction. If the goal of the plan is to prevent overcrowding, then choice D supports the claims of the critics: apartment buildings will draw more residents to the town than would private houses and thus the plan's goals would likely be threatened.

22.
The correct answer is E. The conclusion is that "one will have a wider selection of homes to choose from if one looks for a home in Florida rather than in Texas." Why? Because 15% of all homes in Florida are on the market whereas only 7% of all homes in Texas are on the market. This argument confuses percentages with specific numbers. It is possible that 15% of the number of homes in Florida is actually smaller than 7% of the number of homes in Texas. If the number of homes in both states were the same, or if the number of homes in Florida were greater than the number in Texas, the argument would be stronger. Choice E tells us that the number of homes in Florida is greater, thus making the argument stronger.

Evaluate

1.
The pharmaceutical company claims that Dietol is highly effective in helping people lose weight and increase their physical endurance. However, since the regular intake of Dietol was accompanied by daily workouts under professional supervision, it is unclear whether the results of the experiment should be credited to the effects of Dietol or the rigorous fitness program in which the subjects participated. Thus, in order to evaluate the conclusion about the effectiveness of Dietol, it would be useful to separate these two effects and to see what result, if any, is attributable to Dietol alone.
(A) While the answer to this question could be helpful in estimating the required doses of Dietol, the actual amount of the supplement taken by participants provides little information about its effectiveness.

(B) Knowing the maximum weight loss is unlikely to be helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the supplement, as the maximum weight loss among the 800 participants is unlikely to be representative of the typical result and provides little information about the effectiveness of Dietol.

(C) CORRECT. This answer choice underscores the importance of separating the effects of the physical program from those resulting from Dietol in evaluating the overall result of the experiment. For example, if a group of subjects with similar characteristics would be able to achieve comparable results just by repeating the fitness program over the 9-week experiment, this outcome would cast serious doubts on the claim of the pharmaceutical company about the effectiveness of Dietol.

(D) Since the company does not make a claim about Dietol's effectiveness for a specific age group, the information about the average age is beyond the scope of this argument.

(E) Note that the pharmaceutical company claims that Dietol will help obese people lose weight and improve endurance. No claim is made about the supplement's effect on physical strength. Therefore, information about the improvement in physical strength is unrelated to the conclusion.

2.
The argument concludes that the prosecution of a small number of people who download music illegally will have a minimal impact on the overall number of people who engage in illegal downloading. The correct answer must relate specifically to this issue and provide additional insight as to whether it seems reasonable.

(A) One premise of the argument states that the recording industry does not have the resources to prosecute all individuals who download music illegally, while a second premise states the number of people who will be charged with a crime is limited. These statements indicate that the legal resources of the recording industry are too limited to have a major impact on the overall number of people who engage in illegal downloading, no matter how these lawyers dedicate their time.

(B) If a small minority of individuals were responsible for the majority of illegal song downloads, the actions of the recording industry could have a significant impact on the number of downloaded songs. The conclusion of the argument, however, was about the number of people who download songs illegally; this number would remain unaffected.

(C) Whether songs are downloaded illegally and then shared with other Internet users is not relevant to the conclusion.

(D) Similar to answer choice A, this choice is limited by the premises of the argument. If new Internet security technology permits the recording industry to more quickly and easily identify individuals who illegally download music, then the recording industry will know who is breaking the law. However, the lack of industry resources still restricts the industry's ability to prosecute a large number of people, even if they are identified as individuals who illegally download music.

(E) CORRECT. The argument concludes that the prosecution of a small number of people who download music illegally will have a minimal impact on the overall number of people who engage in illegal downloading. However, if the threat of prosecution were enough to "alter the behavior" of others (i.e., deter them from illegally downloading music), the actions of the recording industry could have a significant impact on the number of people who illegally download music.

4.
The author claims that the "decrease in such insourcing will hurt America's competitiveness in basic research and applied technology, with serious consequences for years to come." In addition, the author claims that the decline in insourcing will "negatively affect the global outlook and experience of American students" because they will "not have the opportunity to learn about foreign cultures directly from members of those cultures." We are asked to find a question whose answer would provide information useful to evaluating the claims of the argument.

(A) The focus of the argument is not on the financial costs of insourcing.

(B) The focus of the argument is not on how insourcing can compensate for outsourcing.

(C) The focus of the argument is not on the specific numbers of foreign-born students, but on the decline in their number instead.

(D) CORRECT. The argument assumes that the students will not have contact with foreigners through channels other than school. This choice asks whether the students have such contact elsewhere. If the answer to this question is "yes", the author's claims carry less weight.

(E) A government policy might have an effect on insourcing, but it would not necessarily have an effect on the specific claims of the argument.

4.
Profits for a particular product have been going down and the CFO has determined that this is because, on the one hand, the cost to make the product has increased and, on the other, consumers won't pay more than the current price (recall that Profit = Revenues – Costs). The CEO only wants Company X to sell products with increasing profit margins; as a result, the CFO decides the solution is to stop making this product. This decision would make sense only if we can be assured that there is no way to have an increasing profit margin for the product in question.

(A) Whether there are new, profitable products does not address the issue of whether there is a way to achieve increasing profit margins for the flagship product.

(B) Whether the management team agrees with the CFO's recommendation does not address the issue of whether there is a way to achieve increasing profit margins for the flagship product.

(C) This may increase the revenues earned by the product, but this choice does not address the additional cost associated with new features, so we still do not know whether we can achieve increasing profit margins for the product. We may be able to, but we may not: the features may cost more than the increased price that consumers would be willing to pay.

(D) CORRECT. If the costs for the existing product can be reduced, then the profit margin will increase (again, recall that Profits = Revenues – Costs). If the costs cannot be reduced, then the profit margins will not increase.

(E) The flagship product's revenues as a percentage of total revenues does not address the issue of whether there is a way to achieve increasing profit margins for the flagship product (although it does highlight why the company might find itself with a big problem if it follows the CEO's advice!).

5.
This argument concludes that the best way to have good governance in the future is to preserve the Pendleton Act. It bases that claim on the record of the first hundred years under that Act. The argument assumes that American government service is still uncorrupted and that no better way exists to preserve that state.

(A) The methods used by other governments in other countries are irrelevant to this argument, which only concerns America. Furthermore, one cannot assume that the Swiss and British governments are free of corruption.

(B) The opinions, wishes, and satisfaction levels of government applicants and employees are irrelevant to the level of corruption.

(C) CORRECT. This would confirm or deny the assumption that American government service is currently not corrupt. The argument only claims that this was so for the first hundred years after the passage of the Pendleton Act. There is no information about the level of corruption for the past twenty-some years.

(D) The number of Presidents assassinated is utterly irrelevant to an argument about corruption in government service.

(E) This percentage of corrupt office-holders in the first hundred years of the Pendleton Act would provide no information about the level of corruption in government service for the past twenty years, which is the gap in the evidence. Thus, investigating this percentage would not be that useful for the evaluation of a conclusion that involves the immediate present and the future.

6.
The conclusion of the argument is that the rate of extinction of bird species will not surge in this century. Evidence from native North American raptors (birds of prey) is cited: namely, that even though several such species nearly vanished between 1900 and 1970, the populations of these birds have since rebounded. We are asked to select a question which would, when answered, provide information that would help us evaluate this claim.

(A) This answer choice inquires about the introduction of non-native raptors. However, the argument cites as evidence the resurgence in native raptor populations. Thus, this question does not shed light on the relevance of the evidence.

(B) CORRECT. This question points to an unwarranted assumption on the author's part. The author assumes that the rebound in native North American raptor populations since 1970 was not due to any special effort to save these species. If special efforts have been made to save these raptor species, then one might not be able to generalize this evidence to other bird species or to make predictions about population trends in the next century, using this evidence.

(C) This question is irrelevant: the argument does not depend in any way on the experience of the zoologists. It hinges instead on the trend in raptor populations that the author uses to justify his or her point.

(D) This question is irrelevant. Note that the given evidence states that "local populations of these raptors have rebounded." Thus, population increases of native North American raptors outside of North America are not pertinent.

(E) This question is irrelevant: the argument does not depend in any way on the number of acres of woodland set aside as bird refuges.

7.
Two points of view are expressed in the argument: consumer groups claim that a la carte pricing will reduce consumer costs, while the cable television industry claims that the current package pricing structure is most cost effective for consumers. If the goal of the government is to reduce the cost of cable television for consumers, it is critical for the government to determine which point of view is correct. The cable television industry favorably compares the cost of buying bundled channels to the cost of buying those same channels individually, but what if most consumers would choose to greatly reduce the number of channels purchased? That could mean that a la carte pricing would result in lower cable bills for those consumers.

(A) The government's decision is based only on the costs to consumers, not the number of channels available to them.

(B) The government's decision is based only on the costs to consumers, not the advertising profits of the cable television companies.

(C) CORRECT. If consumers would not choose to order all of the channels they currently buy as part of a package subscription, then the cable television industries' claim that a la carte costs always would increase is faulty. If most consumers only watch and wish to pay for a few of their favorite channels, a la carte pricing could very well result in lower cable bills for those consumers. Consumers who want to purchase more channels could still choose the package subscriptions, so a la carte pricing would not harm them.

(D) The government's decision is based on only the costs to consumers, not the current purchasing agreements that exist between the cable television companies and content providers.

(E) The government's decision is based on only the costs to consumers, not the technical equipment requirements a change in cost structure would require.

8.
The director of programming argues that the addition of a conservative news program in response to the hiring of a liberal news personality represents an institutional attempt at balancing different perspectives, rather than any conservative bias. The evidence provided by the director is outside of the context of any past actions on the part of the Network; it would be useful to have more information about actions the Network has taken in response to the hiring of conservative or liberal news personalities in the past to determine a pattern of behavior.

(A) CORRECT. If the Network responds to the addition of a liberal news personality in the same way that it does the addition of a conservative news personality, then the argument presented by the director is valid. An identical response to the hiring of a personality from either side of the political spectrum suggests that the Network does act in a fair and balanced manner, at least in this regard.

(B) Whether the Network presents a program airing the opinions of its viewers on contemporary issues does not indicate either a balanced approach or a conservative bias. This statement is irrelevant.

(C) The nature of the former employer of the newly-hired liberal news personality is not relevant in determining whether or not there is a systematic conservative bias regarding the overall programming of the Network.

(D) Whether the new liberal news personality has indicated that he has felt any editorial pressure is not relevant; he might not want to admit to such pressure even if it did exist. Moreover, the experience of one employee does not address the overall programming of the Network.

(E) That the Network has suffered from lower ratings in the past year is not relevant to determining the bias or lack thereof of the Network, though it may explain why new personalities and programming are being added.

9.
The conclusion of the passage is that parents can ensure that their children will not spend money on frivolous items by limiting their children's allowances. This claim is based on the observed difference between the spending habits of children who receive large allowances and those of children who receive small allowances. The argument assumes that the high dollar amount of the allowance – as opposed to some other unobserved factor – is directly linked to the fact that children spend the money on items their parents consider frivolous. Information that provides data about any other factor that might be the cause of the children's spending behavior would help to evaluate the validity of the conclusion.

(A) The actual dollar amount received by adolescents who receive large weekly allowances is not related to the conclusion of the passage. Whether this amount is $40 or $10, the key is that it is considered by the child development specialists to be a "large" weekly allowance.

(B) CORRECT. One alternative to the conclusion of the passage is that the standard used to judge an item as frivolous was much lower for parents who gave their children large weekly allowances than for parents who gave their children small weekly allowances. If for example, the former group of parents considered all movie tickets to be frivolous, while the latter did not, then this fact (and not the difference in allowance money) might explain the difference observed by the child development specialists. Thus, information about any differences among parents in the standard used to judge an item as frivolous would be extremely relevant in evaluating the validity of the conclusion of the passage.

(C) The background of the child development specialists who made the observation has no bearing on the conclusion. The conclusion is based on the observation, not on the credentials of those making the observation.

(D) Family income differences have no clear relevance to the link posited between high allowances and spending on frivolous items.

(E) Adolescents who receive no weekly allowance play no role in the argument. Thus, information about this group of adolescents has no relationship to the conclusion of the passage.

10.
The conclusion of the argument is that the prediction of decreased consumer spending has not come to pass. The evidence for this is that there has been no corresponding increase in the amount of money set aside in savings accounts by the general public.

This question asks us to choose a question whose answer will provide information relevant to evaluating the significance of the fact that the amount of money placed in savings accounts has not increased. The author mentions this savings pattern to support the claim that people have not been curtailing their discretionary spending. So we need to find a question whose answer will relate to savings and spending patterns.

(A) Information about which business sectors were most affected by the layoffs will not help us establish the relevance of the savings pattern to the claim.

(B) The savings used by those who are laid off has no bearing on the savings patterns of those who are not laid off, which is the group this argument addresses ("even if their jobs were secure").

(C) CORRECT. This question asks about the prices of necessities such as food and utilities. If people have not been saving their money, perhaps they have been spending it on necessities (as opposed to spending it on discretionary items). If these items have become more expensive, then perhaps people have not been able to save money despite curtailing their discretionary spending.

(D) The percentage of people with savings accounts is not related to the question of whether people have curtailed their discretionary spending or increased the amount they save.

(E) Knowing the statistics for average salaries during the period since the layoffs will not help us evaluate the significance of the spending and savings patterns during that time. It might help to be able to compare the statistics for the

periods before and after the layoffs, but knowing just one of those statistics tells us nothing about the trends.

11.

The correct answer is C. The conclusion of the argument is that the price of chocolate will increase within six months. The basis for that claim is that the wholesale price of cocoa has increased. However, if the price of other ingredients in the chocolate has dropped, the decrease could offset the higher price of cocoa and render the argument invalid. The only choice to address this is C.

12.

The correct answer is B. The conclusion of the argument is that "eating whole grains can have an appreciable effect on cholesterol levels." This assertion is based on the fact that some people who ate three servings of whole grains every day for six months had lower cholesterol than did people who did not, even though their cholesterol levels were the same before the study began. The argument does not take into account, however, other factors, such as exercise, that may have contributed to the difference in cholesterol levels. Choice B asks whether there is indeed another factor – exercise – that should be taken into account.

Paradox

1.

The statements above present a paradox. If, as the author implies, the ethos of Greek tragedy still holds as an "enduring pillar of our belief system," an ethos declaring each person's misfortune that person's fault, then the majority of the public should not support "social safety net" programs, which are based on the philosophical position that someone's misfortune is not necessarily his or her fault.

(A) This choice does not resolve the paradox. The observation that the ancient Greeks had few social safety net programs does not explain why the public today supports such programs, while holding onto the ethos of Greek tragedy.

(B) This is an irrelevant comparison. This choice does not say that the public is actually unfamiliar with Greek tragedy, and its greater familiarity with Shakespeare does not explain the paradox.

(C) The fact that "some" people insist that society is to blame for misfortune does not explain why the public today "broadly supports" social safety net programs.

(D) This choice does not resolve the paradox. Perhaps many destitute people do not take advantage of social safety net programs because they feel ashamed -- maybe even guilty, as if they caused their own misfortunes (whether or not they did), in accordance with the ethos of Greek tragedy. However, this observation does not explain why these programs enjoy the broad support of the public.

(E) CORRECT. This statement undermines the author's assumption that the ethos of the ancient Greeks is the only operative component of the public's belief system. If most people believe in helping innocent victims of natural disasters, then they must believe that there can be "innocent victims" and that not all misfortune is due to the actions and flaws of the individual in question.

2.
The argument provides information about the substantial costs associated with the development of Dendadrine. Yet the management views Dendadrine as a highly profitable project. In order to reconcile these claims, we need to demonstrate that the drug will be able to generate profits that will more than compensate for the high initial expenditures associated with its development.

(A) CORRECT. This statement demonstrates that the patent protection is likely to allow the pharmaceutical company to charge the unusually high prices that will more than compensate for the initial research and development costs. Note that the patent protection is likely to result in prices that are at least double the level necessary for the company to recoup its costs, thus leading to substantial profits.

(B) This answer tells us that for some pharmaceutical products, high R&D expenditures are quite typical. While this explains the high costs associated with the development of Dendadrine, it tells us nothing about how well such products do on the market and whether they subsequently become profitable.

(C) This statement makes an emotionally-charged claim about the irrelevance of corporate profits in health-related issues and provides no information that would explain how the pharmaceutical company would be able to make profits on Dendadrine.

(D) This statement would actually reduce the likelihood that the company will be able to make profits on Dendadrine, since the presence of similar products would likely reduce the market share of the firm and put downward pressure on prices.

(E) This statement does not provide information on how the company can make profits on Dendadrine despite the high costs and side effects. In fact, the presence of side effects is likely to reduce rather than increase the profit potential of a drug.

3.
We are given a list of problematic events, each one leading to the next, and we are asked to find a way to break the cycle of events. In order to do so, we need to find a way to alter one of these events in such a way that it will change the overall cycle so that small community hospitals are no longer losing money (at least, for these particular reasons).

(A) The reimbursement rates for specialty care are not a part of the problematic cycle; rather, the relatively low volume of specialty care at community hospitals is the problem. If the hospital is doing very little or no specialty care work in the first place, then charging more for specialty care won't help much.

(B) Even if the hospital successfully advertises its specialty care services and attracts a lot of new customers, it will not be able to serve these customers because it does not have the necessary specialists in place to provide the specialty care. This choice does not "follow through" the entire cycle.

(C) CORRECT. Since the local residents choose to patronize the nearby affluent hospitals due to the presence of specialists, they will also begin to patronize the community hospital, which is using these same specialists. The amount of high-margin specialty care will increase and the hospital will make more money, thus enabling it to continue using specialists.

(D) The mere act of educating the public about the relatively low reimbursement rates of government health plans does not directly impact the hospital or break the cycle. In order for this to work, the hospital would have to find some way to increase reimbursement rates for routine care from the government plans or convert people from government plans to private insurers that reimburse at better rates.

(E) Most of the community hospital's patients are either on government-funded plans or lack insurance altogether. Receiving more money from private insurers, therefore, is unlikely to generate enough revenue to break the cycle.

4.
The mountaineering experts have asserted that exceptionally good weather is directly linked to the record number of fatalities. The correct answer choice will demonstrate the nature of that link.

(A) Whether or not the climbers expected the good weather and were subsequently surprised does not explain how this surprise would contribute to the record death toll.

(B) CORRECT. While it may be reasonable to assume that good weather would cause a lower percentage of people attempting to reach the summit to perish because bad weather typically creates complications which have fatal consequences, the absolute number of fatalities could increase if a much higher number of people attempt to reach the summit. This answer choice states that there was a significant increase in the number of people entering the "death-zone," the area of the mountain where "almost all" of fatalities took place. Hence, this provides a reasonable explanation of how the good weather was a cause of the record number of fatalities.

(C) This implies that the "death-zone" is more survivable during good weather than in bad and does more to refute the experts' conclusion than it does to explain it.

(D) The fact that modern equipment protects climbers in bad weather does not provide any insight as to why good weather would result in an increased number of fatalities.

(E) The decrease in the number of expert climbers does nothing to explain the overall increase in deaths. In order to do so, the answer choice must either show or imply that either non-expert climbers have a higher probability of dying due to the good weather, or the number of non-expert climbers has increased enough to overcome any decrease in the probability of them perishing and any deaths that may have occurred in the expert group prior to their decrease in numbers; the answer choice does neither.

5.
The argument focuses on the relative cost of goods and services in Countries X and Y due to an exchange rate that has historically favored the currency of Country Y. The argument presents an apparent discrepancy: the citizens of Country Y often take their vacations in Country X, yet rarely purchase clothing or electronics in Country X, despite the fact that those items are more expensive in their home country, even when sales taxes are taken into account. The correct answer will be one that indicates some reason why it might not actually be cheaper for citizens of Country Y to purchase clothing and electronics in Country X.

(A) The fashion preferences of the citizens of Country Y do not directly explain their buying habits. To be relevant, this statement would have to go further to link fashion preferences to purchasing decisions: for example, it would have to continue "…and are therefore willing to pay more for the goods available in their own country."

(B) The fact that stores in Country Y receive the latest fashions and technology earlier than stores in Country X does not address the buying habits of the citizens. Even if we could assume that the citizens of Country Y demand the latest goods as soon as they are available, it still would not directly explain their buying habits. To be relevant, this statement would have to go further to link consumer preferences to purchasing decisions: for example, it would have to continue "…and the citizens of Country Y are willing to pay more in their own country just to acquire the latest goods as soon as they are available."

(C) The attitude of the citizens of Country X is irrelevant to an argument about the purchasing habits of the citizens of Country Y.

(D) CORRECT. This choice states that the government of Country Y imposes tariffs on imported goods. This suggests that perhaps items that are purchased in Country X and brought into Country Y become prohibitively expensive because of the tariffs and could explain the spending habits of the citizens of Country Y.

(E) The currency of Country Z is irrelevant to why citizens of Country Y rarely purchase clothing or electronics in Country X.

6.
This question asks us to explain a counterintuitive result – why is it the case that the arrival of a new restaurant, Bob's Bistro, somehow increased the number of meals served per day at the only other restaurant in town, Andrew's Eatery? If the number of meals served in the town of Montrose were to stay constant, then the business at Andrew's Eatery would certainly be reduced by the opening of Bob's Bistro. In order to provide an explanation for the surprising increase, we must find a reason that either more people are coming to Montrose to eat than was the case last year or that the people in Montrose are eating out more frequently.

(A) The fact that Andrew's Eatery is less expensive than Bob's Bistro would not explain an increase in the number of meals served; it would only explain that perhaps some price-sensitive consumers in Montrose would continue to eat at Andrew's Eatery.

(B) That Bob's Bistro is closed on Sundays does not explain an increase in the number of meals served at Andrew's Eatery on an everyday basis.

(C) Higher profit margins at Bob's Bistro do not explain an increase in business at Andrew's Eatery; they simply suggest that Andrew's Eatery may provide a slightly better value for certain price-sensitive consumers.

(D) CORRECT. This statement explains that the number of diners in the town of Montrose as a whole has increased due to the opening of Bob's Bistro, and also explains why the patronage at Andrew's Eatery has increased. Bob's Bistro has apparently brought in many out-of-towners to eat at Montrose, and many of these first-time diners, when turned away from Bob's Bistro, arrive at Andrew's Eatery as the only alternative in town.

(E) The fact that Andrew's Eatery serves more meals on weekends than on weekdays relative to Bob's Bistro does not explain the increase in business.

7.
The question asks us to find a choice that contributes most towards explaining why City Y is considered less affordable than City X. This situation is surprising because the percentage of yearly income devoted to housing costs is higher in City X than in City Y, implying that it is more expensive to live in City X. We do know, however, that insurance and fuel costs are generally exorbitant in both cities, and that both cities are home to many commuters.

(A) This does not explain why City Y is less affordable than City X. Private school is a choice. Public schools remain a free option for parents in both cities.

(B) CORRECT. If City Y has no effective public transportation system, its residents will need to provide their own means of transportation. Since insurance and fuel costs are exorbitant in both cities, we know that residents of City Y will likely be forced to spend significant amounts on car insurance and gasoline. Because City X has an inexpensive public transportation system, its residents may be able to avoid these specific expenses.

(C) If new houses are more expensive in City X than in City Y, one would expect City X to be considered less affordable than City Y. This does not explain why City Y is considered less affordable than City X.

(D) The presence of expensive restaurants and boutiques in City Y is not relevant, since these represent only one end of the retail spectrum and do not preclude the presence of inexpensive alternatives. Moreover, we know nothing about the retail establishments in City X; they could be even more expensive.

(E) We do not know whether the relocations have affected the ability of residents of City Y to cover their living expenses.

8.
The passage describes an apparent discrepancy. On the one hand oil companies undermine scientific research that portrays global warming as a severe problem, presumably because this research will lead to government action that might

harm the companies' profits. On the other hand, these same companies invest millions of dollars in climate change research. The correct answer must provide a motive for the companies to invest in certain research related to global warming.

(A) This choice establishes a time frame for when the oil companies began investing research dollars. However, it does not provide a reason as to why they would make this investment.

(B) CORRECT. This choice provides a motive for companies to invest in global warming research. If the research is specifically geared at developing technologies used to combat global warming, this research represents a long-term strategy for finding new ways for the companies to profit. This is in contrast with the research that the oil companies oppose - research focused on the severity and immediacy of the issue, a focus which might lead to government action that could have a negative impact on the profitability of the oil companies in the short term.

(C) The fact that the government action would negatively affect the oil companies explains why they would oppose this scientific research. It does not provide a reason why they would also invest in scientific research related to global warming.

(D) The fact that the scientific data related to the severity of global warming is not definitive does not provide a reason as to why oil companies would invest millions of dollars in research that accepts that global warming will have long-term affects.

(E) If oil companies didn't believe that any scientific research related to climate change will serve their interests, there would be no reason for them to invest any money in such research.

9.
The hydroelectric dams in Country X generate "more than enough power... to meet the country's energy needs." Yet, Country X still experiences shortages and outages. This could result from several causes: perhaps the system breaks down frequently, or the energy generated in Country X is not actually used by citizens of Country X.

(A) If the flow is heavier, that would provide even more energy during the spring. This does not address a potential cause of shortages or outages.

(B) The argument states that the dams provide "more than enough power... to meet the country's energy needs" - including a reliance on electric appliances.

(C) This choice is irrelevant; the topic is why the country experiences shortages even though the current energy system provides "more than enough" energy.

(D) CORRECT. If the electricity produced is sold to other countries, then there may not be enough left unsold to accommodate the needs of Country X citizens.

(E) This would just mean that the country has the potential to produce even more power than it already does; it does not address a potential cause of shortages or outages.

10.
The passage states that the price-per-pound of ostrich meat has not decreased even though the supply of the meat has been abundant. We are asked to find an explanation for this seeming contradiction.

(A) CORRECT. If the demand has outpaced the supply, even if the supply is abundant, it is likely that the price will remain steady, at the very least.

(B) The difficulty of breeding ostriches is not relevant to the market price, given that the supply of the meat is abundant.

(C) If other types of meat have decreased in price, one might expect that ostrich meat would decrease as well to remain competitive.

(D) The lack of effort of the part of the beef industry to counter beef's poor image does not speak to the issue of why the price of ostrich meat has remained steady despite an abundant supply.

(E) If ostrich meat becomes more readily available, one might expect that the price of the meat would decrease.

11.
The correct answer is B. Despite the fact that urban dwellers live close together and exurban dwellers live farther apart, the exurban dwellers report feelings of connectedness while urban dwellers report feelings of isolation. The question then asks which choice best accounts for this discrepancy.

Choice B is the only choice that provides a potential reason for the relative connectedness of exurban dwellers. It offers the possibility that because rates of attendance at houses of worship is higher in exurban areas, perhaps exurban dwellers find through these organizations a sense of community lacking in urban

areas, where people perhaps do not have ongoing social contacts despite their physical proximity.

12.
Tax revenues increased 13.4% from the previous year, even though the number of employee tax returns filed stayed almost constant. Many possible explanations exist: an increase in tax revenue collected per person, an increase in tax revenue collected from other sources, such as from businesses or taxes on investments, a misleading increase due to a return to normal levels after a sharp reduction last year, and so on.

(A) CORRECT. This statement does not explain the seemingly contradictory trends. It does not address the change in the revenue at all.

(B) An increase in taxes paid by non-employees on dividends and capital gains would explain how the total tax revenue increased even though the number of employee tax returns filed stayed the same.

(C) If tax revenues were unusually low last year, and then returned to normal levels this year, that would explain how tax revenues could have increased during that time period even though the number of employee tax returns was unchanged.

(D) Rising corporate tax collections could explain rising tax revenue at a time when the number of employee tax returns stayed the same.

(E) Even though the number of employees paying taxes is the same, the fact that the government is collecting more money from them would explain the increase in revenue.

13.
The argument describes a sales tax plan that is expected to bring in the same amount of money as the current property tax, despite the fact that current sales tax revenues are lower than current property tax revenues. The correct answer will include information that will involve the sales tax bringing in more money than is presently the case.

(A) CORRECT. If a new shopping center is opening in Amtown, the retail sales in the town, and the receipts from the sales tax, would be expected to rise. This would potentially enable the sales tax to generate at least as much money as the current property tax.

(B) The fact that some residents might leave Amtown is irrelevant, as this may not necessarily have an impact on property tax or sales tax receipts, particularly

if the plan is adopted and the residents change their minds. Additionally, the argument states that the sales tax will not have a negative impact on the funds available for the town's public schools.

(C) The fact that some parents do not pay property taxes is irrelevant to the sales tax plan generating as much money for the public schools as the current property tax.

(D) Higher taxes in surrounding areas might encourage individuals to shop at Amtown. However, this phenomenon would already be factored into current sales tax receipts, which are less than the current property tax.

(E) It could be argued that this magazine profile would increase immediate tourism in Amtown, and thus sales tax receipts. However, any economic impact would depend upon a direct link between the magazine article, increased visitors, and money spent by those visitors, all of which must be assumed. Additionally, a magazine article is unlikely to have a sustainable effect over a long period of time, which is necessary for the sales tax to provide funds equivalent to those provided by the current property tax.

14.
The question asks us to explain a counterintuitive result. How is it that the elimination of the James Street stop actually caused an increase in commuting time? In order to answer this question, we must consider any unexpected side effects of the elimination that could have resulted in unanticipated delays. What changed after the elimination that caused unexpected delays?

(A) CORRECT. The overcrowding of the Green Street stop is an unexpected side effect that caused unanticipated delays that did not exist before the elimination of the James Street stop.

(B) This does not provide a reason for an increase in delays. If anything, fewer commuters would cause a decrease in commuting time.

(C) The commuters' opinions regarding the elimination of the James Street stop have nothing to do with the reason why the elimination actually caused an increase in commuting time.

(D) There is no indication that the traffic conditions have changed since the elimination of the James Street stop. Heavy traffic was a problem before the elimination, just as it has been since the elimination. Therefore, this cannot be the cause of increased commuting time.

(E) While this information may point to an emerging pattern, it does not help to explain why eliminating a stop on the Holdsville-River Valley line would cause an increase in commuting time.

15.
The majority of residents voted to allow a national chain to build a hotel in town. This appears to contradict the mayor's claim that a recent survey showed most people want to live in the town because of the locally-owned businesses. In order to answer the question, we need an additional piece of information which explains away, or resolves, this apparent contradiction.

(A) If people rank a small-town feel higher in importance than quality schools, then this fact would still contradict the combination of the vote and the survey response.

(B) If a locally-owned business could generate the same amount of revenue as the national hotel, then this fact would still contradict the combination of the vote and the survey response.

(C) This does not address why the residents voted to approve the hotel while survey respondents said they preferred locally-owned businesses.

(D) This appears to contradict the reason given for residents voting to approve the hotel but does not do so in a way that explains the discrepancy with the survey respondents.

(E) CORRECT. If the survey respondents were not actually residents of the town, this explains why the residents of the town voted in a way that does not reflect the results of the survey.

16.
The passage states that, on the one hand, the government was successful in releasing mental health patients from institutional care. On the other hand, according to the leading professional health associations, which explicitly supported the government's plans, the plight of the mentally ill only became worse. We need to find one statement that explains what prevented the plan from achieving its expected results.

(A) An increase in the number of people diagnosed with psychiatric disorders does not explain why the plight of psychiatric patients has gotten worse.

(B) Believing that someone else could have better implemented the plan does not explain what went wrong with the plan as it was actually implemented.

(C) The passage does not indicate or imply that adequate funding must be tied to the inflation rate. It might have been sufficient, for example, for funding increases to match the rate of inflation.
(D) CORRECT. This resolves the paradox by offering a reason why the plan failed: only half of the plan was implemented. According to the passage, the original plan supported by the leading mental health associations was "to remove the mentally ill from institutions, incorporate them into their communities, and give them outpatient treatment." While the removal was accomplished, choice D explains that the outpatient treatment services were not; patients, therefore, haven't improved.

(E) The past addictions of release patients do not explain why the plight of the patients became worse after they were released.

17.
The company's new swimsuit line was not as successful as hoped, especially in light of the favorable consumer polling on both style and price. We are asked to find a choice that does NOT explain this surprising outcome. The True/False technique is useful for EXCEPT questions: those which would explain the outcome are labeled True, while the one which would not is labeled False.

(A) True. This could explain the outcome: if the swim wear was not displayed prominently, perhaps customers did not see it.

(B) True. This could explain the outcome: if the colors were not the same as the ones tested, it may be that consumers disliked the new colors they were actually offered.

(C) True. This could explain the outcome: if a competitor offered similar swim wear at a lower price, customers could have purchased the other brand instead.

(D) CORRECT. False. The poll was based upon style and price, not the idea that a major actress would wear a swimsuit in a film. The fact that the scene was not filmed is irrelevant to the argument.

(E) True. This could explain the outcome: if consumers anticipated a summer of bad weather, they may not have been as eager to buy swim wear in March.

Boldface

1.

The author concludes that raising the fine to $1,000 would have the unintended effect of increasing the amount of litter in the picnic area. When determining the function of the two bold statements, we must consider how they relate to this conclusion: the first bold portion weighs against the conclusion, while the second bold portion supports the conclusion. The correct answer will represent these relationships.

(A) The "prediction" mentioned here refers to the author's conclusion (raising the fine to $1,000 would increase the amount of litter). This answer choice incorrectly states that the first bold portion supports this conclusion. Also, this choice incorrectly states that the second bold statement is the prediction, or conclusion.

(B) This choice incorrectly states that the author's prediction, or conclusion, is consistent with the first bold statement when in fact it predicts the exact opposite outcome. Further, this answer states that the second bold portion weighs against the author's conclusion when in fact it supports the conclusion.

(C) The second bold portion does not come as a consequence of the first. In fact, the two bold portions are in complete contrast to one another.

(D) The second bold portion is not the main position that the author defends. The main position is that raising the fine to $1,000 would increase the amount of litter in the picnic area.

(E) CORRECT. This answer choice correctly identifies the first bold portion as a statement of causation that does not support the author's claim, and the second bold statement as a line of logic that does support this claim.

2.
This argument presents a claim that America needs a permanent third party. This claim is the argument's conclusion, in fact. The author then cites the view held by critics of this claim and notes their subordinate assertions that a third party would slow the legislative process and impede governance. Finally, the author cites European countries to contradict the opponents' claim and their evidence.

(A) This choice is incorrect because the first boldface is not the main point of the argument. It is the conclusion of the argument's opponents. Furthermore, the second boldface is a premise that supports the actual conclusion, not the claim made by the opponents.

(B) This choice is incorrect because the first boldface does not oppose the premises of the argument; it opposes the conclusion. Furthermore, the second boldface is a premise that supports the conclusion; it is not the conclusion.
(C) This choice is incorrect because the first boldface is the actual position held by the opponents, not a premise for their position. This choice does correctly state that the second boldface is a premise that argues against the position held by the opponents.
(**D) CORRECT.** The first is the claim of the argument's opponents, and the second is evidence that contradicts the opponents' claim.
(E) This choice is incorrect because the second is not the claim that the opponents are opposing by asserting the first boldface. They assert the first boldface to oppose the conclusion of the argument.
3.
The author of the letter believes that the city's proposed handgun ban will actually make the city a more dangerous place. In support of this prediction, the author offers the second boldfaced portion of the argument: an assertion that criminals will feel increased confidence to act since their victims will no longer be armed. This assertion contradicts the first boldfaced portion of the argument, a relationship between fewer guns and less violent crime cited by proponents of the ban.

(A) The first boldface portion argues that the handgun ban would lead to less violent crime, a position that directly contradicts the author's stated position. The second boldface portion offers support for the author's position, but is not the position itself.

(B) The first boldface portion is a pattern of cause and effect that the author believes *not* to be true in this case. By demonstrating that violent crime will increase, the second boldface portion does offer evidence to contradict the first boldface pattern.

(C) The first boldface portion does present a position that the author argues will not hold in this case. The second boldface portion, however, is not the author's position; instead, it offers evidence in support of the author's position.

(D) The first boldface portion is a prediction that the author believes to be untrue. The second boldface portion, however, does not undermine the author's position that the handgun ban will increase violent crime. Instead, it supports the author's position.

(E) CORRECT. The first boldface portion shows a direct relationship between the number of handguns and violent crime; proponents cite this relationship to support the handgun ban, but the author refutes this relationship. The second

boldface portion provides evidence to support the author's position that the handgun ban will actually make the citizens of the city less safe.

4.
The first two sentences of the argument address the currently-held theory that certain physical features that serve only to indicate "attractiveness" have developed in order to help those males distribute their own genes more widely. For example, a male peacock's plume of tailfeathers does not actively help him to survive; the theory holds that it helps him to procreate by attracting females. The first boldface portion explains to us how this theory works.
The final two sentences of the argument introduce information that contradicts this theory. In this particular species of bird, the homelier birds are better at passing on their genes than the attractive birds. The second boldface portion provides an example of the specific research results that contradict the theory.
(A) The first bold statement is not a conclusion; it is an explanation of how the theory works. The second bold statement is not a contention (or conclusion); it simply presents new evidence and allows the reader to draw a conclusion.
(B) The two bold statements address opposite sides of the argument, but this choice says that the second statement supports the theory advanced by the first statement.
(C) CORRECT. The first bold statement explains how the theory is thought to work and the second bold statement presents research results that contradict this theory.
(D) Nothing in the argument indicates that the long-held theory discussed in the first two sentences is not still prevalent. Indeed, the research that contradicts the theory was only discovered "recently." In addition, the second bold statement does not introduce a new theory; it simply presents research results that contradict the original theory.
(E) The scientist does not completely disprove the long-held theory; she merely presents one piece of data that does not support the theory. In addition, the second bold statement does not introduce a new theory; it simply presents research results that contradict the original theory.

5.
The author explains that devoted gamers traditionally dictate the design of video games. However, due to changes in the market, the author argues that this system is no longer in the best interest of the industry. Instead, to infuse new life into the video game market, manufacturers should simplify their games in order to attract non-gamers into the gaming fold.

(A) The first boldface portion does relate a situation that the author believes to be true. The second boldface portion, however, does not explain this situation; instead, it offers evidence to demonstrate why this situation should not continue.

(B) CORRECT. The first boldface portion is a situation that the author believes to be true now. Due to changes in the market, however, the author believes this situation should not continue. The second boldface portion provides evidence to support the author's contention that the best way to grow the gaming market is to attract new gamers.

(C) The first boldface portion is a statement of fact that contradicts the author's position. The second boldface portion, however, provides evidence to support the author's position, but it is not the position itself.

(D) The first boldface portion is a statement of fact that contradicts the author's position. The second boldface portion provides evidence to support the author's position.

(E) The first boldface portion is not a prediction; rather, it is a statement of fact (or description of a situation) that the author believes should not hold in this case. The second statement is not an assumption, nor does it weigh against the author's position; instead, it is a premise that provides evidence in support of the author's position.

6.
This question is an Analyze the Argument Structure question; the best approach is to identify the conclusion, and then check each boldface portion of the question for how it relates to the conclusion, and eliminate incorrect answer choices on that basis. Here, the conclusion of the argument appears in the last sentence, that "these findings suggest that the real reason why musicians over thirty rarely make significant contributions to the musical canon is not that they have aged but rather that they have spent too much time as musicians." This conclusion is drawn in contrast to the conventional explanation that age erodes creative ability, which appears in the first boldface. The second boldface is a description of the findings that are used to support the argument's conclusion.

(A) The description of the first boldface is accurate, as it does present an explanation that is challenged by the argument. However, the second boldface is not a finding that supports the challenged explanation. Rather, the second boldface is a finding that supports a different explanation altogether, and is the primary evidence for the challenge as opposed to the explanation itself.
(B) The description of the first boldface is accurate, as it does present an explanation that is opposed by the argument. However, the second boldface is not an objection raised against the alternative explanation advocated by the argument, but the primary evidence in support of the alternative explanation.

(C) The first boldface is not a claim advanced in support of a position, but is itself a position or explanation. Additionally, the second boldface does not serve to clarify the position proposed by the first boldface.
(D) The first boldface is not an explanation advocated by the argument, as the argument advocates an alternative explanation. The description of the second boldface is accurate.
(E) CORRECT. The first boldface does present an explanation that the argument challenges. The second is a finding that provides the basis for the challenge to the conventional explanation.
The correct answer is E.

7.
The conclusion of the argument is that the city will see many of its prized industries relocate to more convenient cities and the city's financial health will be jeopardized if the city does not make changes soon to the transportation network. This is also the second bolded sentence. The first bolded sentence states that most of the network was put in place at a time when the city was much smaller in both area and population. We need to find a choice that correctly describes both of these bolded statements.
(A) **CORRECT.** This choice states that the first statement is an explanation of a current state of affairs. This explanation is consistent with the passage. The answer choice goes on to describe the second bolded statement as a prediction based on that state of affairs. This is also consistent with the passage: the second bolded statement predicts what will happen as a result of the inadequacy of the current transportation network.
(B) The first statement is indeed a statement of fact, but the author cites it in order to bolster his or her claim; thus the statement is not in opposition to the conclusion. The second statement is the conclusion of the argument.
(C) The first statement does not "emphasize an existing problem" but rather explains that existing problem (of an overtaxed subway). Moreover, the second statement does not "offer a proposal to solve that problem" but rather warns of what will happen if the problem is not solved.
(D) The first statement arguably presents information that "the author suggests has been overlooked in the situation at hand"; however, the second statement does not describe that situation, but rather proposes a hypothetical outcome in the future.
(E) The first statement is not really "justification" (a term that implies approval on the part of the author) but rather an "explanation"; nor does it refer to an "impending problem" but rather an existing problem. Also, the second statement does not describe "consequences" exactly but rather "potential consequences" if the problem is left unchecked.
The correct answer is A.

8.
The chief economist begins his argument by describing the usual relationship of cause and effect. Thus, the first statement in boldface represents a generalization that the chief economist accepts as accurate. The economist then goes on to conclude that this time, however, the usual cause-and-effect relationship will not hold and strong figures of the GDP will cause a decrease rather than an increase in stock prices. To support this conclusion, the economist offers evidence explaining how strong GDP figures may lead to lower stock prices. Therefore, the second statement in boldface represents evidence that supports the main conclusion of the economist.

(A) This answer choice correctly describes the role of the first statement but incorrectly states that the second statement in boldface represents the conclusion of the economist rather than the evidence that supports that conclusion. Remember, the conclusion of the economist is that strong GDP figures will result in a decrease rather than an increase in stock prices.

(B) CORRECT. This answer choice correctly identifies the role of each of the two parts in boldface. The first part represents a generalization that is typically accurate but will not be repeated in the case at issue. The second portion presents evidence in support of the economist's prediction.

(C) This answer choice correctly describes the role of the first portion but mistakenly states that the second part in boldface follows from this generalization. The second statement in boldface presents evidence that supports the opposite effect from that described in the first portion. Namely, the economist claims that this time, stock prices will decrease rather than increase, as would be usual.

(D) This answer choice incorrectly states that the first portion supports rather than weighs against that economist's prediction. In addition, this answer choice incorrectly states that the second portion in boldface represents the economist's prediction rather than evidence supporting it.

(E) This answer choice incorrectly states that the first statement will be repeated in the case at issue. Remember, the economist argues that the usual pattern will not hold this time. The second statement is correctly described as acknowledging a circumstance in which the usual pattern will not hold.

9.
The analyst recounts a proposal by the Russian government to increase the Russian population. The analyst then dismisses that proposal and makes a

counterproposal that he or she then supports with hypothetical scenarios. The claim that the counterproposal (to try good governance) is preferable is the conclusion of the argument.

(A) This choice is incorrect. The first boldface is a fact that indicates the government plan has failed before; it is not the conclusion of the argument. However, the second is a premise in support of the argument's proposal.

(B) CORRECT. The first is the fact that the government plan has "been tried before, to no avail," a fact that undermines the alternative proposal made by the government. The author's proposal is to improve the country's governance, and the second boldface supports that plan by showing one way in which better governance might lead to a population increase.

(C) The first does not contradict the argument's conclusion that improved governance will reverse the decline in population. Rather, it undermines the other proposal presented by the government, which is a claim that the argument does not support. The second is not the argument's main point, but an assertion that supports the conclusion of the argument by showing one way in which better governance might lead to a population increase.

(D) The first is a premise that the government plan has "been tried before, to an avail," which weighs against the preceding proposal. The second is not the proposal that the first directly supports, but an assertion that supports the conclusion of the argument by showing one way in which better governance might lead to a population increase.

(E) The first is not a conclusion at all, rather a factual premise that these measures "have been tried before, to little avail." The second boldface does not oppose the first boldface, rather it is an assertion that supports the conclusion of the argument by showing one way in which better governance might lead to a population increase.

10.
The argument concludes that United Energy may be acting in a manner consistent with reaching its financial goals. However, this conclusion must be distinguished from the assertion of the environmentalists described in the question - that the actions taken by United Energy indicate that the company is putting environmental concerns ahead of financial returns. The answer choices may consider either the author's conclusion (which is considered the overall conclusion) or the conclusion asserted by the environmentalists (which is considered the opposing opinion).

This is an Analyze the Argument Structure question. The best approach is to consider each boldface in turn.

(A) The first boldface does not support the author's conclusion that United Energy may be acting in a manner consistent with its financial goals; the second does not call the conclusion into question as much as state its opposite.
(B) The first boldface does not state the conclusion of the argument; the second boldface does not support the conclusion of the main argument, which is that United Energy may be acting in a manner consistent with its financial goals.
(C) CORRECT. The first boldface supports the environmentalists' conclusion that United Energy is acting in a manner that places environmental impact ahead of financial returns. The second boldface states this conclusion.
(D) The first boldface is a relationship that does support the environmentalists' conclusion; however, the second states this conclusion, and does not undermine it.
(E) The first boldface does not support the author's conclusion, which is that United Energy may be acting in its financial interest; the second boldface also does not support this conclusion.

11.
The marketing analyst begins his argument by describing the usual relationship between the introduction of a new product and the impact on corporate revenues. Note the use of the word "traditionally" at the beginning of this premise, indicating that the suggested pattern of cause and effect typically holds. Thus, the first statement in boldface represents a generalization that the market analyst accepts as accurate. The analyst then goes on to conclude that this time, however, the usual cause-and-effect relationship will not hold and the introduction of a new product will reduce rather than increase the company's profits. To support this conclusion, the analyst offers evidence explaining why the new product launch may erode the company's profits. Therefore, the second statement in boldface represents evidence that supports the main conclusion of the analyst.

(A) This answer choice incorrectly states that the first statement will be repeated in the case at issue. Remember, the analyst argues that the usual pattern will not hold this time. The second statement is correctly described as acknowledging a circumstance in which the usual pattern will not hold.

(B) This answer choice correctly describes the role of the first portion but mistakenly states that the second part in boldface follows from this generalization. The second statement in boldface presents evidence that supports the opposite effect from that described in the first portion. Specifically, the analyst claims that the new product launch will decrease rather than increase

profits.

(C) This answer choice correctly describes the role of the first statement but incorrectly states that the second statement represents the conclusion rather than the supporting evidence for that conclusion. Remember, the conclusion of the analyst is that the new product launch will decrease rather than increase profits.

(D) CORRECT. This answer choice correctly identifies the role of each of the two parts in boldface. The first part represents the generalization that is typically accurate but will not be repeated in the case at issue. The second portion presents evidence in support of the analyst's prediction.

(E) This answer choice incorrectly states that the first portion supports rather than weighs against that analyst's prediction. In addition, this answer choice incorrectly states that the second portion in boldface represents the analyst's prediction rather than the evidence supporting it.

12.
The letter writer believes that if criminal penalties for drug use are eliminated, the incidence of armed robbery and other violent crimes will decrease. In support of that belief, the letter writer offers the second boldface portion of the argument: an assertion that crimes are committed by drug users because they need money to buy expensive illegal drugs, and that if drugs were legal and therefore cheaper, the crimes would become unnecessary. The first boldface portion of the argument mentions an observed relationship between drug use and other crimes: when drug use declines, other crimes decline as well. This observation is counter to the letter writer's ultimate claim.

(A) The letter writer forecasts that violent crime will decline even if drug use is decriminalized. The first boldface portion does not offer support for that forecast, but rather evidence that violent crime decreases when anti-drug laws are enforced. The second boldface portion is not the letter writer's forecast, but rather the support given for it.

(B) The first boldface portion is an observation that violent crime decreases when anti-drug laws are enforced; that observation weighs against the letter writer's main position, but falls short of refuting his claim that violent crime will decrease as a result of decriminalizing drug use. The second boldface portion is support for the letter writer's main position, not the position itself.

(C) The first boldface portion shows a direct relationship between a decline in drug activity and a decline in violent crime, but the letter writer does not argue

that future events are predicted by this relationship. In fact, the letter writer ultimately claims the opposite: that violent crime will decrease when criminal penalties for drug use are eliminated, even if drug use increases as a result.

(D) CORRECT. The first boldface portion shows a direct relationship between a decline in drug activity and a decline in violent crime, but the letter writer claims that violent crime will decrease when criminal penalties for drug use are eliminated, even if drug use increases as a result. If true, the information in the second boldface section explains why the letter writer makes that claim: that the high cost of illegal drugs is the reason drug users commit violent crimes, so cheaper, legalized drugs will cause crime to decline.

(E) The first boldface portion is presented by the letter writer as true. However, the second boldface is not an inference drawn from the first boldface portion; rather, it contradicts the first boldface portion.

13.
In the first bold statement, the agent predicts, or concludes, that occupancy rates will increase despite decreasing population. The second bold statement describes the reasoning behind this prediction: if potential home-buyers are discouraged by high interest rates on mortgages, they will opt to rent instead. So, the first statement is a prediction, and the second statement supports this prediction.

(A) The second statement does not weigh against the conclusion, but rather supports it.

(B) The agent's final prediction is made in the first bold statement, not the second bold statement.

(C) The first bold statement does not describe a pattern of cause and effect. In fact, it predicts the disjointed relationship between population and occupancy rates: as population decreases, occupancy rates will increase.

(D) CORRECT. This choice describes the correct relationship between the two statements: the first is the conclusion, and the second supports this conclusion.

(E) The first statement is not an undisputed fact, but rather a prediction.

14.
The conclusion of the policy analyst is that the experts' recommendation—to eliminate every government agency after 10 years and create it anew—is impractical. The first bold-faced statement, the generalization that government

agencies become less effective over time, is used as evidence to support the experts' position. The second bold-faced statement, the observation that certain governmental agencies cannot afford even temporary upheaval, is used to defend the analyst's position.
(A) This choice correctly states that the first bold-faced statement offers evidence in support of an opinion (the experts') that the policy analyst rejects. However, the second bold-faced statement does not contradict the premise that government agencies lose their effectiveness over time. Instead, the second bold-faced statement simply offers another observation—that certain government agencies cannot afford even temporary upheaval.
(B) This choice correctly states that the second bold-faced statement offers evidence in support of the policy analyst's position. Additionally, it is true that the first bold-faced statement is a premise that the policy analyst accepts. However, the analyst does not argue against this premise; instead, the analyst argues against the experts' position, which is based on this premise.
(C) The first bold-faced statement is not a position that the policy analyst argues against; in fact, the first bold-faced statement is one that the analyst accepts as true. Moreover, the second bold-faced statement is not the policy analyst's position; it is evidence offered in support of the analyst's position, which is that the experts' recommendation is impractical.
(D) CORRECT. The first bold-faced statement, the fact that government agencies become less effective over time, is accepted by the policy analyst as true and yet is used as evidence to support the experts' position, which the policy analyst rejects. The second bold-faced statement, the observation that certain government agencies cannot afford even temporary upheaval, is used to defend the analyst's position.
(E) This choice correctly states that the second bold-faced statement offers a consideration in support of the policy analyst's position. It is also true that the first bold-faced statement is a generalization that the policy analyst accepts as accurate. However, the first bold-faced statement is not used as the basis for the analyst's position; it is used as the basis for the experts' position.

15.
The conclusion, or ultimate position, of the political candidate is that older and disabled individuals should be offered drug coverage alternatives that, in contrast to plans built around individual choice, do not force them to gamble with their health. The first bold-faced statement is an observation that the candidate makes about the appeal of the choice-based plans; the use of the phrase "deceptively appealing" and the continuation of the argument makes it clear that the candidate views the appeal of these plans as unfortunate. The second bold-faced statement, that consumers cannot predict their future health needs, is an assertion that the candidate uses to support his ultimate position that alternative plans should be offered.

(A) This choice incorrectly states that the candidate argues against the fact that choice plans are deceptively appealing to numerous stakeholders. The candidate views this fact as unfortunate but one cannot argue against a "fact." Moreover, the second bold-faced statement is not the candidate's ultimate claim, or conclusion; instead, it is a claim used to support the candidate's ultimate conclusion that alternative plans should be offered.
(B) This choice correctly states that the second bold-faced statement is a claim that the candidate uses as evidence to support his ultimate position. However, the first bold-faced statement is not an observation to which the candidate is ultimately opposed; it is his own observation that the current prescription drug plans are "deceptively appealing." His opposition is to the drug plans themselves, but that is not the observation made in the first statement.
(C) CORRECT. The first bold-faced statement, that coverage plans centered around choice are deceptively appealing, is an observation that the candidate acknowledges as true but unfortunate. The second bold-faced statement—that consumers cannot predict their future health needs—is an assertion that the candidate makes to support his ultimate position that alternative plans should be offered.
(D) This choice incorrectly states that the candidate argues against the observation that choice plans are deceptively appealing to numerous stakeholders. This is the candidate's own observation; though he does view the fact as unfortunate, one cannot argue against one's own observation. Moreover, the second bold-faced statement is not an observation; instead, it is a claim used to support the candidate's ultimate conclusion that alternative plans should be offered.
(E) This choice correctly states that the first bold-faced statement is an observation the candidate makes. However, the second bold-faced statement—that consumers cannot predict their future health needs—is not an assertion that the candidate opposes; instead, he uses this claim to support his ultimate position.

16.
The conclusion of this argument is that "many weight-loss efforts fail because people eat more calories than they intend to consume." The first boldface portion is a factual premise ("Studies have shown…") that there is an observed correlation between keeping a diet record and losing weight successfully. This premise (indirectly) supports the researchers' conclusion. The second boldface portion is another supporting premise, this one citing a specific study showing that dieters who do not keep a diet record eat far more than they realize.

(A) The first boldface is not the conclusion, it is an observed fact. The second boldface is evidence that the researchers' conclusion is correct, but is not evidence that the first boldface is correct.

(B) The first boldface is a fact that supports the researchers' theory, but it does not explain why their conclusion is correct—the other premises do so.

(C) The first boldface is a fact that supports the researchers' theory, but it does not illustrate the truth of that theory—the second boldface does. The second boldface is a fact that supports the researchers' theory; it is not a competing theory.

(D) CORRECT. The first boldface (diet record = diet success) is a basis for the researchers' conclusion that many weight-loss efforts fail because people consume more than they intended. The second boldface directly illustrates how weight-loss efforts of a certain group failed for exactly that reason.

(E) The first boldface is a factual statement, not a theory. Furthermore, the first boldface supports the theory of the researchers; it is not something they have disproved.

17.
The conclusion of this argument is the first sentence: "Weight loss programs that guarantee results mislead their customers." The rest of the text is evidence in support of that conclusion. The correct answer will identify the first boldface portion as the conclusion, and the second boldface portion as evidence in support of the conclusion.

(A) The first boldface portion is a fairly strong assertion, not a generalization. The second boldface portion is not a consequence of the first.

(B) CORRECT. The first boldface portion is the author's position, or conclusion. The second boldface portion is a consideration in support of the position stated in the first boldface portion.

(C) The second boldface portion is evidence in support of the opinion stated in the first boldface portion, not weighing against it.

(D) The first boldface portion is the author's assertion, not one that he or she questions.

(E) The first boldface portion is the author's main point, not evidence in support of it. The second boldface portion is not the author's main point, but rather support for it. This answer choice incorrectly reverses the roles of the boldface portions.

18.
The question asks us to analyze the structure of the argument. Specifically, it asks us to determine the relationship of the two bolded sentences to the argument as a whole. To do this effectively, we need first to determine the conclusion of the argument. In this case, the conclusion is the final sentence, which follows from the evidence presented in the rest of the argument. So we know that the correct answer cannot describe either bolded portion as the author's final conclusion.
The first bolded portion is presented as an earlier, erroneous belief. In evaluating the answer choices, we should look to eliminate any that suggest the author agrees with this first statement. The second bolded statement shows that the earlier theory (that lactic acid causes soreness) was incorrect, and thus also provides evidence in support of the author's conclusion. So we know that the correct answer must describe the second bolded portion as supporting the conclusion. The correct answer must describe both portions correctly, not just one or the other.
(A) This choice misrepresents the first bolded portion by claiming that the author accepts it as true, when the author actually presents it as an incorrect, outdated belief. The second portion is also incorrect because it indicates that the second bolded portion supports the first one.
(B) This choice also misrepresents the first portion, for the reason described above. It corrects the second bolded portion, however, by describing it as contradictory to the first portion.
(C) The first portion is correctly described as an assertion that the author does not believe to be true. Yet the second portion is incorrectly described as going against the author's final conclusion.
(D) CORRECT. This choice correctly represents the first portion by saying the author believes it is no longer valid. The second portion is correctly described as evidence in support of the author's conclusion.
(E) The first portion is correctly described as evidence considered by the author to be invalid. However, this choice misrepresents the second portion as the conclusion, when it is actually evidence given in support of the conclusion.

19.
The conclusion of the argument is that the nominees "are more notable for their close ties to corporate and economic interests" than for their positions on controversial issues. The first **boldfaced** statement is a recognition of the fact that the president's nominees have been branded conservative. The second boldfaced statement offers information in support of the assertion that the nominees are more notable for their corporate ties. So we need to find a choice that describes both statements accurately.
(A) The author does not seek to attack the assertion made in the first statement.
(B) The author does acknowledge the first statement as true. However, the second statement is not the conclusion.

(C) CORRECT. The author does accept the first statement as true, and the second statement is indeed given in support of the conclusion.
(D) The first statement is not the author's "position" (i.e., conclusion).
(E) The first statement is not an exception to a rule, making the description of the second statement false as well.

20.
The question asks us to analyze the structure of the argument. Specifically, we are asked to determine the respective roles of the two portions in boldface. To do so, we need first to find the conclusion of the argument and then determine the relationship of each boldface portion to that conclusion.
The author argues that high interest rates will cause people to refrain from buying homes because their mortgage costs will be too high. In turn, sellers will be forced to lower their asking prices. In the end, this chain of events will work to stabilize the real estate market. So the last sentence, which happens to be the second boldface portion, is the conclusion. The first boldface portion is a fact that the author belives will lead to the stabilization of the market. We need to find a choice that reflect this assessment.
(A) The first portion is not the author's main point (another term for conclusion).
(B) CORRECT. The first portion is indeed a consideration that the author believes will result in a particular situation, namely the stabilization of the market. The second is indeed that situation.
(C) The first portion does not weigh against (contradict) the author's main point (conclusion).
(D) The first is indeed a prediction, but the second portion is not evidence -- it is the conclusion.
(E) The first portion is not the main point (conclusion).

21.
The corporate strategist begins the argument by describing the usual relationship between the reduction in price and the resulting effect on product demand. After describing the traditional relationship, he concludes, however, that the management’s price-reduction strategy is flawed. Thus, the first statement in boldface represents the conclusion of the corporate strategist. Finally, the strategist finishes his argument by providing evidence that justifies his reasoning. Therefore, the second statement in boldface provides evidence that supports the main position of the corporate strategist.

(A) This answer choice correctly describes the first statement but incorrectly

states that the second statement weighs against rather than supports the main position of the equity strategist.

(B) This answer choice incorrectly states that the first statement represents an assumption made by the strategist. Remember that assumptions are never stated in the body of the argument. The second statement is correctly described as evidence supporting the strategist's reasoning.

(C) This answer choice incorrectly labels the first statement as evidence supporting the conclusion and the second statement as the conclusion itself. The order of the two descriptions should be the reverse of that presented in this answer choice.

(D) This answer choice incorrectly describes the first statement as evidence rather than the conclusion, and incorrectly states that the scenario outlined in the second statement will not hold in the case at issue.

(E) CORRECT. This answer correctly describes the first statement as the strategist's conclusion and the second statement as the evidence supporting that conclusion.

22.
The first boldface sentence states that the fight against the drug trade in Country X should focus for the time being on tightening the country's borders and targeting its major smugglers. The second boldface sentence states that the United Nations and the government of Country X should eventually replace the poppy fields with other farming ventures ("agricultural infrastructure"). We need to find a choice that describes the relationship between these two sentences.

(A) This choice states that the first sentence is the conclusion and that the second sentence is an alternative to that conclusion. This misrepresents the relationship. The first sentence is a shorter-term conclusion and the second sentence is a longer-term conclusion of the argument.

(B) CORRECT. This choice states that the first sentence is a short-term solution to a problem and the second a long-term solution to the same problem. This accurately describes the relationship. The first sentence states that the fight should focus "for the time being" on borders and smuggling while the second

sentence states that the United Nations and the government of Country X should work to replace the poppy crop with something else.

(C) This choice states that the first sentence presents a problem. According to the text, however, the first sentence is not a problem but a solution to a problem.

(D) This choice states that the first sentence presents a popular solution to a problem. Since we have no way of knowing whether the solution is popular, this cannot be correct.

(E) This choice states that the first sentence presents an argument and that the second sentence provides evidence to support that argument. Though the first sentence does present an argument, the second sentence, rather than providing evidence, presents a second argument.

23. This argument begins with the classic "some of my critics claim" construction. As we know from that discussion, the conclusion of the argument will typically be the opposite of the claim. In this case, the conclusion comes in the second sentence when the mayor states the following: **Conclusion:** I do not agree that I am at fault for this problem [the budget deficit]. Because neither **bolded** portion overlaps the conclusion, the **bolded** portions must be premises or counter-premises. Take a moment to go back and look at some of the indicator words-see the "although" just before the first **bolded** portion? The presence of that word means that the first **bolded** portion is given as a counter-premise to the author's conclusion. That is, the mayor admits that there was a budget deficit, and this fact possibly undermines his or her argument in some way, but the mayor still believes that the conclusion is true despite this fact. The second **bolded** portion comes after the conclusion and is used as a premise to support the conclusion. Thus, one **bolded** portion is a counter-premise, and the other is a premise, and the correct answer must reflect that fact. In summary, the pertinent portions of the argument appear as follows: **Critics claim:** The critics claim that the mayor is responsible for the current budget deficit. **Bolded portion:** In this counter-premise the mayor admits that there is a budget deficit. **Conclusion:** The conclusion indicates that even though there is a budget deficit, the mayor is not responsible for the deficit, contrary to the claim of the critics. **Bolded portion:** This is a premise that indicates that the mayor's economic policies have actually benefited the city, not hurt the city. A quick scan of the answer choices reveals that each will be broken into two parts: the first part will describe the first **bolded** section and the second part will describe the second **bolded** section. Answer choice (A): The first half of this answer is a classic Contender. It may very well be that the counter-premise

has been used against the mayor. Setting that aside, however, the description of the second **boldface** portion is inaccurate, so this answer choice is incorrect. Answer choice (B): This is classic Half-Right, Half-Wrong answer choice. The first **bolded** portion is a statement accepted by the mayor; however, it is not the case that the second **bolded** portion is a "consequence of the critics' claims." **Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer**. In this case, although the mayor admits that the first **bolded** portion is true, he or she does not believe that fact has a negative impact on the conclusion. Answer choice (D): This answer begins poorly because we do not know that the first **boldface** portion is evidence of unlawful activity by the mayor. Answer choice (E): This is another answer where the first **bolded** portion causes many people to leave the answer as a Contender. However, the description of the second **bolded** portion is inaccurate because the second portion is not a consequence of the first **bolded** portion (this is a direct test of your ability to discern a premise from a conclusion).

24. **Conclusion:** "A more sensible preservation strategy would be to assist the farmers to modernize their farms to the extent needed to maintain viability." **Boldface 1:** Preservation of the Wilgrinn land (that's got to be **the goal** referred to by the answer choices). Reading on… The plan is ill-conceived (not the goal, but the plan—argument does not argue against the goal, but does argue against the plan for achieving the goal), so, the goal is preservation of the land (First **Boldface**) and that's also part of the main conclusion so **First Boldface is a goal with which the argument basically agrees** so A and B are not true. **Boldface 2:** Doesn't really relate to the main conclusion, so… Return to the answer choices and consider **second Boldface** description in remaining choices. C and D are still possibilities, but… E implies that the argument suggests changing a situation in order to make attainment of the goal possible. But the argument suggests changing **the entire strategy** for attaining the goal, which is not the same thing, at all—so the second **Boldface** part of this choice doesn't fit. Also, the argument doesn't really endorse the goal so much as it endorses a particular strategy by which to attain the goal. So the first part of Choice E doesn't fit, either E is not correct, leaving us with C and D. Read Choice C in its entirety: (1) says the first **Boldface** presents a goal that the argument concludes can be attained. Not exactly—the argument actually concludes that **a different strategy is needed to attain the goal**, not simply that the goal is attainable (so this part of this choice doesn't match the argument). (2) Says the second **Boldface** in the argument is a judgment disputing whether the goal can be attained. NO, definitely not—the second BF in the argument suggests a reason why one strategy won't succeed, but has nothing to do with whether the goal can be attained—the second part of this choice clearly doesn't match the argument, at all so C is incorrect. Now look at the

remaining choice, to make sure it fits: (1) Goal, strategies for achieving under consideration—YES. (2) An opinion or judgment that serves as the basis supporting an alternative to the earlier plan, but with the same ultimate goal—preservation of Wilgrinn land—YES. So, **the final answer is D**.

25. Conclusion: "However, these environmentalists are probably wrong (about their assessment of Tropicorp's intent)." It's not one of the **bolded** phrases, so… Back to the **boldfaced** phrases to determine their relationship to the main conclusion: **Boldface 1:** Main conclusion of the argument says, essentially, that the environmentalists are wrong in thinking that Tropicorp's decision not to pursue rubber tapping and, thereby, leave the forests intact INDICATES that Tropicorp is not entirely profit-motivated. In other words, the main conclusion disagrees with the environmentalists' assessment of Tropicorp's motives. So, that means that the first BF is reasoning that supports the position that the argument opposes. **Boldface 2:** This is the environmentalists' conclusion, which means that it **is the conclusion which the argument refutes.** This is the easier of the two **Boldface** roles to work with first so C is the only choice that offers this option so C is the answer. Return to the answer choices and **consider the first BF description in remaining choices.** Once again, C is the only choice that offers the option for which we are searching.

26. The argument is structured as follows: **Premise:** It is well documented that people have positive responses to some words, such as "kind" and "wonderful," and negative responses to others, such as "evil" and "nausea." **Premise:** Recently, psychological experiments have revealed that people also have positive or negative responses to many nonsense words. **Conclusion:** This shows that people's responses to words are conditioned not only by what the words mean, but also by how they sound. Like many Method-AP arguments, the conclusion is in the final sentence and is introduced by the conclusion indicator "this shows that." As discussed earlier, you should not expect to be asked about the conclusion if it appears in the last sentence of a Method-AP question, and indeed the statement referenced in question stem is clearly a premise used to support the conclusion. With this in mind, we will examine the answers. The first few words of each answer indicate the general role the statement is claimed to play. Answer choices (B) and (E) both name the statement as a conclusion, and both are unlikely to be correct. Answer choices (A) and (D) are early Contenders, and answer choice (C) bears further analysis. Answer choice (A): We know that the statement is a premise, so this is answer is possibly correct based on the first line of the answer. But, the answer claims the statement is used to support a conclusion that "people have either a positive or a negative response to any word," and that is not the conclusion of the argument. Thus, although the answer starts out correctly describing the statement, it finishes

by incorrectly describing the statement. As we know, half- right, half-wrong answers are always incorrect. Answer choice (B): This answer is immediately eliminated since the statement is not a conclusion. A further reading reveals that the answer also characterizes the conclusion of the argument as a premise, another reason to dismiss this answer. Answer choice (C): Although the statement could probably be characterized as a generalization, it is not one supported by the first premise. This answer tries to claim the statement is a conclusion, whereas we know that the first two statements are both separate premises. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. We know the statement is a premise designed to support the conclusion, and this answer choice describes that role perfectly. Answer choice (E): We know this answer is incorrect because it claims the statement is a conclusion. The remainder of the answer choice would also cause the answer to be eliminated since it describes a claim that does not occur in the argument.

27. The psychologist's argument is structured as follows: **Premise:** However much society may have changed over the centuries, human psychology is still driven primarily by personal interaction. **Sub-conclusion / Premise:** Thus, the important social function of positively reinforcing those behaviors [of expressing gratitude] that have beneficial consequences for others can be served only if the benefactor knows the source of the gratitude. **Main conclusion:** The obligation to express gratitude cannot be fulfilled anonymously. Often, the identifiers used before the subsidiary conclusions are dramatic and somewhat misleading, such as "clearly" and "obviously." In these cases, the conclusion is neither clear nor obvious, and those words are used to lead the reader into thinking that the conclusion should simply be accepted without further analysis. The statement referenced in the question stem is the main conclusion of the argument, and as the answer choice correctly describes, the conclusion that the argument is designed to support. The argument, when considered in terms of order, is "out of order": First sentence = main conclusion, Second sentence = basic premise, Third sentence = sub-conclusion. The last sentence is a sub-conclusion, and in a Method-AP answer choice the author can describe a sub-conclusion in a variety of ways: subsidiary conclusion / secondary conclusion / intermediate conclusion / supporting conclusion. Note that as predicted, the main conclusion is not modified by a conclusion indicator but the sub-conclusion is. Answer choice (A): The statement in question is not an example of an idea raised in a premise. Answer choice (B): The answer choice describes a premise that is used to defend the argument from attack. This would better describe the second sentence of the argument. Answer choice (C): This answer choice describes a premise supporting a sub-conclusion. Again, this would better describe the second sentence of the argument. Answer choice (D): This answer choice better describes the last sentence. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. By consistently breaking down the structure

of the argument before reading the answer choices, these problems become very easy to solve.

28. The argument is structured as follows: **Premise:** A rise of just two degrees prevents the vertical mixing of seawater from different strata. **Premise:** This restricts the availability of upwelling nutrients to phytoplankton. **Premise:** Zooplankton, which feed upon phytoplankton, feed the rest of the food chain. **Conclusion:** Seemingly inconsequential changes in sea temperature due to global warming eventually result in declines in fish and seabird populations. The conclusion in the first line is echoed again in the final sentence. The argument part referenced in the question stem is a premise (note the use of the premise indicator "since" in the last line), and your answer must indicate that the role played by the argument part is that of a premise. Answer choice (A): The portion referenced in the question stem is not a hypothesis, but rather a statement of fact. Answer choice (B): The statement referenced in the question stem is not an example of the way the mixing of seawater affects feeding habits, but rather another premise that is then combined with the vertical mixing premise to help support the conclusion. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. The phrase "it helps show" describes a premise, and in this case the premise is used to support a statement about the effect of temperature changes on fish and seabirds. Answer choice (D): The argument does not take a position that global warming should be curtailed. Instead, the argument shows how small changes in sea temperature lead to population declines, and no opinion of those effects is stated. Answer choice (E): This is an Exaggerated Answer. The argument specifically indicates that fish and seabirds populations will decline. This answer choices states that all organisms are threatened.

29. The correct answer choice is (D) The nutritionist's argument can be deconstructed as follows: **Premise:** Humans have evolved very little since the development of agriculture. **Sub-conclusion/Premise:** It is clear that humans are still biologically adapted to a diet of wild foods, consisting mainly of raw fruits and vegetables, nuts and seeds, lean meat, and seafood. **Premise:** Straying from this diet has often resulted in chronic illness and other physical problems. **Conclusion:** Thus, the more our diet consists of wild foods, the healthier we will be. The statement referenced in the question stem is a sub-conclusion. Answer choice (D), the correct answer, describes this role using the phrase "intermediate conclusion." This is a great example of a question that allows you to accelerate: if you take the correct steps (fulfill the Primary Objectives) when analyzing the argument, you already know the correct answer and you simply need to scan the answer choices quickly for a match. Answer choice (A): This is a Half Right, Half Wrong answer. The statement is a conclusion, but the only support offered for this conclusion is that humans have evolved very little since the development of

agriculture. Since this fact contradicts what is stated in the answer choice, the answer choice is incorrect. Answer choice (B): Since we know the statement is a sub-conclusion, there is justification provided and this answer choice is incorrect. Note that describing the statement as a premise is also accurate, since a sub-conclusion is a conclusion for one argument and a premise for another argument. Answer choice (C): The main conclusion does not explain the statement referenced in the question stem, so this answer choice is incorrect. The answer would be much improved if it said: "It is a phenomenon that helps explain the main conclusion of the nutritionist's argument." Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer, and the answer you should have been looking for after you analyzed the argument and read the question stem. Answer choice (E): This is a Reverse answer. The claim that humans have evolved very little since the development of agriculture is a premise offered in support of the statement referenced in the question stem.

30. The correct answer choice is (B) The argument has an interesting structure. Visually, the argument appears as follows: **Premise:** Pedigreed dogs, including those officially classified as working dogs, must conform to standards set by organizations that issue pedigrees. **Premise:** Those standards generally specify the physical appearance necessary for a dog to be recognized as belonging to a breed but stipulate nothing about other genetic traits, such as those that enable breeds originally developed as working dogs to perform the work for which they were developed. **Premise:** Dog breeders try to maintain only those traits specified by pedigree organizations, and traits that breeders do not try to maintain risk being lost. **Sub-conclusion / Premise:** Certain traits like herding ability risk being lost among pedigreed dogs. **Conclusion:** Therefore, pedigree organizations should set standards requiring working ability in pedigreed dogs classified as working dogs. Given the size of the stimulus, this is a tough problem to analyze. The second to last sentence contains both a premise and a conclusion. The final sentence contains the main conclusion. Perhaps because of the size of the problem, the test makers kindly inserted the conclusion indicator "therefore" before the main conclusion. Answer choice (A): This is a Half Right, Half Wrong answer. The phrase referenced in the question is a "claim on which the argument depends," but it is not one for which no support is given. In fact, several premises back up the statement. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. The statement in question is a sub-conclusion, described in this answer as a subsidiary conclusion. Answer choice (C): The phrase in question is in agreement with the argument, and does not reference a possible objection. If you were to choose this answer, you would have to ask yourself, "What is the possible objection mentioned in this answer choice?" Answer choice (D): The argument as a whole works towards supporting the recommendation that "pedigree organizations should set standards requiring working ability in pedigreed dogs classified as

working dogs." The phrase in the question stem does not summarize the antithesis of that position. Answer choice (E): This answer has the order of the argument backwards. The phrase referenced in the question stem provides evidence necessary to support a claim stated later in the argument.

31. **Analysis:** There are two persons in the question: Professor Jones and the author. As one can see, the author does not agree to the argument by Professor Jones. "This conclusion, however, is unwarranted because … **(the second boldface)** ". Therefore, the opinion of the author is very much at odds with the opinion of Professor Jones. Then, let's take a look at the first **boldface** "**certain vital biological processes, such as photosynthesis, are slower in these areas than is usual for the inspected species**". This is result of a test or lab or discovery, so it is an evidence professor Jones used to back up his conclusion "Professor Jones has claimed that...".Therefore, answer C is the correct choice. **Why is B incorrect?** "The first contains the argument the author critiques" is incorrect, because the author does not agree with the evidence (the first **boldface**), but only disagrees the conclusion (claim) made by Professor Jones. We can rule out A, D and E as they are unrelated. B states that 'the first contains the argument the author critiques'. Nowhere in the passage does the author critique the argument; he merely attacks the conclusion that is based on the argument. Furthermore the first sentence is clearly evidence and not an argument in itself.

32. **Analysis: First Boldface:** Consideration that has led to the adoption of a certain strategy. **Second Boldface:** A reason against adopting that strategy

A. The first describes a **strategy** that has been adopted to avoid a certain problem; the second presents a **drawback** to that strategy**. Correct**
B. The first describes a strategy that has been adopted to avoid a certain problem; the second is a consideration raised to call into question the effectiveness of that strategy as a means of achieving that goal [contrary to this the strategy is effective indeed in achieving its goal, however with a drawback]. **Incorrect**
C. The first describes a strategy that has been adopted to avoid a certain problem; the second is a consideration the consultant raises in questioning the significance [rather he suggests a balance of two*;* significance is not attacked at all]of that problem. **Incorrect**
D. The first is part of an explanation that the consultant offers for a certain phenomenon; the second is that phenomenon [it's not a phenomenon]. **Incorrect**

E. The first describes a policy for which the consultant seeks to provide a justification [he does not; *not at all*]; the second is a consideration the consultant raises as part of that justification**. Incorrect**

33.

A. The first identifies a claim that the reasoning seeks to show is false; the second is evidence that has been cited by others in support of that claim. **Wrong:** second does not support the claim in first
B. The first identifies a claim that the reasoning seeks to show is false; the second is a position for which the reasoning seeks to provide support. The second is evidence, and not a position.
C. The first is a position that the reasoning contends is inadequately supported by the evidence; the second is a position for which the reasoning seeks to provide support. Second is not a position.
D. The first is a position that the reasoning contends is inadequately supported by the evidence; the second is evidence used to support the reasoning's contention. **CORRECT.**
E. The first is a position that the reasoning contends is inadequately supported by the evidence; the second is evidence that has been used to support that position. Second is evidence that opposes the first position (that position)

34. **Analysis: Conclusion** is: it is likely that some of the fragments were at least large enough to have passed through Jupiter's outer atmosphere without being burned up – giving indication of the size of the fragments! **1st part** is a consideration that the author is using to prove something so it is either C or D. **2nd part** is definitely not a conclusion. Hence, C is better.

Miscellaneous

1.

On a "mimic the argument" question, it's useful to use logic notation to understand the flow of the argument. In this case, we're told that IF A happens (a match reaches a fifth-set tiebreak), THEN B will definitely happen (the lower-ranked player loses). Standard logic rules tell us that, when given "If A, then B," the only definite conclusion we can draw is "If not B, then not A." In other words, if A always leads to B, and B doesn't happen, then A can't have happened either. The second sentence of the argument shows this principle: If not B (the lower-ranked player doesn't lose), then not A (there wasn't a fifth-set tiebreak). So we need to find another argument that follows this pattern: If A, then B; if not B, then not A.

(A) CORRECT. If A (a woman with a family history of twins gets pregnant 3 times), then B (she will have 1 set of twins). Note that these numbers are precise: if she gets pregnant exactly three times, she will have exactly one set of twins. If not B (a woman with a family history of twins has 2 sets of twins - that is, not 1), then not A (she must have gotten pregnant either fewer than 3 times or more than 3 times - that is, not exactly 3 times).

(B) If A (a salesman sells more product than anyone else), then B (he will earn an all-expenses-paid vacation). If B (Joe earned the trip), then A (he must have sold more than anyone else). We can see why logic rules do not include "if B, then A" as a logical conclusion: A may always lead to B, but B does not necessarily have to lead to A. There may be other ways to earn the trip besides selling more than anyone else.

(C) If A (a newspaper's circulation surpasses 100,000), then B (the newspaper can charge a 50% premium). If not A (the circulation doesn't surpass 100,000), then not C (the newspaper cannot charge any premium). The final assertion here does not match the initial A / B argument We know nothing about any other premium the newspaper might charge; we are only given information about charging a 50% premium.

(D) If A (a student is in the top 10% of the class), then B (she will earn a scholarship). If not A (Anna is not in the top 10%), then not B (she won't earn a scholarship). We can see why logic rules do not include "if not A, then not B" as a logical conclusion: A may always lead to B, but it doesn't have to be the only way to reach B. There may be other ways to earn a scholarship besides being in the top 10% of the class.

(E) If A (the team wins the Super Bowl), then B (the players receive a bonus). If not A (a player was not on the winning team), then not B (the player won't receive a bonus). We can see why logic rules do not include "if not A, then not B" as a logical conclusion: A may always lead to B, but it doesn't have to be the only way to reach B. There may be other ways to earn a bonus besides winning the Super Bowl.

2.
A person's immune system becomes hypersensitive to an allergen via repeated exposure. We need to find an example of a series of minor events (repeated exposure to an allergen) can ultimately provoke an extreme response (a life-threatening reaction after even minimal exposure to the allergen).

(A) In this situation, a behavior (diet) over time leads one to become more and more susceptible to other chronic conditions (diabetes and high blood pressure). In the real world, those chronic conditions might in turn lead to an extreme response such as a heart attack, but this statement does not exactly illustrate how a series of minor events can ultimately provoke an extreme response to those same minor events.

(B) CORRECT. A series of minor earthquakes (minor events) weaken the existing infrastructure. The weakened infrastructure then allows a minor earthquake to do greater damage (an extreme response) than would a single major earthquake.

(C) This statement simply makes a judgment (those with peanut allergies should avoid peanuts); it does not illustrate how a series of minor events can provoke an extreme response.

(D) A person can recover from a problem (failing a test). This does not illustrate how a series of minor events can provoke an extreme response.

(E) A person engaging in an activity regularly (speeding) is more likely to be noticed for that activity than is a person who engages in it only occasionally. This does not illustrate how a series of minor events can provoke an extreme response.

3.
The argument itself provides one example of the Doppler effect: a siren decreases in perceived pitch as it approaches, passes and then moves away from an observer. The answer choice that most closely describes a similar scenario is a correct illustration of the Doppler effect.

(A) CORRECT. The passengers on the westbound train see the eastbound train approaching, passing, then traveling away from them. The sound of the horn, therefore, will decrease in pitch for the westbound passengers.

(B) The passengers on the westbound train see the eastbound train approaching, passing, then traveling away from them. The sound of the horn, therefore, will decrease in pitch for the westbound passengers. This choice, however, says that the sound will increase in pitch.

(C) Relative to the passengers on the eastbound train, the eastbound train and its horn are in fact standing still! The Doppler effect only describes an "perceived change in pitch that occurs when the source of a sound is in motion relative to the observer," a situation that is not illustrated by this choice.

(D) Relative to the passengers on the eastbound train, the eastbound train and its horn are in fact standing still! The Doppler effect only describes an "perceived change in pitch that occurs when the source of a sound is in motion relative to the observer," a situation that is not illustrated by this choice.

(E) Relative to the passengers on the eastbound train, the eastbound train and its horn are in fact standing still! The Doppler effect only describes an "perceived change in pitch that occurs when the source of a sound is in motion relative to the observer," so while it is true that the eastbound passengers would hear their train's horn at its true pitch, this situation does not illustrate the Doppler effect.

4.

Jim initially presents two premises: 1) it costs more to make a penny and a nickel than their face value; and 2) there is little that can be bought for a penny or a nickel. He goes on to opine that the coins no longer provide any necessary function to the economy, then concludes with a proposal to remove the coins from circulation and declare the basic unit of American currency to be 10 cents.

Mary responds by implying that such a policy would be a "non-starter" based on her assumptions of the practical effects of trying to do so.

(A) Mary's assertion that all prices would round up to the nearest dime is not presented anywhere in the passage as a statement of fact; it is simply an assumption made by Mary.

(B) By asserting that Congress would not approve such a proposal as part of her response to Jim, Mary implies that such approval is necessary.

(C) Mary provides an argument that such a proposal would have little practical chance of being implemented because of its unpopularity. The unpopularity of a public proposal is not necessarily correlated with whether the proposal is "justified" or not.

(D) There is nothing in the passage that describes how Congress would treat unpopular proposals. Mary's assertion that Congress would "never" approve such an unpopular proposal is an assumption made on her part.

(E) CORRECT. Mary's response is based on her assumption that Congress would not approve Jim's proposal because she assumes that it would be extremely unpopular. She does not attack or even mention any of Jim's premises underlying his proposal.

5.
The owner of the coffee store makes three statements citing evidence supporting his belief that things are not going well at his store: 1) the store has become a hangout for teenagers; 2) many of his adult customers do not appear comfortable; and 3) some of them have told him they will no longer frequent the store. He then states that his goal is to maximize his revenue and directs his store manager to discourage the teenagers from frequenting his store and to cultivate a more adult clientele. We can reasonably infer that the owner believes that his directive will help him achieve his goal of maximum revenue.

In response, the store manager makes no attempt to refute the manager's three statements, but instead offers some new evidence which implies that following the owner's directive may work against the owner's goal of maximum revenue, further implying that the status quo may be indeed be compatible with that goal.

(A) The store manager makes no attempt to question the veracity of the statements of the owner. When the manager asks "Are you sure?" he is questioning the owner's directive (or its effectiveness), not the veracity of the owner's evidence.

(B) The implementation of the owner's directive is not mentioned by the manager and is not relevant.

(C) CORRECT. By asserting that the average teenager spends just as much money as the average adult and that there are more new customers than former customers, the manager is presenting new evidence that implies that the current situation is actually helping the owner achieve his goal more than his directive would.

(D) The manager only states that the average teenager spends as much as the average adult; hence, he makes a claim as to the relative *revenue* generated by the average member of each group. He does not make any claim as to the relative *profitability* of the average member of each group.

(E) The new evidence that the manager presents neither contradicts nor refutes any of the evidence that the owner had previous presented.

6.

We begin by analyzing the structure of the problem: **Premise:** Garbage is usually collected here on Wednesdays, and the garbage collectors in this city are extremely reliable. **Premise:** Monday was a public holiday. **Premise:** After a public holiday that falls on a Monday, garbage throughout the city is

supposed to be collected one day later than usual. **Conclusion:** Garbage in this neighborhood probably will not be collected until Thursday this week. The argument is **sound** and the conclusion seems reasonable. The language in the conclusion is not absolute ("probably"), and this is justified since the language used in the argument—"usually" and "supposed to be"—is also probabilistic. Knowing that the argument is valid, the question you must ask yourself is, "How would I describe the structure of this argument?" Answer choice (A): This answer forces you to make an assessment of the premises (the "evidence") as they relate to the conclusion. Are the premises irrelevant to the conclusion? Clearly not. Therefore, this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (B): This is a half-right, half-wrong answer. The argument does establish "that one thing is likely to occur." But, is this established by ruling out all of the alternative possibilities? No, to do that would mean presenting arguments against the garbage being collected on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, etc. Since this section of the answer choice does not occur, this answer is incorrect. Also, because the argument does not rule out all the alternatives, the conclusion is not established "indirectly." Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. Consider each piece of the argument: "providing information"—a variety of information about the garbage situation is provided. "application of a general rule"—the general rule is that "After a public holiday that falls on a Monday, garbage throughout the city is supposed to be collected one day later than usual." "to a specific case"—the specific case is the pickup of garbage this week in this neighborhood. Given that all elements occurred and the answer presents an accurate description of the way the author made his or her argument, this answer is correct. Now, take a moment and compare this answer to the prephrase you made after reading the stimulus. How similar are the two? Given that you may not be familiar with the language used by the test makers, the two may not be very similar. As your preparation continues, you will become more comfortable with the language and your Method of Reasoning pre-phrasing will improve. For example, note the use in this answer of "general rule" to describe the last sentence of the stimulus. The test makers could also have used a phrase like "basic principle" to achieve the same result. Your job is to match their language to what occurred in the stimulus. Answer choice (D): This answer is an overgeneralization—a situation where one instance is used to make a broad based conclusion. This is a Reverse Answer since the stimulus actually uses a general principle and applies it to one instance. In addition, the language in the answer is far too strong in saying "all actions of a certain kind" when the language in the stimulus was probabilistic. Answer choice (E): This is an Exaggerated Answer. The conclusion states that "Garbage in this neighborhood probably will not be collected until Thursday this week" and the use of "probably" is a clear and obvious indication that the author does not think the Thursday garbage pickup is inevitable.

7.

This is one of the greatest Method of Reasoning questions of all time. First take a close look at the statements made by Jane and Mark. In the majority of GMAT questions with two speakers—one identifiably male and the other identifiably female—the male makes a mistake or an error of reasoning and the female uses sound reasoning. This does not occur in every problem, but it occurs enough to be more than random. Why? The thinking goes that in order for GMAC to protect themselves against accusations that they are biased against women, they create problems where the male is clearly the one using faulty reasoning. Jane's position: Jane concludes that Professor Harper's ideas are valueless because there is no way to evaluate a guitar sound and determine what constitutes a better-sounding guitar. Mark's position: Mark also agrees that Professor Harper's ideas are valueless, but Mark's reasoning is that if Harper's ideas really worked, then they would have been adopted by now. In making this analysis, Mark reveals that he believes there is a way to determine that one guitar sounds better than another. Like all GMAT questions, you must lock down the exact nature of the premises and conclusions! Mark's initial comment of "What's more" leads most people to believe he is in complete agreement with Jane. Yes, he agrees with her conclusion, but his reason for doing so is completely contrary to Jane's reason. Mark actually misinterprets Jane's claim, and this is why he says "What's more," as if he is adding an additional piece of information that supports her position. He is not; the premise that he uses contradicts Jane's premises. If you simply accept "What's more" to mean that he is in complete agreement with Jane, you will most certainly miss the question, and have no idea you have done so. The problem becomes even more challenging because the answer choices are brilliantly constructed: Answer choice (A): Mark does not address a weakness in Jane's argument or show how one could be overcome. Do not mistake the use of "What's more" to automatically mean that he is adding something helpful to the situation. Answer choice (B): This is an answer chosen by many people, and it has Shell game aspects. Mark's argument does not have a premise in common with Jane's argument; rather, Mark's argument has the conclusion in common with Jane's argument. Before you select this answer, use the Fact Test and ask yourself, "Which premise do the two arguments have in common?" You won't be able to find one, and that would instantly disprove the answer. Answer choice (C): This is a very clever Reverse Answer choice. The answer states: "Mark and Jane use similar techniques to argue for different conclusions." In fact, the following happens in the stimulus: "Mark and Jane use different techniques to argue for similar conclusions." If you had any doubt that the makers of the GMAT put the same amount of work into the wrong answers as the correct answers, this answer choice should be convince you that they do. Answer choice (D): An argument is the sum of the premises and conclusion. Although Mark restates Jane's conclusion, he does

not restate her premises. Therefore, he does not restate her argument and this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. As discussed in the argument analysis, Jane believes that there is no way to evaluate the merit of a guitar's sounds. On the opposite side, Mark's response indicates he believes that there is a way to evaluate the merit of a guitar's sound ("because of the improvement it makes in tonal quality") and thus the two have conflicting positions. This is another great example of a separator question: one that scorers in a certain range will get and scorers in a lower range will not get. This is also a dangerous question because many people think they have chosen the correct answer when in fact they have missed it. The lesson here is that you must be an active, prepared reader. Do not allow yourself to be lured by Mark's comment of "What's more" into believing that he automatically is in agreement with Jane. The test makers use that phrase to see if you will read closely enough to discern his real argument or if you will simply gloss over his comments on the basis of how they are introduced. The GMAT always makes you pay if you gloss over any section of a stimulus.

8.

The arguments of Jorge and Ruth can be analyzed as follows: **Jorge's Argument:** Premise: Rock music of the 1960s was created by and for people who were then in their teens and early twenties. **Premise:** You were just an infant then [in the 1960s]. **Conclusion:** You won't be able to write well about the rock music of the 1960s. **Ruth's Argument:** Premise: There are living writers who write well about ancient Roman culture, even though those writers are obviously not a part of ancient Roman culture. **Premise:** Why should my youth alone prevent me from writing well about the music of a period as recent as the 1960s? **Conclusion:** Your reasoning is absurd. Note that the question stem asks you to identify how Ruth responded. When two-speaker stimuli are combined with Method of Reasoning questions, you are typically asked to identify the reasoning of only one of the speakers (often the second speaker). However, you must still understand the argument of the other speaker as the answer choices often refer to it. Now let's use the answer choices to discuss the structure of the argument. Answer choice (A): Ruth does not challenge Jorge's claim about her age. To the contrary, she seemingly admits he is correct when she says "Why should my youth alone..." Answer choice (B): Although Ruth uses an example that cites culture, she does not clarify a definition of popular culture, and certainly not one left implicit in Jorge's argument. Answer choice (C): This is a Half Right, Half Wrong answer. The first part of the answer choice—"using the example of classical culture"—does occur in Ruth's response, but she does not use that example "in order to legitimize contemporary culture as an object worthy of serious consideration." Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. An analogy is a comparison between two items. In argumentation,

analogies are often used to clarify the relationship between the items or reveal a fundamental truth about one of the items, as in "To better understand the operating system of your computer, think of it as the brain of your system." The use of "brain" in the preceding sentence is the analogy. Analogies can be used to challenge a position or support a position, but their strength often rests on the relevant similarities between the two items or scenarios. In the next chapter we will discuss False Analogies, where an author uses an analogy that is dissimilar enough to be non-applicable. As referenced in this answer choice, Ruth analogizes writing about Roman culture to writing about the 1960s to show that it is not unreasonable that someone who was an infant can write about that time period. Jorge's assumption is that if a person was not a teen or older during the 1960s, then they cannot write well about the music of that period. Since all elements described in the answer choice occur and the answer describes the method used by Ruth, this is the correct answer. Answer choice (E): Ruth does not attack Jorge's qualification to make his argument, just his pronouncement that she will not be able to write well about the rock music of the 1960s.

9.

The correct answer choice is (D). The arguments of Anne and Sue can be analyzed as follows: **Anne's Argument:** Premise: Halley's Comet, now in a part of its orbit relatively far from the Sun, recently flared brightly enough to be seen by telescope. **Premise:** No comet has ever been observed to flare so far from the Sun before. **Conclusion:** Such a flare must be highly unusual. **Sue's Argument:** Premise: Usually no one bothers to try to observe comets when they are so far from the Sun. **Premise:** This flare was observed only because an observatory was tracking Halley's Comet very carefully. **Conclusion:** [Your conclusion is] Nonsense. As is often the case with two-speaker stimuli, the speakers disagree. In this case, Anne uses causal reasoning to indicate that the cause of the sighting is unusual activity with Halley's comet: FU = the flare is highly unusual, NCO = no comet has ever been observed to flare so far from the sun, **FU□NCO.** Sue counters by citing an alternate cause: no one has been looking for such a flare. NO = no one bothers to try to observe comets when they are so far from the Sun, NCO = no comet has ever been observed to flare so far from the sun, **NO□NCO.** The problem now becomes an exercise in figuring out how the test makers will describe the alternative cause cited by Sue. Answer choice (A): This answer quickly fails the Fact Test. Sue does not comment on use of the term "observed" (other than to explain why the flare was observed). Answer choice (B): Although Sue cites an explanation that is inconsistent with Anne's claim, she does not point out an inconsistency between two of Anne's claims. Answer choice (C): Remember, evidence is the same as premises. Does Sue contradict Anne's premises? No, she only contradicts her conclusion. Do not be drawn in by the word "nonsense." That word is used to

attack the conclusion, not the premises of the argument. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. In this answer, the alternate cause is described as an "alternative explanation." In most cases, a causal counterargument can be described as offering an alternative explanation. Answer choice (E): This is a Reverse Answer. The answer appears as follows: "undermining some of Anne's evidence while agreeing with her conclusion" If the answer choice was reversed in the following manner, it would be correct: "undermining her [Anne's] conclusion while agreeing with some of Anne's evidence " The evidence she agrees with is the first sentence of Anne's argument (the premise in the second sentence is not directly addressed).

10.

The correct answer choice is (D). The heart of Ingrid's argument is that durability is measured by how many times a song is recorded, and using this standard, rock music songs are not as durable as songs from the 1940s. Jerome admits that rock music songs are not typically recorded multiple times, but he then introduces a new way of judging durability—one based on the continuing popularity of the original recording. Answer choice (A): Jerome does not misinterpret the claim. He starts off by saying, "True, rock songs are usually recorded only once," and is a perfect characterization of part of Ingrid's statement. Answer choice (B): This is a good example of an answer that might be kept as an initial Contender. However, as you further consider the answer, you must identify the "contradiction" mentioned in the answer choice. Does Jerome show that Ingrid's claim must lead to a contradiction? No. Note that there is a difference between a speaker contradicting an argument (as Jerome does here) and a person making a statement that leads to an internal contradiction (known as a self-contradiction.) An example of a self-contradiction would be: "Everyone should join our country club. After all, it's an exclusive group that links many of the influential members of the community." The self-contradiction occurs when the speaker says "Everyone should join" and then follows that by saying that it is "an exclusive group." Exclusive, by definition, means that some people are excluded. Answer choice (C): As discussed in answer choice (A), Jerome accepts the evidence presented by Ingrid. Because he does not undermine the truth of the evidence used by Ingrid, this answer is incorrect. Again, evidence is another way to say "premise." We know that Jerome disagrees with Ingrid's conclusion, but that does not mean that he disagrees with her premise. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. Jerome's standard for judging durability is the popularity of the original. This contrasts with Ingrid's standard, which is the re-recording of the song. The point at issue is the definition of durability. Answer choice (E): Again, use the Fact Test on this answer. Where does Jerome claim that Ingrid's knowledge is incomplete? As we discussed previously, he has admitted that her premise is true.

CR Challenge Set

1. When reading the stimulus, your eye should be drawn to the modifier and indicator words, which are underlined below: The scope of the stimulus is relatively broad, and aside from the word "entirely," most of the modifiers are not absolute. Now, look at the rest of the problem and see how several of the answer choices attempt to prey upon those who did not read the stimulus closely. Here are the question stem and corresponding answer choices for the stimulus above: With the previous discussion in mind, let us analyze the answer choices: Answer choice (A): The very first word—"all"—should be a red flag. Nowhere in the stimulus do we have support for stating that all damaging wavelengths are filtered out by the ozone layer. The stimulus only states that the ozone layer filters "some" wavelengths and lets others through. Some of those that are filtered are dangerous, as indicated by the last sentence. Surprisingly, about 10% of all test takers select this answer choice. Answer choice (B): We know that many animal species could suffer severe eye damage, and from this we can infer that some of them live in areas threatened by the ozone layer. We do not know that few of the species live in non- threatened areas. Do not forget the Fact Test—it will eliminate any answer choice without support. Answer choice (C): Nothing in the passage proves this answer choice. If you selected this answer thinking that "many" implied "not all," then you made a simple, correctable mistake. "Many" can include "all." Answer choice (D): Again, watch those modifiers! One reason the answer choice is incorrect is because it references "most" species when the stimulus only discusses "many" species. **Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer.** We can follow the chain of connections in the stimulus to prove this answer: the ozone layer filters some wavelengths of light; holes in the ozone layer are dangerous, but one previously overlooked danger of the holes is possible eye damage for many species. From these two statements we can infer that the holes must be letting some damaging wavelengths of light through. This is essentially what answer choice (E) states. The lesson from this question is simple: read closely and pay strict attention to the modifiers used by the author. Even though you must read quickly, the test makers expect you to know exactly what was said, and they will include answer choices specifically designed to test whether you understood the details.

2. The correct answer choice is (B). The stimulus is a fact set and offers a solution for dating an event when the usual sources offer conflicting chronologies: 1. Minimize the number of competing sources, possibly by

eliminating the less credible ones. 2. Independent of the usual sources, determine which date is more likely to be right. Notice how the test makers throw in the word "historiography" in order to be intimidating. As usual, you do not need to know the meaning of this word (or any unusual word) in order to continue with the problem. The remainder of the sentence makes clear that dating an event is the point of discussion, and you can comfortably connect the "historio" word root to "date an event" and "historians" and confidently move on with a good idea that historiography is connected to history in some way. By definition, historiography is the writing of history. Answer choice (A): The stimulus discusses dates where there is conflict between sources. In no way does the stimulus support answer choice (A). Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. As stated in the last sentence, historians are on occasion unsuccessful in determining independently the date of an event. If the usual sources offered are in conflict about the date of a particular event and an analysis independent of the usual sources fails to confirm a date, then a date cannot be reliably determined for the event. Answer choice (C): About one-third of all test takers choose this answer. The stimulus speaks specifically of dating an event when the usual sources offer conflicting chronologies. The stimulus does not discuss dating an event when there is no conflict of chronologies, and most likely many dates could be set with certainty in the absence of any conflict. With this in mind, the language of the answer choice becomes problematic because "attaching a reliable date to any event" would not "require determining which of several conflicting chronologies is most likely to be true." Answer choice (D): The language of the answer choice is too strong in saying that an independent determination is an ineffective way of dating events. There is simply not enough information about what constitutes a "determination independent of the usual sources" to say it is ineffective. Answer choice (E): This is another tricky answer, and just under a quarter of test takers incorrectly select this answer. The answer claims that the soundest approach to dating an event is to undermine the credibility of as many of the competing sources as possible. First, the stimulus suggests that the historian should, perhaps, eliminate the less credible ones. No mention is made of eliminating as many as possible, and the stimulus indicates that several remaining sources are to be expected. Second, that same section discusses eliminating less credible sources, not undermining the credibility of those sources.

3. **Answer (B).** The "rolling pin" problem above is a famous question that lures many people to incorrectly select answer choice (D), a Shell Game answer. Answer choice (D) looks perfect at first glance, but the author never indicated that the children could identify only the utensils that they used. Rolling pins, yes; utensils, no. The correct answer choice is (B), which many test takers quickly pass over. Let's examine each answer: Answer choice (A): From the text, it seems possible that the children did understand the function

of a rolling pin; certainly, they were able to identify the rolling pin they used. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer choice. The answer must be true because we know that despite being asked to identify all the rolling pins, each child selected only the rolling pin he had used. No two children picked the same rolling pin and therefore no two children understood the name "rolling pin" to apply to the same object. Answer choice (C): Apparently not, otherwise logic would say the children would pick other rolling pins aside from the one they used. Answer choice (D): Do not be concerned if you fell into this trap, but consider it a lesson for the future. The test makers smoothly slip "utensils" into the answer choice, and most students make the mistake of equating utensils with rolling pins. Yes, a rolling pin is a utensil, but there are other utensils as well, and the stimulus does not give us information about whether the children could identify those utensils. This is the essence of the Shell Game: you expect one thing and the test makers slip something quite similar but essentially different into its place. Answer choice (E): This is an Opposite Answer. As indicated by the final sentence of the stimulus, the children were able to distinguish the rolling pin they used from the other rolling pins. This circumstance is exactly opposite of that stated in answer choice (E), which declares, "The children were not able to distinguish..." In this case, if you miss the "not," this answer choice is very attractive.

4. **Answer (B).** Answer choice (A): The stimulus never discusses who conducts the studies, only who authors the reports. Thus, there is no proof for this answer choice and it fails the Fact Test. Even if you mistook "conducted" for "reported," the answer choice is still incorrect because the stimulus indicates that reports involving patients from several hospitals are usually coauthored physicians from each hospital. Although "usually" could mean "always," it does not have to, and hence it is possible that a clinical trial could be reported by physicians from just one hospital. Answer choice (B): This answer choice is a direct paraphrase of the second sentence. The second sentence states, "Reports of clinical trials involving patients from several hospitals are usually coauthored by physicians from each participating hospital." Answer choice (B) translates "usually" into "most," and "coauthored by physicians from each participating hospital" into "multiple authors." Thus, the answer choice passes the Fact Test and is correct. Answer choice (C): This is a Shell Game answer choice. Although the stimulus says there has been a proliferation of multi-authored technical articles, no comment is made about the frequency of multi-authored technical articles. In the next sentence, a frequency—"usually"—is given, but only for multi-authored clinical trial reports. The test makers give you hard data about the clinical trial reports, and then try to entice you into picking a broader answer involving technical reports. Answer choice (C) shows how the Shell Game can occur in the stimulus as well as in the answer choices. The

stimulus of this problem switches from "technical articles" to "reports of clinical trials." Answer choice (C) plays on that substitution. Answer choice (D): This is a Reverse answer that contains a complex pair of reversed elements when matched against the stimulus. Let us compare the stimulus and the answer choice, using italics to indicate the reversed parts: The stimulus states, "physics papers reporting results from experiments using subsystems developed at various laboratories generally have authors from each laboratory." Answer choice (D) states, "Physics papers authored by researchers from multiple laboratories usually report results from experiments using subsystems developed at each laboratory." The reversed pair has two notable features: 1. The numbers are reversed—authors from each laboratory have become researchers (authors) from multiple laboratories, and subsystems from various laboratories have become subsystems from each laboratory. In a nutshell, the "various" and "each" elements have been reversed in the sentences. 2. The pair also reverses logical position within the argument, as the stimulus states that the experiments generally have authors from each laboratory and the answer choice states that the researchers usually report experiments from each laboratory. Answer choice (E): As with answer choice (C), we do not know enough about technical articles to support this answer choice.

5. **Answer (B).** The "Some environmentalists question..." construction at the start of the stimulus does not lead to the usual counter- conclusion because the stimulus does not contain an argument. This is a very interesting stimulus because the author repeats the opinions of others and never makes an assertion of his or her own. When a stimulus contains only the opinions of others, then in a Must Be True question you can eliminate any answer choice that makes a flat assertion without reference to those opinions. For example, answer choice (A) makes a factual assertion ("It is...") that cannot be backed up by the author's survey of opinions in the stimulus—the opinions do not let us know the actual facts of the situation. Answer choice (E) can be eliminated for the very same reason. Answer choices (B), (C), and (D) each address the environmentalists, and thus each is initially a Contender. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. The second sentence references the views of many environmentalists, who claim that "nature has intrinsic value" (for example, beauty). This view is the non-economic justification cited by the answer choice. This answer can be a bit tricky because of the convoluted language the test makers use. "Questioning the defensibility of exploiting features of the environment" is a needlessly complex phrase. A more direct manner of writing that phrase would be "attacking the exploitation of the environment." To increase the difficulty of this problem, this language was then repeated in answer choices (C) and (D). Answer choice (C): We only know the opinions of "some" and "many" environmentalists, and these numbers do not provide enough information to discern the views of "most"

environmentalists, which is the term used in the answer choice ("many" is not the same as "most"). Answer choice (D): This answer choice cannot be proven. While we know that many environmentalists claim a non-economic justification, we do not know that that is the only justification they provide. When you are reading a stimulus, keep a careful watch on the statements the author offers as fact, and those that the author offers as the opinion of others. In a Must Be True question, the difference between the two can sometimes be used to eliminate answer choices.

6. **Answer (A).** Unlike many Must Be True question stimuli, this stimulus contains an argument. The conclusion is in the second sentence: "the primary function of law is surely to help order society so that its institutions, organizations, and citizenry can work together harmoniously, regardless of any further moral aims of the law." The stimulus also begins with the "Some argue that..." construction, and as usual, is followed by a conclusion that argues against the position established in the first sentence (see "A Commonly Used Construction" in Chapter Two if this sounds unfamiliar). The last sentence is a premise that proves to be key for choosing the correct answer. Answer choice (A): This correct answer is largely a paraphrase of the last sentence. Answer choice (B): While the author certainly agrees with the first part of the sentence, in the second part the phrase "devoid of moral aims" is too strong to be supported by the information in the stimulus. The last sentence indicates that morality has some effect on the law and invalidates the "devoid" claim. Answer choice (C): This is an exaggerated answer. Although the last sentence indicates that religious faith has been grounds for making exceptions in the application of law, the stimulus does not indicate that actions based on religious or moral belief tend to receive the protection of the highest courts. Answer choice (D): The author indicates that the "primary function" of law is to help order society; the author does not indicate that this is the one and only function of law. The answer choice overstates the case by saying that a society ordered by law should not reflect any moral convictions about the ordering. Answer choice (E): No mention is made of the "best way" to promote cooperation, only that the primary function of law is to promote such cooperation.

7. The correct answer choice is (B). The stimulus tells the story of recent physics theories: Newtonian physics was preeminent for over two centuries, and despite widespread acknowledgment and confirmation it was surpassed by Einsteinian physics in the early 1900s. Answer choice (A): The two theories cited in the stimulus are not sufficient to form a pattern, which is the basis of answer choice (A). Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. As shown by the case of Newtonian physics, success and substantiation is no guarantee of dominance. Answer choice (C): This is an exaggerated answer that takes one instance and exaggerates it into a pattern. Although

Newtonian physics was surpassed, this does not prove that every theory of physics will be eventually surpassed. The answer goes farther than the facts of the stimulus and fails the Fact Test. Answer choice (D): Like answer choice (C), this answer goes too far. Although some theories of physics have been dominant for centuries, there is no guarantee that every theory will be dominant for that long. Answer choice (E): Even though Einsteinian physics has enjoyed wide success in surpassing Newtonian physics, nowhere in the stimulus is there evidence to prove that each theory must be surpassed by an equally successful theory.

8. The correct answer choice is (E). This interesting stimulus contains two definitions of "refusal:" an initial definition that implies refusal is a point at which pilings will go no further, and then a second, contemporary standards definition of refusal that reveals that refusal is a point at which additional penetration into the ground is no greater than two inches after twenty-four hammer blows. The stimulus is a fact set, and thus there is no conclusion present. Answer choice (A): Although there was an inquiry into the solidity of the piers of the Rialto Bridge, the results of that inquiry are not disclosed. The only other information we are given is that the pilings of the Rialto Bridge met the contemporary standard of refusal, but this is not sufficient to indicate whether the pilings of this particular bridge were safe. Hence, this answer fails the Fact Test and is incorrect. Answer choice (B): Similar to answer choice (A), we have insufficient information to make this judgment. Answer choice (C): This answer is somewhat opposite of the information in the stimulus, which states that Da Ponte had met the contemporary standard of refusal. Answer choice (D): This is another Opposite answer. The stimulus indicates that bridges built prior to 1700 were driven to the point of refusal. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. As stated in the stimulus, "he had caused the pilings to be driven until additional penetration into the ground was no greater than two inches after twenty-four hammer blows." The statement indicates that additional penetration was possible with a sufficient number of hammer blows.

9. The correct answer choice is (C). This is a fact set. Note the strength of the modifiers in this stimulus—"every," "most," and "any." We should be able to use this narrow scope to support a fairly strong statement, but be careful: the test makers know this too and they will supply several answer choices that are worded strongly. Make sure you select an answer that conforms to the facts. Answer choice (A): The phrase "better than a merely good life" goes beyond the statements in the stimulus. Answer choice (B): This answer is incorrect because we are not given information about how the moral theories are different, or if they different at all. The only detail we are told is that the theories all have one thing in common—they tell us what a good life is. Since the answer choice makes a claim based on differences between

theories, it cannot be correct. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. At first glance, this answer choice may seem a bit strong in saying the conception would not match that of any moral theory. But, as discussed above, we can support this because the stimulus uses very strong language, specifically stating "most people would judge someone who perfectly embodied the ideals of any one of these theories not to be living a good life.". Answer choice (D): This answer is worded strongly but it quickly fails the Fact Test. Nothing is said to indicate that the life described by one of the moral theories cannot be realized. Answer choice (E): This answer also has strong language, but it goes too far in saying that it is impossible to develop a theory that accurately describes a good life.

10. The correct answer choice is (C). The last sentence contains a conclusion, and this conclusion is the primary evidence that supports answer choice (C). Answer choice (A): The word "often" in the first sentence is the key to this answer choice. "Often" means frequently, but frequently is not the same as "most." Had the stimulus said "more often than not," that would mean "most" and this answer choice would be correct. Answer choice (B): We cannot determine if readers of mystery stories solve the mystery simply by spotting the errors of the dull companion. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. The second sentence indicates that "clues are presented in the story...the detective uses to deduce the correct solution." Combined with the last sentence, which states "the author's strategy...gives readers a chance to solve the mystery," this answer choice is proven by facts. Answer choice (D): Look for the facts in the stimulus—do they support this answer? Although the dull companion diverts readers from the correct solution, we do not know if actions of the brilliant detective rarely divert readers from the actions of the dull companion. Answer choice (E): This is a tricky answer choice if you do not read closely. The stimulus states that the dull companion infers a wrong solution from clues that the brilliant detective ultimately uses to solve the mystery. Answer choice (E) states that the dull companion uncovers misleading clues. This is incorrect; the interpretation of the clues is misleading, not the clues themselves.

11. The correct answer choice is (C) The final three problems in this section are harder than the previous five. This problem is answered correctly by about 45% of test takers and is classified as difficult (the hardest GMAT questions have success rates under 20%. Fortunately, questions this difficult appear infrequently). Students can miss questions for a variety of reasons: 1. The stimulus is difficult to understand. 2. The question stem is difficult to classify (very rare) or confusing. 3. The correct answer is deceptive, causing students to avoid it. 4. One (or more) of the incorrect answers is attractive, drawing students to it. Given that the stimulus is a simple fact set and that none of the incorrect answers attracted more than 15% of test takers, the difficulty in

this problem apparently lies in the correct answer. Answer choice (A): The controversy in the stimulus is about the categorization of Cézanne as an artist, not about Cézanne's work. Further, even if the answer did correctly reference the categorization controversy, the answer would still be suspect because of the word "highly." The stimulus indicates that only a small few reject the categorization of Cézanne as an early modernist and most experts accept it. Answer choice (B): The stimulus asserts that Cézanne inspired the creators of abstract art, not that Cézanne himself created abstract art. Answer choice (C): This correct answer is a paraphrase of the first sentence. The deceptiveness of this answer lies in two areas: 1. The substitution of "develop" for "inspire." Some students feel the word "develop" is too strong, but if Cézanne inspired the creators of the next generation of art then he helped develop it. 2. The use of the word "modernism." Some students are thrown off by "modernism" because they expect to see "abstract" instead. The stimulus is careful about saying "twentieth-century modernist creators of abstract art." Notice how the test makers use answer choice (B)—which mentions "abstract"—to subtly prepare you to make this error. Answer choice (D): The first sentence indicates that Cézanne inspired the modernist creators. The rest of the stimulus discusses a disagreement about the categorization of Cézanne that is not resolved in favor of either group. Hence, there is no way for us to determine if modern art owes less to Cézanne than many experts believe. Answer choice (E): The word "tends" is the problem in this answer choice. Logically, "tends" means "most." So, according to answer choice (E), Cézanne's work is usually misinterpreted as modernist. The stimulus disagrees with this view: only a "small few" reject the categorization of Cézanne as a modernist whereas the majority accepts it. Further, the disagreement in the stimulus involves art experts, and from their view we would dispute answer choice (E). Answer choice (E) can also be understood as involving all interpretation of Cézanne's work—whether by art expert or not—and from this perspective the answer is still unsupported since the views of others are not discussed in the stimulus.

12. The correct answer choice is (B). The stimulus is a fact set. Part of the difficulty with this problem is the scientific subject matter. Many people are intimidated by the mention of rhodopsin, with which they are unfamiliar. As with the flavonoids in problem #1 of the chapter text, you do not need to know what rhodopsin is to complete the problem. The stimulus can be broken into several easily digestible parts: **Premise:** Light is registered in the retina when photons hit rhodopsin molecules and the molecules change shape. **Premise:** Due to normal molecular motion, rhodopsin molecules sometimes change shape without having been hit by light. This change causes errors in the visual system. **Premise:** The amount of molecular motion is directly proportional to the temperature of the retina. Answer choice (A): The stimulus does not indicate that the temperature of the retina

depends on the amount of light. It could easily be affected by other factors, such as body temperature. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer and just over 40% of test takers correctly choose this answer. To prove this answer you must link together several pieces of information. First, the last sentence of the stimulus shows that the amount of rhodopsin molecular motion is directly proportional to the temperature of the retina, and the second sentence of the stimulus shows that this motion causes visual errors, so the higher the retinal temperature, the more errors in the visual system. The answer choice ties body temperature (remember, the retina is a body part) to the temperature of the surroundings and then rightly notes that hot surroundings would cause more visual errors than cold surroundings if body temperature matched those surroundings. Answer choice (C): This was the most popular incorrect answer, and just under a quarter of test takers fell for this answer. The answer is wrong because we do not know that temperature causes the rhodopsin to react more slowly. Higher retinal temperature causes the rhodopsin molecules to change shape, but no mention is made of reaction time. This answer falls under the "New information" category. Answer choice (D): Another New Information answer choice. Similar to answer choice (C), this answer fails the Fact Test because no information is given about the surface area of the retina. Answer choices (C) and (D) are great examples of how an answer can contain information unmentioned by the stimulus. These answers are somewhat attractive because there is nothing actively wrong about them and thus they could be true. To avoid them, always keep in mind that your goal is to find the answer that must occur based on the information in the stimulus. Answer choice (E): While the stimulus focuses on rhodopsin, no indication is given that rhodopsin is the only naturally occurring pigment molecule—there could be others.

13. **Answer (D).** We can make the determination that since there is no conclusion in the stimulus, this is a fact set and not an argument. In this case the stimulus is short, and can be broken down into three components: First Statement: Flavonoids are a common component of almost all plants. Second Statement: A specific variety of flavonoid in apples has been found to be an antioxidant. Third Statement: Antioxidants are known to be a factor in the prevention of heart disease. The scope of the stimulus—especially if that scope is broad—often helps eliminate one or more of the answer choices. Answer choice (A): This is an interesting answer choice, and most people take a moment before categorizing this as a Loser. The answer choice could be true, but it is too broad to be supported by the facts: nowhere are we told that a diet of fruits and vegetables will help prevent heart disease (and in this sense the answer fails the **Fact Test**). Perhaps apples are the only fruit with the antioxidant flavonoid and there is nothing beneficial about other fruits and vegetables. And, eating a diet of fruits and vegetables is no guarantee that the diet includes apples. Regardless, this answer choice can be

especially attractive because it plays on the general perception that fruits and vegetables are good for you. Answer choice (B): This answer is also a Loser. Nothing in the stimulus supports the rather strong statement that flavonoids are essential to preventing heart disease. Answer choice (C): Many people hold this answer as a Contender and then move on to answer choice (D). As it will turn out, this answer is incorrect because the language is too strong: the stimulus only stated that apples contain an element that was a factor in preventing heart disease, not that they definitely will prevent heart disease. Answer choice (D): This answer is the closest to our pre-phrase, and this is the correct answer. Notice how the language of this answer choice—"helps to prevent"—matches the stimulus language—"factor in the prevention." Answer choice (E): This answer choice also could be true, but it cannot be correct because the stimulus makes no mention of the causes of heart disease. Just because an antioxidant can help prevent heart disease does not mean that a lack of antioxidants causes heart disease. Notice how the **scope** of the stimulus plays a role in how we attack the answer choices. The language of the stimulus is relatively broad—"almost all," "factor in the prevention,"—and the author shies away from making definite statements. Because the stimulus does not contain much in the way of direct, absolute information, selecting an answer choice that contains a direct, absolute statement is difficult to justify. This reasoning helps us eliminate answer choices (B) and (C), both of which contain strong statements that are ultimately unsupportable (literally, they both fail the Fact Test because they are too strong).

14. As with most Cannot Be True questions, the stimulus does not contain an argument. Instead, a fact pattern is presented and you are tested on your knowledge of those facts. Let's review each statement, sentence-by-sentence, keeping in mind that in Cannot questions you accept the statements in the stimulus as true: **Statement:** Sharks have a higher ratio of cartilage mass to body mass than any other organism. This is a very broad, global statement indicating that no other organism has a higher ratio of cartilage mass to body mass than sharks. **Statement:** They [sharks] also have a greater resistance to cancer than any other organism. his is another very broad, global statement indicating that no other organism has a greater resistance to cancer than sharks. **Statement:** Shark cartilage contains a substance that inhibits tumor growth by stopping the development of a new blood network. This statement is narrower, and focuses only on shark cartilage. Since no information is given about the cartilage of other organisms, it is possible that other organisms contain the tumor-inhibiting substance mentioned in this statement. **Statement:** In the past 20 years, none of the responses among terminal cancer patients to various therapeutic measures has been more positive than the response among those who consumed shark cartilage. This statement is also narrower than the first two, but broader than the last statement. While it is specific in stating that no

therapeutic measures have received more positive response than shark cartilage, the statement is limited to the past 20 years and to terminal cancer patients. Note also that just because shark cartilage has received a more positive response than any other therapy does not mean that other therapies were unsuccessful—they could have worked very well but not quite as well as shark cartilage. Of the four statements above, the first two are global and can never be violated. The last two are possible sources of wrong answers as they are specific enough to eliminate certain statements, but open enough to allow for a variety of others. The makers of the test love to play with these "edges," and you should make sure that the answer you select directly violates a statement in the stimulus. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. The answer violates the second sentence of the stimulus, where the author indicates that sharks have a "greater resistance to cancer than any other organism." This statement means that no other organisms matches or exceeds the cancer resistance of a shark. Answer choice (B): This answer focuses on the susceptibility of an organism to cancer. Other than stating that sharks are the least susceptible to cancer (greatest resistance = least susceptibility), we know nothing about cancer susceptibility of any other organism. Hence, this answer is possibly true and therefore incorrect. Answer choice (C): The third statement in the stimulus notes that shark cartilage contains the inhibiting substance. There is no mention that other organisms do not have the substance or that the substance is the primary reason that sharks are cancer resistant. Thus, this answer choice could be true and is incorrect. Answer choice (D): From the discussion of the fourth statement you know this answer choice could be true. Accordingly, it is incorrect. Answer choice (E): The stimulus addresses sharks and cancer resistance. Although cancer resistance would logically have some connection to the immune system, cancer resistance is only one aspect of the immune system and therefore other organisms could have an immune system that is overall more efficient than the shark's immune system. Consequently, this answer choice is possibly true and therefore incorrect.

15. The stimulus in this problem contains a set of interrelated conditional statements: GS = good student, LM = learn more than what their parents and teachers compel them to learn, DP = derive pleasure from the satisfaction of their curiosity, CC = capable of concentrating on a topic so intently that one loses track of one's own identity. 1. First sentence: **GS—>LM**. 2. Second sentence, first part: **LM—>DP.** 3. Second sentence, second part: **DP—>CC**. Chain of all statements: **GS—>LM—>DP—>CC**. Remember, when you encounter Cannot Be True questions featuring conditional relationships, actively seek the answer that violates the precept that when the sufficient condition occurs the necessary condition must also occur. In this problem, that situation is found in answer choice (B). Answer choice (A): This answer describes a situation where the necessary condition in the second part of the second sentence occurs and the sufficient condition

does not. Since the occurrence of the necessary condition does not make the sufficient condition occur, this scenario could happen and this answer is therefore incorrect. This type of answer is a frequent wrong answer in Cannot Be True questions featuring conditional relationships. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. The chain of statements in the stimulus shows that every good student derives pleasure from the satisfaction of their curiosity. Thus, it cannot be true that "Most good students do not derive pleasure from the satisfaction of their curiosity." Answer choice (C): Like answer choice (A), this answer describes a situation where the necessary condition occurs and the sufficient condition does not. This time the scenario references the relationship in the first sentence. Answer choice (D): The stimulus only offers information about good students; no information is given about people who are not good students. Accordingly, we can make no judgment about these individuals, and the answer is incorrect. Answer choice (E): Like answer choices (A) and (C), this answer describes a situation where the necessary condition occurs and the sufficient condition does not. Unlike those two answers, you must rely on your understanding of the chain of all statements in order to understand why this answer is possible. Because the "capable of becoming so absorbed in a topic that they lose track of their own identities" is the necessary condition for being a good student, it is possible that most people who meet this condition are still not good students. Again, avoid Mistaken Reversals!

16. The correct answer choice is (A). Let us first review the facts given in the stimulus: **Statement:** For a ten-month period, the total monthly sales of new cars within the country of Calistan remained constant. The wording of this statement should alert you that numbers and percentages in the form of market share ("monthly sales...remained constant") may be an issue in this problem. Note that the statement is a simple fact; no explanation is given for why the total sales stayed constant. **Statement:** During this period the monthly sales of new cars manufactured by Marvel Automobile Company doubled, and its share of the new car market within Calistan increased correspondingly. If total monthly sales of new cars remains constant and Marvel's sales doubled, then Marvel's share of the new car market must also have doubled. Again, no explanation for Marvel's increase is given; the increase is just stated as a fact. **Statement:** At the end of this period, emission standards were imposed on new cars sold within Calistan. Imposing new emission standards serves as a chronology marker in this stimulus. Again, no explanation is given for why the new standards were imposed. **Statement:** During the three months following this imposition, Marvel Automobile Company's share of the Calistan market declined substantially even though its monthly sales within Calistan remained constant at the level reached in the last month of the ten-month period. This sentence is the key to the stimulus. From a numbers and percentages standpoint, we are given two pieces of related information: during the three months after the

emissions standards were imposed, Marvel's monthly sales of new cars within Calistan remained constant at the pre-standards level, and at the same time Marvel's share of the market declined. From the discussion in Chapter Seventeen, we know that if sales remain constant but the share represented by those sales decreased, then the overall sales in the market must have increased. For example:

	pre-Standards	post-Standards
Marvel's Monthly New Car Sales	10	10
Total Monthly New Car Sales in Calistan	100	200
Marvel's Market Share	10%	5%

The other important part of this sentence is what is not said. No cause is given for Marvel's decline, and you cannot assume that the new emissions standards are the cause of the decline (causal indicators are needed to convey causality, and none are present in this stimulus). Remember, one error of causal reasoning is to assume that because two things occur in sequence that one caused the other. There could be many different explanations for Marvel's decline other than the new emission standards. For example, Marvel could have raised their car prices or perhaps Marvel received some negative publicity about the quality of their cars. Regardless, the problem is clearly designed to test whether you will fall into the trap of assuming that the new emission standards caused Marvel to lose market share, so read carefully and do not fill in the "spaces" in the stimulus. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. As shown in the discussion of the last sentence of the stimulus, in the three months after the imposition of the emissions standards, the total monthly car sales in Calistan must have risen, and since Marvel's monthly car sales remained constant, we can conclude that the sales of other car makers must have risen. Since this answer claims they decreased, this answer cannot be true and is correct. Answer choice (B): This answer is possibly true. The stimulus indicates that Marvel doubled sales and market share in the ten months prior to the imposition of the emissions standards, and it is possible that in the three months prior to the implementation of the new standards the market share of the other companies decreased. Some students look at this answer and assume that it must be true based on the first two sentences of the stimulus. But that judgment assumes that Marvel's growth during the ten-month period was constant, a circumstance never stated by the author. It would be consistent with the stimulus if Marvel doubled sales in the first month and then remained constant for the remaining nine months. Answer choice (C): No reason is given for Marvel's loss of market share (or alternately, the increased sales of other manufacturers), so it is possible that the new emission standards actually decreased Marvel's loss of market share (or alternately, the emission standards limited the increase in sales of the other manufacturers). Remember, no explanation is given for the situation after

the imposition of the emission standards, so whatever happened in the absence of the standards could always be true. Answer choice (D): This answer could occur because Calistan's future car sales could fall due to a variety of causes (including the emission standards). This is true regardless of whether the emissions standards remain in force because we know nothing of the effect of the standards. Answer choice (E): No information is given about profit in the stimulus, so this answer choice could be true.

17. The correct answer choice is (A). The first statement regarding immoral actions indicates that "if they are performed in public, they offend public sensibilities." The correct diagram for this statement is: IP = immoral actions performed in public, O = offend public sensibilities, **IP—>O**. The relationship above is restricted to public performances. No information is given about non- public performances. The next statement in the stimulus is "second, they are accompanied by feelings of guilt." This statement can cause problems because most students assume that the "they" refers to immoral actions performed in public. But read the stimulus carefully—the first sentence states that two things are true of immoral actions, and the "they" in the last sentence refers to those actions in the first sentence. Because the last sentence does not reference actions in public, it is a broader statement that addresses all immoral actions: I = immoral actions, G = accompanied by feelings of guilt: **I—>G.** Thus, the two conditional statements in the stimulus do not have the same sufficient condition. Again, read carefully in order to avoid the error of assuming the two statements reference the same condition. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. Answer choice (A) is correct because any immoral action is accompanied by feelings of guilt, and (A) improperly tries to assert that some immoral actions are not accompanied by feelings of guilt. Note how this answer plays off the second statement—the exact statement that many students are likely to misunderstand. If you interpret the second statement to apply to public actions, you will mistakenly think answer choice (A) could occur. Answer choice (B): The stimulus does not address the "wrongness" of immoral actions. Thus, this answer could possibly be true and is therefore incorrect. Answer choice (C): This answer is tricky. Look carefully at the wording of the answer—is immorality mentioned? No, it is not, and thus neither sufficient condition in the stimulus can apply. The statement in this answer choice is possible because a public action that offends public sensibilities does not have to be an immoral action, and so a public action that offends public sensibilities does not have to be accompanied by feelings of guilt. For the purposes of discussion, say that the public action in question is flag burning. Such an action performed in public could offend the public, but since we do not know if it immoral according to the answer, the flag burner does not have to experience feelings of guilt. This conforms to the scenario described in answer choice (C). Answer choice (D): This answer choice tests your knowledge a Mistaken Reversal. Remember, any Mistaken Reversal is an error because it is not certain that

the sufficient condition must occur when the necessary condition occurs. So, if the necessary condition occurs, the sufficient condition may or may not occur. This answer states that the necessary condition of the second statement occurs and that the sufficient does not. This outcome is possible under any single-arrow conditional scenario. In concrete terms, just because some actions are accompanied by feelings of guilt does not mean they are immoral, so this answer choice could occur and hence is wrong. Answer choice (E): This answer tests the flip side of possibilities that could occur under a conditional statement. In this situation, the necessary condition of the second statement occurs and the sufficient condition also occurs. Since a Mistaken Reversal might be true unless otherwise stated, this answer could occur and is incorrect. Answer choices (D) and (E) present a dynamic one-two punch: answer choice (D) tests to see if you understand that the occurrence of the necessary condition does not automatically lead to the occurrence of the sufficient condition, and answer choice (E) tests to see if you understand that the occurrence of the necessary condition could lead to the occurrence of the sufficient condition.

18. The conclusion to this argument is the fourth sentence, which begins with the conclusion indicator "For this reason..." By applying the Primary Objectives you should have identified this conclusion while reading, and then, upon classifying the question stem you should have looked for a paraphrase of this sentence. Answer choice (C) fits the bill, and is the correct answer. Answer choice (A): The author would agree with this statement but this is not the Main Point of the argument; rather, it is closer to a premise that might support the conclusion. Incidentally, the author's general agreement with this answer choice is signaled by the use of "however" in the third sentence. In the stimulus, the author begins by mentioning that a free marketplace of ideas, including dangerous ideas, ensures a fair hearing of ideas. In the third sentence, the author then says, "however, the government is responsible for over half the information released to the public," indicating the author feels the government is a threat to this free marketplace. Answer choice (B): The author would also agree with this statement, but again this is not the Main Point of the argument. As discussed in the analysis of answer choice (A), the author believes that the freedom of the marketplace of ideas is at risk, and in stating that we should curtail the government's power over information, the author assumes that preserving a free marketplace of ideas is important. Thus this answer choice would be better described as an unstated premise that supports the conclusion. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. Remember, any answer that is a paraphrase of the conclusion of the argument will be the correct answer to a Main Point question. Answer choice (D): The stimulus specifically notes that malicious or prejudicial ideas can "prompt beneficial outcomes." The outcome of an idea is different than stating the ideas themselves "can be valuable." Answer

choice (E): The stimulus states that "governments continue to construct near monopolies on the publication and dissemination of enormous amounts of information." This phrasing is not the same as answer choice (E), which asserts that the government already has a monopoly on the dissemination of many kinds of information. **The lesson learned from this particular problem is that you must isolate the conclusion and then look for a paraphrase of that conclusion.**

19. The conclusion of this argument is difficult to identify because the author does not use a traditional conclusion indicator. The first three sentences are admissions by the author regarding the nature of Hogan's actions. The fourth sentence contains the conclusion and a premise, and the conclusion is that "Hogan's actions should not be wholly condemned." If you struggled to identify the conclusion, consider how you might have applied the Conclusion Identification Methodology to the pieces of the argument. For example, consider the two parts of the last sentence. If you thought one of them might be the conclusion, place one as the conclusion and the other as a premise, as follows: "Because I ask that Hogan's actions not be wholly condemned, therefore I emphasize again that Hogan mistakenly believed Winters to be the robber who had been terrorizing west-side apartment buildings for the past several months." Does that configuration sound right? No. Try again by reversing the premise and conclusion pieces: "Because Hogan mistakenly believed Winters to be the robber who had been terrorizing west-side apartment buildings for the past several months, therefore I ask you to concur with me that Hogan's actions not be wholly condemned." The relationship now sounds much more logical. Answer choice (A): The author admits that Hogan fully realized his actions and the author asks that "Hogan's actions not be wholly condemned." Both of these statements are counter to the idea that Hogan should not be considered responsible for Winter's injuries. Answer choice (B): The only reference to the robber is that Hogan mistakenly believed that Winters was the robber. Thus, there is no evidence in the stimulus to support this answer. Answer choice (C): This correct answer is a paraphrase of the conclusion of the argument. Answer choice (D): According to the information in the stimulus, this answer must be true. Regardless, the answer is still incorrect because it fails to summarize the author's main point. This type of answer—one that is true but misses the main point—is frequently featured as an incorrect answer in Main Point questions. Answer choice (E): Like answer choice (D), this statement is true according to the stimulus. But, it is incorrect because it does not capture the main point.

20. The correct answer choice is (C). Like the majority of Main Point question stimuli, the argument does not contain a traditional conclusion indicator. Thus, you must look at the pieces of the argument in order to determine the

point the author is making. In this case, the conclusion is "The similarities are too fundamental to be mere coincidence." Use the Conclusion Identification Methodology to help establish that point if you are unsure. The argument uses the fact that the two workstations are similar and were released in the same time-span to assume that the similarity is not caused by coincidence. Answer choice (A): This is a repeat of a premise of the argument, not the main point. As mentioned in the discussion, in Main Point questions you should expect to see incorrect answers that repeat premises from the argument. Answer choice (B): The statement does not pass the Fact Test. The scenario could be reversed: OCF could have copied Ergotech. Regardless, this is not the main point. Answer choice (C): This correct answer is a paraphrase of the conclusion. Answer choice (D): This would undermine the argument and thus it cannot be the main point. Answer choice (E): Although the author would likely agree with this statement, this does not capture the main point, which addresses the two named products.

21. The correct answer choice is (D). Like the previous problem, the conclusion is in the middle of the argument and is not prefaced by a conclusion indicator. Get used to seeing this format on Main Point questions! The author states that prediction has been made possible by reducing phenomena to mathematical expressions and that some social scientists want to have this same power. The author argues that it would be a mistake to allow social scientists to have this ability. The conclusion, therefore, is "But this would be a mistake." Answer choice (A): The author says, "some social scientists also want the power to predict accurately," so the author would likely agree with this statement. Regardless, this is not the main point of the argument. Again, be careful with answers that are true according to the author—do they also address the main point? Answer choice (B): The author might very well agree with this statement, although there is not enough information to assert that this statement is true based on the stimulus (the words "more important" are a bit strong). Regardless, this answer choice does not address the main point of the argument and is therefore wrong. Answer choice (C): While the social scientists may believe this is true, the author's point is a different one—that social scientists ought not to perform a mathematical reduction. And, because the author believes that prediction is apparently made possible by reducing phenomena to mathematical expressions, the author would likely disagree with this statement. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. The conclusion states that it would be a mistake for social scientists to have the ability to reduce phenomena to mathematical expressions. Answer choice (D) is a paraphrase of that idea. Answer choice (E): This point is not addressed in the stimulus.

22. The single sentence prior to the last sentence is lengthy and contains the information required to fill in the blank at the end of the question. The

argument topic is language acquisition; the author indicates that "one cannot attribute such acquisition solely to environmental influences" and then immediately follows that phrase by saying "innate mechanisms also play a role." Hence, the author feels that both environment and innate mechanisms play a role. The last sentence then prefaces the blank by saying, "the most reasonable question that ought to be studied is whether_____." The most logical answer would be one that addresses the relative roles played by environment and innate mechanisms in language acquisition. Let's examine the answer choices: Answer choice (A): The argument is not about whether language acquisition can ever be explained, but about what influences exist on language acquisition and to what degree. Answer choice (B): The psychologist asserts this statement at the end of the first sentence and if this were a Must Be True question, this would be the correct answer. But, this is more than a Must Be True question and the correct answer must meet the Main Point criterion. So, although this answer choice is true according to the psychologist, it does not capture the point of the argument as indicated by the last sentence and is therefore incorrect. Answer choice (C): The argument does not attempt to establish that language acquisition is solely the product of innate mechanisms, but that innate mechanisms have some influence, as does environment. This answer choice tries to confuse test takers by going in the opposite direction of the psychologist's statement that "one cannot contribute such acquisition solely to environmental influences." This does not mean that we can therefore attribute such acquisition solely to innate mechanisms. Answer choice (D): "Parents and peers" would qualify as environmental influences and the argument is not about determining if the environmental influence is the most important factor, but about the relative roles played by environment and innate mechanisms in language acquisition. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer, and this is the only answer that addresses the relative roles of environment and innate mechanisms. Note that the language of the answer choice could have indicated that either play a greater role because what ought to be studied is a question that determines which is a greater influence.

23. This problem is a classic example of how the GMAT attempts to disguise conditional reasoning. The stimulus can be diagrammed as follows: Sentence 1: **SF—>~H**. Sentence 3: **H —>~SF**. The sufficient condition in the first sentence is introduced by the phrase "people with." The necessary condition in the third sentence is introduced by the phrase, "only if." Note that the third sentence provides the contrapositive of the first sentence. The second sentence is not conditional and contains only general statements about the effects of their misery. The question stem uses the word "inferred" and can be classified as a Must Be True. When you encounter a stimulus that contains conditional reasoning and a Must Be True question stem, immediately look for a contrapositive or a repeat form in the answer choices. In problems with

this same combination, avoid Mistaken Reversals and Mistaken Negations as they are attractive but wrong answer traps. Answer choice (A): One reason answer choice (A) is incorrect is because it only refers to serious problems, not serious financial problems as in the stimulus. Even if the answer correctly referred to serious financial problems, it would still be incorrect because it would be a Mistaken Reversal of the first sentence and a Mistaken Negation of the third sentence. Answer choice (B): The answer choice can be diagrammed **~SF—>H**. This answer is incorrect because it is the Mistaken Negation of the first sentence. However, it is also the Mistaken Reversal of the third sentence, which you should recognize as the contrapositive of the first statement. This leads to the interesting point that the Mistaken Negation of a statement and the Mistaken Reversal of the same statement are contrapositives of each other. This fact reveals how important it is to diagram conditional statements correctly; otherwise, the makers of the test can lure you with answer choices which contain contrapositives of Mistaken Negations or Reversals. Answer choice (C): This answer choice would be diagrammed the same way as answer choice (B), and it is incorrect for the same reasons. Answer choice (D): The answer choice can be diagrammed as **~H—>SF**. As such, it is the Mistaken Reversal of the first sentence and also the Mistaken Negation of the third sentence. **Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer.** Answer choice (E) is the contrapositive of the first sentence and a repeat of the third sentence.

24. The stimulus can be intimidating because it contains several formidable scientific terms, but as usual these terms are explained as the stimulus progresses. Let us take a moment to recap the information in this problem. The stimulus begins by defining endosymbiosis, which is when one organism engulfs another such that the "conquered" organism still functions. Next, we are told that a nucleomorph—a DNA-containing, nucleus-like structure—has been discovered in a plant known as a chlorarachniophyte. As the last sentence begins we are told that this nucleomorph contains two versions of a particular gene. The remainder of the final sentence is the key to the problem and it illustrates how the test makers force students to maintain an awareness of conditional indicators. The conditional relationship in the final sentence is contained in the following section of text: "one would expect to find only a single version of this gene if the nucleomorph were not the remains of an engulfed organism's nucleus." In the middle of this section of text the word "if" appears, and produces the following conditional relationship: R = nucleomorph is the remains of an engulfed organism's nucleus, 1 = find only a single version of this gene **~R—>1.** However, as we know from our discussion of the last sentence, there was not a single version of the gene but two versions. This is equivalent to the necessary condition not occurring: ~1. Combining the two above diagrams, if the necessary condition does not occur, then the contrapositive is enacted and we can

conclude that the sufficient condition does not occur: R. We can see the contrapositive in action more clearly if we link the two conditions in an arrow diagram: ~1**—>**R. In GMAT problems, the contrapositive is often introduced in this fashion, where a premise is given that contains both a sufficient and necessary condition, and then the necessary condition is denied. Adding those two pieces together produces a conclusion via the contrapositive that the sufficient condition cannot occur, as the following summary reveals: Premise 1: ~R**—>**1, Premise 2: 1. Conclusion: R. Premise 2 and the conclusion link together in the traditional contrapositive relationship we have seen previously: ~1**—>**R. Thus, the contrapositive produces the inference that the nucleomorph is the remains of an engulfed organism's nucleus. With this information in hand, we can combine some of the other elements in the stimulus. Given that the nucleomorph is part of the chlorarachniophyte and is the remains of an engulfed organism's nucleus, we have strong evidence that the chlorarachniophyte came about as the result of endosymbiosis (the engulfing of one organism by another). **This is most clearly stated in answer choice (E), the correct answer**. Answer choice (A): This is an exaggerated answer: the word "only" at the beginning of the answer choice is too strong, and there is no evidence in the stimulus to suggest that a conditional relationship exists between endosymbiosis and nucleomorphs. Answer choice (B): This is also an exaggerated answer: the word "all" in the middle of the answer choice is too strong. Answer choice (C): The stimulus discusses one unusual nucleomorph whereas the answer choice attempts to make a general statement about all nucleomorphs. As such, the answer choice exaggerates the situation and is incorrect. Note that the first three answer choices in this problem all exaggerate some aspect of the stimulus. This is not surprising: in a stimulus with complex terminology, the test makers wisely attempt to prey upon that difficulty by presenting answers that have a degree of truth but go just a bit too far. These answer choices are attractive to a test taker who fails to lock down the facts of the stimulus. Answer choice (D): This answer choice is similar to answer choice (A), and is incorrect for similar reasons: no conditional relationship is established where nucleomorphs are necessary for endosymbiosis.

25. When you begin reading this stimulus, your first action should be to notice the sufficient condition indicator "if" at the beginning of the first sentence. There is another "if" near the beginning of the second sentence, and the two sentences produce the following conditional relationships, which can be linked together: KS = keyboarding skills, AUC = able to use a computer, WEWP = able to write your essays using a word processing program. Sentence 1: ~KS**—>~**AUC. Sentence 2: ~AUC**—>** ~WEWP. Chain: ~KS**—>**~AUC**—>**~WEWP. Perhaps the most problematic element of the stimulus is that each term is negated, but as you continue to work with the arrow statements and get more comfortable symbolizing the elements, working

with the negated statements will become second nature. Now that we have controlled the elements of the stimulus, we can attack this Must Be True question by looking for the two most likely answers: the chain inference that ~KS**—>**~WEWP, or the contrapositive of that inference, WEWP**—>**KS. Of these two, the contrapositive is the more likely correct answer because it requires more steps and thus more work. As we approach the answers, remember to avoid Mistaken Reversals and Mistaken Negations of the individual statements and of the chain inference. Answer choice (A): This is a Mistaken Negation of the chain inference and is therefore incorrect. The diagram for this answer choice would be: KS**—>**WEWP. Answer choice (B): This is a Mistaken Reversal of the chain inference and is therefore incorrect. The diagram for this answer choice would be: WEWP**—>**KS. **Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer**, and this answer is the contrapositive of the chain inference. Answer choice (D): This answer is a Mistaken Negation of the second sentence and is therefore incorrect. The diagram for this answer choice is: AUC**—>**WEWP. Answer choice (E): This answer is a Mistaken Reversal of the second sentence and is therefore incorrect. The diagram for this answer choice is: ~WEWP**—>~**AUC.

26. To attack this problem effectively, you must recognize the conditional indictors in each sentence: "only" in the second sentence and "without" in the third sentence. Do not be intimidated by the science topic! As we will see, if you can understand the conditional form of the stimulus, the topic is of little concern. The two sentences produce the following conditional relationships, which can be linked: AS = angle stable, GI = gravitational influence of Earth's large, nearby Moon, PCE = planet's climate too extreme and unstable to support life. Sentence 2: AS**—>**GI. Sentence 3: ~PCE**—>**AS. Chain: ~PCE**—>**AS**—>**GI. Again, consider the answers that are most likely to appear in a problem like this: either the chain inference ~PCE**—>**GI, or the contrapositive of that chain inference, **~**GI**—>**PCE. Answer choice (A): This incorrect answer is the Mistaken Reversal of the chain inference. The diagram for this answer choice would be as follows, with the sub-M indicating Mars: GI**—>~**PCE. **Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer.** As expected, this is the contrapositive of the chain inference. Answer choice (C): This incorrect answer is the Mistaken Reversal of the third sentence, and is diagrammed as follows: AS**—>~**PCE. Answer choice (D): This answer discusses issues that were not raised in the stimulus, and is thus incorrect. Answer choice (E): The stimulus indicates that Earth's large Moon has been necessary for the stable angle of Earth's tilt, and this stable angle has been necessary for a climate that can support life. Mars, with many small moons, tilts at fluctuating angles and cannot support life. The key difference is that Earth's Moon is large, and that creates a greater gravitational influence. It is possible therefore, that a planet with more than one moon could have a stable angle as long as at least one of the moons was of sufficient size (in

Mars' case, the stimulus indicates each moon is small). Thus, it is possible that a planet can have more than one moon and support life. This scenario is contrary to the answer choice, and thus this answer is incorrect.

27. The correct answer choice is (A) This is a fact set. The stimulus begins with the author indicating that drivers with a large number of demerit points who have also been convicted of a serious driving-related offense should either be sentenced to jail or be forced to receive driver re-education. This either/or relationship sets up the following diagram: J = sent to jail, DE = receive driver re-education, sub-D = drivers with a large number of demerit points who have also been convicted of a serious driving-related offense, **$\sim J_D \rightarrow DE_D$ So $\sim DE_D \rightarrow J_D$.** The next sentence begins with the conditional indicator "only if," and introduces the following conditional relationship: R = likely to be made more responsible drivers: **$DE \rightarrow R_D$.** The final sentence denies that drivers with a large number of demerit points who have also been convicted of a serious driving-related offense can be made into more responsible drivers. This can be represented as follows: **$\sim R_D$.** At this point the stimulus ends, but you should continue your analysis by linking the pieces of the stimulus together. The denial of the "R" condition in the final sentence enacts a contrapositive: **$\sim R_D \rightarrow \sim DE$.** Linking this contrapositive to the either/or diagram in the first sentence yields the following chain: **$\sim R_D \rightarrow \sim DE \rightarrow J_D$**. Hence, the pieces of the argument allow us to conclude that drivers with a large number of demerit points who have also been convicted of a serious driving-related offense should go to jail. This is restated almost exactly in answer choice (A). Answer choice (B): Like all four of the incorrect answers, this answer contains new information, which in a Must Be True question is cause for suspicion. The stimulus does not discuss the "best chance" for making drivers more responsible. Answer choice (C): Similar to the reasoning behind eliminating answer choice (B), the stimulus does not discuss whether driver re-education is a "harsh enough punishment" and thus we can eliminate this answer choice. Answer choice (D): The stimulus does not address drivers who have not committed a serious driving offense, only those convicted of such an offense. Further, this answer does not indicate that the drivers under discussion have a large number of demerit points, and thus we cannot be certain the recommendations made in the stimulus apply to the drivers mentioned in this answer choice. Answer choice (E): This is an Opposite Answer. According to the last two sentences of the stimulus, drivers with a large number of demerit points should not receive driver re-education.

28. The correct answer choice is (C). Unlike the first two questions in this set, this is a Main Point question. As with all Main Point questions, if you follow the Primary Objectives, the question should be easy and you should have a

solid answer in mind before attacking the answer choices. The first sentence of the argument is a premise. The second sentence is divided into a premise and a conclusion: the premise is introduced by the indicator "since," and the conclusion of the argument is introduced by the indicator "it follows that." As stated in the argument, the conclusion is "a requirement for an athlete to become a champion is a superior mastery of athletic techniques." Because the conditional indicator "requirement" is used, we can draw a conditional diagram of the conclusion: C = champion, SM = superior mastery of athletic techniques, C**—>**SM, Note that "requirement' is a necessary condition indicator, and the "requirement" referred to is "superior mastery of athletic techniques." Answer choice (A): This is a Mistaken Reversal of the conclusion. Note how right away the test makers are trying to test you to see if you will fall for an answer that uses the elements of the conclusion but in the wrong relationship. You must be on guard at all times! Answer choice (B): Although this answer is likely to be true in the real world, this is not stated in the argument. The only comment made on muscle strength is that top athletes do not differ greatly from each other in muscular strength. Answer choice (C): This correct answer is a paraphrase of the conclusion, and the diagram for this answer choice is the same as the diagram of the conclusion. Answer choice (D): This is a classic incorrect Main Point question answer choice. Although the author would agree with this statement, this is not the main point of the argument. Answer choice (E): This answer is similar to answer choice (D). Again, the answer choice repeats part of the argument, but this answer does not capture the main point of the argument.

29. The correct answer choice is (A). The stimulus is a fact set containing three conditional statements. The statements can be linked together to create one long chain: IMP = inspired musical performances, GS = audience treated to a good show, SL = sophisticated listeners in the audience, UMR = understand one's musical roots. 1. First sentence: IMP**—>**GS. 2. Second sentence, first part: GS **—>** SL. 3. Second sentence, second part: **SL —> MR**. 4. Chain of all statements: IMP**—>**GS**—>**SL**—>**UMR. With a long conditional chain and a Must Be True question, the correct answer will likely be a contrapositive of the entire chain or of a portion of the chain. Wrong answers will likely be Mistaken Reversals or Negations of the entire chain or of a portion of the chain. Keep this in mind and attack the problem! Answer choice (A): This correct answer is a contrapositive of the chain created by the first two statements above. The diagram for this answer choice is: **~SL—>~IMP.** Answer choice (B): This answer choice is a Mistaken Negation of the chain created by the second and third statements above. The diagram for this answer choice is: **~GS—>~UMR.** Make sure you do not miss the "if" in the middle of the answer choice. Answer choice (C): This answer choice is a Mistaken Reversal of the chain of all statements. The diagram for this answer choice is: **UMR—>IMP**. Answer choice (D): This answer choice is a Mistaken

Negation of the chain created by the second and third statements above. This answer choice is identical to answer choice (B), and the diagram for this answer choice is: **~GS—>~UMR.** Answer choice (E): This answer choice is a Mistaken Reversal of the chain created by the first two statements above. The diagram for this answer choice is: SL**—>**IMP

30. The correct answer choice is (A) The argument begins with a statement that contains two necessary conditions: SS = involved in any serious scandal, sub-P = politician, R = reelected, C = censure, **SSp —>~R and ~C.** This conditional relationship is introduced by the "if" in the middle of the sentence, but the statement also features a "neither/nor" construction. In this case, the neither/nor indicates that the two named events both cannot occur if a politician is involved in a serious scandal, hence the "and" in the necessary condition. The argument continues by stating that several prominent politicians have been involved in a serious scandal. This assertion begins a Repeat form argument by indicating that the sufficient condition has occurred: **SSp**. Given this occurrence, the author now concludes that one of the two necessary conditions—"not reelected"—will happen. Because this is true based on the premises, this is a valid conclusion. Some readers object that because the author does not mention censure, the conclusion is incomplete and therefore incorrect. This point has no merit. Any GMAT author can choose what he or she wishes to address, and in this case the author has made a conclusion that follows from the premises. No false or incorrect statement has been made. The author is not compelled to address every single consequence of a given set of premises. However, as soon as the Must Be True questions stem appears, you should immediately search for an answer that addresses the censure issue. Based on the premises, we know that the prominent politicians will also be censured and answer choice (A) indicates that fact. Answer choice (A): This correct answer is a result of the Repeat argument form enacted in the stimulus. Answer choice (B): This answer is a Mistaken Negation of part of the conditional statement in the first sentence. Answer choice (C): This answer is a Mistaken Reversal of part of the conditional statement in the first sentence. Answer choice (D): This issue is not addressed in the stimulus. Answer choice (E): While this answer is possibly true because the stimulus limits the discussion to "politicians known to be involved in any serious scandals," there is no evidence to prove that some politicians avoid detection and censure. Thus, this answer is incorrect.

31. The correct answer choice is (E). The key to this problem is the "if and only if" construction in the second sentence. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, when you encounter that construction, you must respond under the assumption that you will be tested on your knowledge of the relationship produced by that phrase. In this case, the following scenario is produced: CE = the landfill's capacity to hold liquids is exceeded, LE = leachate escape into

the environment. **CE<——>LE.** According to our knowledge of the double-arrow relationship, only two possible scenarios can result: 1. CE and LE or 2. **~CE and ~LE.** You should immediately glance at the question stem and determine what question you are being asked, and then attack the answer choices with the knowledge above. Answer choice (E) reflects scenario 2 above, and (E) is correct. Answer choice (A): Although leachate escapes in "generally unpredictable" quantities, there is no evidence in the stimulus to suggest that the ability to predict the volume of escaping leachate would help solve the problem. This is a good example of an answer that sounds reasonable or likely to be true, but is incorrect. Answer choice (B): No. Leachate escapes into the environment if the landfill's capacity is exceeded, not just if any water permeates a landfill. If the water permeating the landfill caused the capacity to be exceeded then this answer would be correct, but the answer does not indicate that the capacity is exceeded. Answer choice (C): This is an Exaggerated answer. The stimulus indicates that "not all" sewage plants are capable of handling leachate. The answer choice exaggerates "not all" into none. Answer choice (D): This is a tricky reworking of the final sentence. The last sentence contains two separate statements, one indicating most landfill leachate is sent to sewage plants and the other revealing that not all sewage plants can handle leachate. But, that does not mean that any leachate is sent to those plants incapable of handling leachate. Thus, answer choice (D) is incorrect. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer, and this is the answer you should have been seeking after identifying the "if and only if" in combination with the Must Be True question. Incidentally, when looking for a correct answer in this situation, scenario 2 from the top of the page is more likely to appear than scenario 1 for the simple reason that scenario 2 represents a manipulation of the original statement.

32. We are given the following facts. From 1973 to 1989 total energy use increased less than 10%. During this same period, the use of electrical energy grew by more than 50%. During this same period, the gross national product (GNP) grew by more than 50%. A careful examination of the second sentence reveals that there is no stated connection between the growth of the GNP and the increase in the use of electrical energy. If you assume that the use of electrical energy somehow caused the growth of the GNP, you are guilty of making an unwarranted causal assumption. Because there is no stated connection between the two other than they both grew by more than 50%, any answer that attempts to connect the two is incorrect. Answer choices (D) and (E) can both be eliminated by this reasoning. Now that we recognize that the GNP issue is only a red herring, let us examine the percentages that are given in the stimulus. The 50% increase in electrical energy gives the impression that the jump must have been substantial. But we know from Misconception #6 that a large percentage does not

automatically mean a large number. For example, in this problem it is possible that the 50% increase in electrical energy use was a jump from 2 units to 3 units. The possibility that electrical energy use in 1973 was a relatively small percentage of overall energy use directly undermines answer choices (A), as shown by the following example:

	1973	1989
Total energy use (in units)	100	109
Electrical energy use	10	15 (in units)
Percentage of total energy use that was electrical	10%	13+%

A close analysis of the chart also reveals that answer choice (B) can be eliminated. In the example, the use of energy other than electrical energy rose from 90 units to 94 units. Although the example disproves both answer choice (A) and (B), obviously you do not have time to make a chart during the test to examine each possibility, so is there a faster way to eliminate the first two answers? Yes—consider the previous discussion point that information about percentages does not tell us about the numbers. With that idea in mind, because the stimulus contains only percentage information (even though there are two percentages), you should be very suspicious of answer choice (A) (which states that the number of electrical units used was greater) and answer choice (B) (which states that the use of non- electrical energy declined) since they both contain numerical information. At the same time, you should be attracted to an answer such as (C) because it contains only percentage information, and as it turns out, answer choice (C) is correct.

33. This stimulus provides information about both the numbers and percentages of obese children, and so you can end up with an answer that has either a number or a percentage (though a numerical answer is more likely since the percentage is fixed at a constant 15% in the stimulus). The numerical information comes from the phrase, "The number of North American children who are obese...is steadily increasing." The percentage information comes from the phrase, "children who are obese—that is, who have more body fat than do 85 percent of North American children their age." The percentage information defines obese children as those who fall into the top 15% among all children their age in terms of body fat, and therefore the percentage is known to be constant. The numerical information tells us that the actual number of obese children is increasing (and since this is a Must Be True question we can accept that information as accurate). Answer choice (A): This answer is incorrect because there is no evidence in the stimulus to support it. Although the stimulus mentioned four major studies that apparently agreed about the increase in the number of obese children, it would be an exaggeration to say that any time four major studies produce similar results they must be accurate. Answer choice (B): This answer proposes a causal reason for why the number of obese children is growing. From the information in the stimulus we cannot determine the cause of the

rise in obesity, so answer choice (B) is also wrong. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. Consider the following example: 15 years ago—100 total children of similar age

Number of obese children	15 = 15%
Number of non-obese children	85 = 85%

Now, let us say that the number of obese children has risen to 150 children today: So far we have conformed to the information given in the stimulus: the actual number of obese children is rising. However, although the number of obese children has now risen to 150, the definition of obesity ("more body fat than 85 percent of North American children") remains unchanged. Since this is the case, the 150 obese children today must still comprise the top 15% of the total child population. Consequently, the remaining 85% of non-obese children must now be 850 (150 is 15% of 1000, and thus 85% of 1000 is 850): Answer choice (C) is fully supported because the stimulus provides information about both the number and percentage of obese children. As stated earlier, if the stimulus provides information about both the numbers and percentages in a situation, then you can select any supported answer choice that contains either numbers or percentages. Note the emphasis on the word "supported." In the obesity problem, GMAC could easily have written an incorrect answer choice that says, "The number of North American children who are not obese decreased over the past 15 years." Answer choice (D): This answer addresses "underweight" children, who are neither defined nor discussed in the stimulus. Answer choice (E): This answer is directly contradicted by the information in the stimulus, which states that the incidence of obesity is definitionally set at a constant 15%.

34. The correct answer choice is (E) The situation in Ditrama is as follows: Under the federal revenue-sharing plan, each region receives a share of federal revenues equal to the share of the total population of Ditrama residing in that region, as shown by a yearly population survey. Last year, the percentage of federal revenues Korva received for its share decreased somewhat even though the population survey on which the revenue-sharing was based showed that Korva's population had increased. If the total population of Korva increased but at the same time they experienced a decrease in revenue allocation, the only possible solution is that the total population of Ditrama increased by more than the Korva increase. Thus, you must seek an answer that indicates that the total population increased more than Korva's population increased. But be careful: this question is one of high difficulty, and the test makers do not make it easy to spot the correct answer. Answer choice (A): Either Mitro or Guadar could have a smaller number of residents than Korva. Answer choice (B): This answer is impossible to prove because we do not have information about the population growth of Korva in the years prior to the last one. Answer choice

(C): This is the most popular wrong answer choice. The key error is the claim that "Mitro and Guadar each increased by a percentage that exceeded" Korva's increase. Although it must be true that at least one exceeded Korva's increase, it does not have to be true that both exceeded Korva, as shown by the following example:

	Before	**After (Last Year)**
Total Population of Ditrama	30 (100%)	100 (100%)
Population of Korva	10 (33%)	15 (15%)
Population of Mitro	10 (33%)	10 (10%)
Population of Guadar	10 (33%)	75 (75%)

In the example above, only one of the other regions had a population increase that exceeded Korva; the other did not. Hence this answer choice is incorrect. Note also that this example disproves answer choice (A) as well. Answer choice (D): As shown by the previous example, this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. From the stimulus we know that Korva had a population increase, but a revenue drop. So, the total population of Ditrama must have increased by more than Korva's increase, and for this to happen, at least one other country must have had an increase in population that exceeded Korva's. Note that the scenario in answer choice (C) would force answer choice (E) to be correct, and based on the Uniqueness Rule of Answer Choices, answer (C) is incorrect for that reason alone.

35. The correct answer choice is (E) The stimulus does not contain a conclusion, but it does contain an interesting fact set: "Students from outside the province of Markland, who in any given academic year pay twice as much tuition each as do students from Markland, had traditionally accounted for at least two-thirds of the enrollment at Central Markland College." This sentence indicates that the non-Marklanders are paying a greater amount of tuition, and they previously accounted for at least 66% of the enrollment. This statement is followed by: "Over the past 10 years academic standards at the college have risen, and the proportion of students who are not Marklanders has dropped to around 40 percent." This sentence can be deceptive because it contains two ideas that are unrelated and many people assume that the proportion of non-Marklanders has dropped because the academic standards rose. The sentence only states that the non-Marklanders have dropped; not that they dropped because of the raised standards. As you learned from our discussion in this chapter, the fact that the non-Marklanders have dropped in percent does not mean that their actual number has decreased (Misconception #2). The following is an example of how the percent could decrease while numbers could increase:

	10 years ago	Today
Total number of students at Central Markland	100	200
Number of non-Markland students	66 (66%)	80 (40%)
Number of Markland students	34 (34%)	120 (60%)

Answer choice (A): The stimulus does not cite any reason for why or how the academic standards were increased, so this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (B): This answer tests your ability to understand the last sentence of the stimulus. As discussed above, the last sentence does not provide a reason for the decline in non-Markland students, so removing the stipulation about the rise in academic standards would not tell us whether non-Marklanders would still be enrolled in the college. Answer choice (C): This is a difficult answer. If the size of the college stayed the same, then this answer would be correct. But, as shown by the example above, the statement in this answer does not have to be true when the total size of the college changes. In the example, both Markland students and non-Markland student numbers grew. Answer choice (D): Remember, this is a Must Be True question, so every answer must pass the Fact Test. No information was given about other Markland colleges, so this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. If the college's per capita revenue from tuition remains constant while at the same time the high-tuition paying non-Marklanders have decreased in percentage, the college must have derived new tuition revenue by raising tuition. In other words, when the percentage of non-Marklanders drops, the average tuition per person must also drop because they pay twice as much as the Markland students. In order to keep the per person revenue the same, fees would have to be raised.

36. The correct answer choice is (C). The causal relationship in this problem appears in the premise, and the argument is structured as follows: **Premise:** Most antidepressant drugs cause weight gain. **Premise:** Dieting can help reduce the amount of weight gained while taking such antidepressants. **Conclusion:** Some weight gain is unlikely to be preventable. Note that the causal premise specifically states that "most" antidepressants cause weight gain, not necessarily all antidepressants. Also, the second premise specifically refers to antidepressants causing weight gain (the use of "such" indicates this). The second premise also indicates that the amount gained can be reduced, not that dieting can stop weight gain. Perhaps the antidepressants cause a twenty pound weight gain, but dieting can reduce that to a ten pound total gain. The question stem is a Must Be True, and thus you must accept the stimulus information and find an answer that is proven by that information. Answer choice (A): This is an Exaggerated answer. The stimulus indicates that most antidepressants cause weight gain, leaving open the

possibility that some do not. This answer choice references any antidepressant drug. Further, the stimulus does not address the role of a physician or the advisability of prescribing certain drugs under certain conditions. The benefits of prescribing an antidepressant that causes weight gain to an overweight patient may well outweigh the negatives (pun intended). Answer choice (B): This is also an exaggerated answer. The stimulus allows for antidepressants that do not cause weight gain. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. Some individuals taking antidepressants that cause weight gain will gain weight even though dieting can reduce the amount of the gain. Answer choice (D): This is an Opposite answer. The stimulus and correct answer both indicate that people taking the weight gain-causing antidepressants will gain weight regardless of whether they diet. Thus, the weight gain cannot be attributed to a lack of dieting. Answer choice (E): This answer is too strong. Not all patients necessarily take antidepressants that cause weight gain, so those that do not might not need to diet to maintain their weight.

37. The structure of the argument is: **Premise:** Maria won this year's local sailboat race by beating Sue, the winner in each of the four previous years. **Conclusion:** We can conclude from this that Maria trained hard. A quick glance at the argument reveals a gap between the premise and conclusion—winning does not necessarily guarantee that Maria trained hard. This is the connection we will need to focus on when considering the answer choices. To further abstract this relationship, we can portray the argument as follows: **Premise:** Maria won (which we could also call "A") **Conclusion:** Maria trained hard (which we could also call "B"). The answer that will justify this relationship is: **A□B.** Which is the same as: **Maria won□Maria trained hard.** A quick glance at the answer choices reveals that answer choice (C) matches this relationship (remember, "only if" introduces a necessary condition). Thus, the structure in this problem matches the first of the two examples discussed on the previous page. A large number of Justify questions follow this same model, and you should be prepared to encounter this form. Answer choice (A): This answer does not justify the conclusion that Maria trained hard. The answer does justify the conclusion that Maria trained, but because this is not the same as the conclusion of the argument, this answer is incorrect. Another way of attacking this answer is to use the Justify Formula. Consider the combination of the following two elements: **Premise:** Maria won this year's local sailboat race by beating Sue, the winner in each of the four previous years. Answer choice (A): Sue did not train as hard as Maria trained. Does the combination of the two elements lead to the conclusion that Maria trained hard? No, and therefore the answer is wrong. Answer choice (B): This is a Mistaken Reversal of what is needed (and therefore the Mistaken Reversal of answer choice (C)). Adding this answer to the premise does not result in the conclusion. In Justify questions featuring

conditionality, always be ready to identify and avoid Mistaken Reversals and Mistaken Negations of the relationship needed to justify the conclusion. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. Adding this answer to the premise automatically yields the conclusion. Answer choice (D): Because we do not know anything about Sue except that she lost, this answer does not help prove the conclusion. If you are having difficulty understanding why this answer is incorrect, use the Justify Formula. Consider the combination of the following two elements: **Premise:** Maria won this year's local sailboat race by beating Sue, the winner in each of the four previous years. Answer choice (C): If Sue trained hard, she would win the sailboat race. The combination of the two creates the contrapositive conclusion that Sue did not train hard. But, the fact that Sue did not train hard does not tell us anything about whether Maria trained hard. Answer choice (E): Because this answer addresses only the relative speed of the two racers, it fails to help prove that Maria trained hard.

38. This is an intimidating problem at first glance. The terminology is complex and the problem appears to be based on difficult philosophical principles. First, analyze the structure of the argument: The mechanistic approach works for the vast majority of Justify questions. On occasion a question is worded so deceptively that the method can be hard to apply. In these instances, the method leaves more than one answer as possibly correct; it will NOT lead you to an incorrect answer. **Premise:** If something would have been justifiably regretted if it had occurred, then it is something that one should not have desired in the first place. **Conclusion:** Many forgone pleasures should not have been desired in the first place. Second, use the three steps for mechanistically solving Justify questions as described in this section. 1. Any "new" or "rogue" element in the conclusion will appear in the correct answer. "Many forgone pleasures" is a new element that appears only in the conclusion. Only answer choices (B), (C), and (D) contain "forgone pleasures," and only answer choice (D) contains "many." Thus, if forced to make a quick decision, answer choice (D) would be the best selection at this point in our analysis. And, fortunately, the technique is so powerful that this analysis does indeed yield the correct answer. Regardless, let's continue. 2. Elements that are common to the conclusion and at least one premise, or to two premises, normally do not appear in the correct answer. "Should not have (been) desired in the first place" appears in both the premise and the conclusion. This element is not likely to appear in the correct answer choice. 3. Elements that appear in the premises but not the conclusion normally appear in the correct answer. "Justifiably regretted" appears in the premise but not the conclusion. Only answer choices (B) and (D) contain "justifiably regretted." Once you become used to examining the elements of the argument, the analysis above can be made very quickly. The method also correctly reveals answer choice (D) as correct with a minimum of effort. This

problem also contains conditional reasoning, and as such the argument can be diagrammed: **Premise: Justifiably Regretted□~Desire. Conclusion: ~many Desire$_{\text{Forgone}}$.** This relationship is similar to the following: **Premise:** A□B. **Conclusion:** B occurs. **Question:** What statement can be added to the argument above to conclude that B must follow? **Answer:** A occurs. In this case, a few additional elements have been added to B in the conclusion, but we can add these elements to A and make the problem work. The term that would justify the conclusion in this problem is: **many Justifiably Regretted$_{\text{Forgone}}$.** A comparison of this term and answer choice (D) reveals that the two are identical. If you are still uncertain, use the Justify Formula to eliminate each of the remaining answer choices. In reviewing Justify the Conclusion questions, you must recognize that each of the strategies described in this section are complementary. The approaches work because they all revolve around the undeniable truth of these questions: your answer, when combined with the premises, must justify the conclusion. Whether you see the conditional or numerical basis for the question or use the mechanistic approach is unimportant. The important part is that you quickly determine which answer has the components sufficient to prove the conclusion.

39. The correct answer choice is (B) The first step in solving a Justify question is to analyze the structure of the argument: **Premise:** There are always situations in which it is healthy to try to express that [visceral] emotion. **Conclusion:** There are always situations in which it is healthy to try to express one's anger. A quick mechanistic analysis reveals that the correct answer should contain "anger" and "visceral emotion." Only answer choice (B) contains these two elements, and as it turns out, (B) is correct. Answer choice (B) must also solve the Justify Formula: **Premise:** There are always situations in which it is healthy to try to express that [visceral] emotion. Answer choice (B): Anger is a visceral emotion. Does the combination of these two elements lead to the conclusion? Yes, and so the answer must be correct. The Justify Formula can also be used to eliminate each of the other answer choices.

40. The structure of the argument is: **Premise:** Anyone who has to struggle early in life is able to keep a good perspective on the world. **Premise:** Anderson had to struggle early in life. **Conclusion:** Marian Anderson, the famous contralto, did not take success for granted. A mechanistic analysis reveals that "Anderson" is common to the conclusion and a premise, and "struggle early in life" is common to the two premises. Thus, we would not expect to see either in the correct answer. New elements that should be in the correct answer are "able to keep a good perspective on the world" and "did not take success for granted." Only answer choices (B) and (E) contain both elements. Since (B) and (E) are Reversals of each other, let us look at

the conditional relationship present in the stimulus: **Premise:** Struggle early in life ☐ able to keep a good perspective on the world. **Premise:** Struggle early in life$_{\text{Anderson}}$. **Conclusion:** Did not take success for granted$_{\text{Anderson}}$. Clearly, we need a connection that moves from "able to keep a good perspective on the world" to "did not take success for granted," such as the following: able to keep a good perspective on the world ☐ did not take success for granted. This relationship, which is the same as that presented in answer choice (B), ultimately creates a chain that can be used to prove the conclusion: struggle ☐ keep a good perspective ☐ did not take success for granted. The addition of the premise "Anderson struggled early in life" to the chain above yields the conclusion "Anderson did not take success for granted." Hence, answer choice (B) is correct. Answer choice (E) is a Mistaken Reversal of the correct answer.

41. The argument can be analyzed as follows: **Premise:** Anybody who manages to convince some people of his or her qualifications in an area—whatever those may be—is an expert. **Conclusion:** Almost anyone can be an expert. The argument contains a classic conditional form: **Premise:** Convince some people ☐ Expert (A ☐ B). **Conclusion:** Expert$_{\text{Almost anyone}}$ (B). The element that must be added to justify the conclusion is: Convince some people$_{\text{Almost anyone}}$. (A). Answer choice (A) contains this element and is the correct answer. Use the Justify Formula to confirm the answer if it is still unclear. Many students mistakenly select answer choice (D). Answer choice (D) is the Mistaken Reversal of the premise. Use the Justify Formula to reveal why this answer fails: **Premise:** Convince some people☐Expert. Answer choice (D): Expert☐Convince some people. Does the combination of these two statements prove that almost anyone can be an expert? No, and therefore the answer choice is incorrect. Answer choice (E) is incorrect because it only justifies the conclusion that some people are experts.

42. The argument can be analyzed as follows: **Premise:** Vague laws set vague limits on people's freedom. **Premise:** Vague limits on people's freedom make it impossible for them to know for certain whether their actions are legal. **Conclusion:** Under vague laws people cannot feel secure. There is a new element in the conclusion—"cannot feel secure"—that must be justified. There is also an unconnected element in the premise—"know for certain whether their actions are legal"—that will likely appear in the answer choice. Unfortunately, four of the answer choices contain those two elements. Only answer choice (D) does not contain both, and as (D) also contains the "vague law" element that appears in both a premise and the conclusion, we can eliminate (D) for the moment. Given the plethora of answers that remain in contention, first examine the conditional structure that is extant in the stimulus: **Premises:** Vague laws ☐ Vague limits☐**~**Know actions are legal. **Conclusion:** Vague laws☐**~**Secure.

Abstractly, this relationship is similar to: **Premises:** A□B□~C, **Conclusion:** A□**~D.** The relationship that must be added to the premise to prove the conclusion is: ~C□**~**D. Translating the diagram back to the terms used in our premise and conclusion, we need a statement like the following: **~Know actions are legal□~Secure.** Of course, the contrapositive of this statement would also be acceptable. Answer choice (A) is the contrapositive and thus (A) is correct. Answer choice (B): This answer is incorrect because it has a different level of certainty than the conclusion: this answer uses the phrase "might not" when the conclusion uses "cannot." If this flaw were corrected, the answer would be correct. Answer choice (C): This answer is the Mistaken Reversal of the correct answer. Answer choice (D): This answer was eliminated previously. Answer choice (E): This answer is also the Mistaken Reversal of the correct answer. If you found yourself in trouble on this question, understanding that answers such as (C) and (E) are identical would allow you to eliminate them under the Uniqueness Rule of Answer Choices (that the correct answer must have unique properties).

43. Take a close look at the conclusion: "we should not hesitate to use public funds to support works of art that many people find shocking." Did "public funds" appear anywhere else in the argument? No. Given our discussion about linking new elements that appear in the conclusion, you should have recognized that a new element was present and responded accordingly. Given that Supporters connect new elements, one would suspect that the correct answer would include this element and that either answer choice (B) or (D) was correct. Take a look at the argument structure: **Premise:** Great works of art have often elicited outrage when first presented; in Europe, Stravinsky's Rite of Spring prompted a riot, and Manet's Déjeuner sur l'herbe elicited outrage and derision. **Premise:** Art is often shocking. **Conclusion:** We should not hesitate to use public funds to support works of art that many people find shocking. However, because the structure of the last sentence in the stimulus ("So, since...") suggests that the author uses the second premise to prove the conclusion, you should focus on the relationship between those two pieces. For the author to say that art is shocking and therefore art should be publicly funded, the author must assume that art is worthy of public support. This assumption is reflected in answer choice (D), the correct answer. Answer choice (A): The author states that "art is often shocking" but does not assume that most art is shocking. Answer choice (B): This is the most popular wrong answer choice. In the argument, is the author committed to believing that Stravinsky and Manet received public funding? Does the author need this statement in order for the rest of the argument to work? No. The author uses Stravinsky and Manet as examples of artists whose work caused shock, but the author never assumes that those individuals received public funding. Think for a moment—does the conclusion rest on the fact that Stravinsky and Manet received public funding? Answer

choice (C): The author makes no statement regarding the "shock level" of today's art, and thus there is no way to determine if an assumption has been made comparing the shock level of past and present art. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. The answer acts as a Supporter and connects the elements in the final sentence. Answer choice (E): The author states that "art is often shocking," but there is no indication that a conditional assumption has been made stating that anything that shocks is art.

44. Unlike Supporter assumptions, Defender assumptions are extremely hard to prephrase because there are so many possibilities for the test makers to choose from. The correct answer in this problem is a Defender, but it is unlikely that anyone could have predicted the answer. Compare this to the previous problem, where many students were able to prephrase the correct Supporter answer. Now, focus on the final sentence of the argument, which contains a premise and conclusion: **Premise:** Energy savings from these efficiencies [new building technologies] save several billion dollars per year today. **Conclusion:** 50 to 100 years from now they will save more than $200 billion per year (calculated in current dollars). So, according to the author, the new building technologies—which are already saving billions—will continue to do the same in the future and the savings will be even greater, relatively. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer, and a classic Defender. If the money-saving and energy-saving technology becomes too expensive to use in the next 100 years, the savings expected will not materialize. Because this idea would clearly weaken the argument, the author assumes that it does not exist, and answer choice (A) denies that the technology will become prohibitively expensive over the next century. Answer choice (B): Although there has been an energy usage decline since the 1973 oil crisis, the author does not assume that there will be another crisis in the next 50 to 100 years. Look at the conclusion—does there seem to be a reliance on the idea in this answer? No. Answer choice (C): Although this answer plays with the idea mentioned in the first sentence of the stimulus—that more energy is used to operate buildings than to operate transportation—no assumption is made that buildings will become a less important consumer of energy. True, buildings have saved billions in operating in costs, but the conclusion is about future savings and not about comparing buildings to transportation. Answer choice (D): The argument is specific about technologies saving more than $200 billion per year; the author does not assume that the total bill in the next 50 to 100 years will be lower by $200 billion. Answer choice (E): The argument is about current technologies saving money in the future. The author does not make an assumption regarding new technologies being introduced in the future.

45. The last sentence contains the conclusion of the argument, which is conditional (note the use of the necessary condition indicator "only"): ERE =

Effectively reduce emissions, Replace = Replace the conventional diesel fuel and gasoline used in automobiles with cleaner-burning fuels, such as methanol, that create fewer emissions. **ERE□Replace**. According to the author, to effectively reduce emissions, conventional fuels must be replaced. Based on our discussion, since the stimulus does not present any conditional chains, you should look for an answer that protects the necessary condition. Answer choice (A) is a Defender that does just that, eliminating an idea that would undermine the relationship. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. Consider the author's position that the only effective way to reduce emissions is fuel replacement. Wouldn't it be more effective to simply stop using cars altogether? Of course this is true, but this would undermine the conditional nature of the conclusion and so the author assumes that this possibility cannot occur. If this answer is troubling you, use the Assumption Negation Technique and ask yourself if the following statement would undermine the argument: Reducing the use of automobiles would be a more effective means to reduce automobile emissions than the use of methanol. This answer clearly shows that there are other, more effective ways of reducing emissions and therefore the answer attacks the argument. This must be the correct answer. Answer choice (B): The author is not committed to methanol because the stimulus clearly references "fuels such as methanol." Accordingly, this answer is not an assumption of the argument. Answer choice (C): The choices automobile owners would make are not part of the argument made by the author. The author simply states that the only effective way to achieve reduced emissions is fuel replacement. No assumption is made about whether automobile owners would follow that way. The problem with the answer can be highlighted by this example: An argument is made that the best way to achieve long-lasting fame is to commit suicide. Does the author assume that people will or will not choose that path? No, because the best way does not involve an assumption about how people will actually act. Answer choice (D): This answer falls under the second of the three quirks discussed in the previous section. The author clearly believes that automobile emissions are a serious threat to the environment, but this does not mean that the author has assumed they are the most serious threat. Negate the answer and ask yourself, "What would the author say to the negation?" The author would reply that he or she never indicated that emissions were the most serious threat, so it is fine that they are not. Answer choice (E): We know that both urban air and the global atmosphere are contaminated by cars, but the author does not indicate that there is a direct correlation between the two. This answer, when negated, has no effect on the argument (and must therefore be incorrect). In an Assumption question, there can be only one answer that will hurt the argument when negated. If you negate the answers and think that two or more hurt the argument, you have made a mistake.

46. The conclusion of this argument is causal in nature ("because" is the indicator): Depression = tendency to be depressed or hypochondriacal, Glasses = glasses are worn. Depression□Glasses. The answer choices are very interesting as they all relate to either the cause or effect, or both. Answer choices (A) and (C) are similar in that they both discuss what causes depression (the cause of the cause). But the author has made no assumption about what causes depression, only that depression causes a person to wear glasses. Therefore, both of these answers are incorrect. Similarly, answer choices (B) and (D) both discuss the effects of wearing glasses (the effects of the effect). Again, this is not a part of the author's argument. Because answer choices (A), (B), (C), and (D) discuss issues that occur either "before" or "after" the causal relationship in the conclusion, they are incorrect. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. Answer choice (E) is a Defender that eliminates the possibility that the stated relationship is reversed (Type D in the Assumptions and Causality discussion). Remember, if the glasses actually cause the wearer to be depressed, this scenario would hurt the argument, so the author assumes the possibility cannot exist. Note how tricky this answer could be, especially if you had not been exposed to the way the test makers think about causality and assumptions. With the right information, the answer can be identified as part of a larger pattern on the GMAT, and this allows you to solve the problem quickly and confidently. While it may take a bit of work to memorize the different assumptions inherent in causal arguments, the payoff is more than worth the effort.

47. The stimulus contains conditional reasoning, and can be diagrammed as follows: DS = democratic society exists, SB = citizens establish strong bonds of mutual trust, PCO = participation in civic organizations, political parties, and other groups outside the family. **Premises:** DS□SB□PCO. **Conclusion:** Widespread reliance on movies and electronic media for entertainment has an inherently corrosive effect on democracy. The conclusion brings in a new element—reliance on movies and electronic media—and you should expect to see that element in the correct answer choice. First, let us take a moment to closely examine the conclusion. The wording in the conclusion is interesting: "has an inherently corrosive effect on democracy." We know from the premises that a democratic society relies on both citizens and participation in groups outside the family. How then can the author suggest that democracy is being corroded? Since corrosion implies an undermining force, democracy can be undermined by attacking the conditions it relies upon. If, for example, the participation in organizations outside the family was curtailed, this would eventually enact a contrapositive that would undermine the existence of democratic society. The assumption that is needed therefore, is to show that movies and other electronic media somehow lead to a lessening of participation in civic organizations, political parties, and other groups outside the family. This is the connection made in answer choice (D), the correct

answer. Answer choice (A): This was the most commonly selected wrong answer, and this answer is incorrect because it exaggerates the situation. The author does not assume that anyone would be unable to form a strong bond of trust. The argument was clear about a corrosive effect on democracy. This answer, if it were an assumption, would lead to the end of democracy. That result is too strong for the author's conclusion. Answer choice (B): The author makes no assumption regarding organizations advancing their agenda. Answer choice (C): The argument is not about newspapers and print media. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. This Supporter assumption connects the new element in the conclusion back to the conditional relationship in the premises. Answer choice (E): The author does not assume that closeness to the family is a bad thing, but that one must also participate outside the family. This answer does not suggest otherwise, and it is not an assumption of the argument.

48. The stimulus to this problem contains a Shell Game, and you must read closely in order to identify it: in the first sentence the author equates "new employees" with "inexperienced workers." Of course, a new employee is not necessarily inexperienced (the employee could have transferred from another company, etc.). The assumption that new employees are inexperienced is reflected in the correct answer, (C). Answer choice (A): The author notes that the duties of the two new employees are too complex for them, but the author does not compare or imply a comparison to the tasks of other workers. Answer choice (B): The author makes no assumption as to why the two new employees are being paid the salary they receive, only that their salary should be reduced. For example, the reason the employees are paid more could be that they are related to the owner of the company. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer, a Supporter. Answer choice (D): This answer is an immediate Loser. No discussion or assumption is made about Barnes' salary. Answer choice (E): This answer would hurt the argument, and therefore it can never be an assumption of the argument.

49. The structure of the argument is as follows: **Premise:** There is only so much metal ore available. **Sub-conclusion/Premise:** Ultimately we must either do without or turn to renewable resources to take its place. **Conclusion:** The current pattern of human consumption of resources, in which we rely on nonrenewable resources, for example metal ore, must eventually change. At first glance the argument does not seem to have any holes. This would suggest a Defender answer is coming, and indeed that is the case. Answer choice (A): The author does not need to assume this statement because the stimulus specifically indicates that "we must either do without or turn to renewable resources." Since doing without is an option, the author is not assuming there are renewable replacements for all nonrenewable resources currently being consumed. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer.

This answer defends the conclusion that the consumption pattern must change by indicating that it would not be possible to simply replace one nonrenewable resource with another nonrenewable resource. If this answer did not make sense at first glance, you should have noted the negative language and then negated the answer. Using the Assumption Negation Technique, the following would clearly attack the conclusion: "We can indefinitely replace exhausted nonrenewable resources with other nonrenewable resources." If the nonrenewable resources can be indefinitely replaced, why do we need to change our consumption habits? Answer choice (C): The author's argument concerns changing current consumption habits. Although the author does suggest turning to renewable resources, this alone would represent a change. The author does not make a long-term assumption that renewable resources can never be depleted. When faced with the negation of the answer choice, the author would likely reply: "If that eventuality does occur, then perhaps we will have to do without. In the meantime, we still need to change our consumption habits." As you can see, the negation has not undermined the author's position, and so this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (D): The author does not make statements or assumptions about actual consumption patterns in the near future, only statements regarding what must eventually occur. Answer choice (E): This answer, when rephrased to eliminate the double negative, reads as "Ultimately we must have nonrenewable resources." Because this answer hurts the argument, the answer is incorrect.

50. The importance of this problem is not just in answering it correctly, but also in answering it quickly. The first step is to recognize the argument structure: **Premise:** In humans, ingested protein is broken down into amino acids, all of which must compete to enter the brain. **Premise:** Subsequent ingestion of sugars leads to the production of insulin, a hormone that breaks down the sugars and also rids the bloodstream of residual amino acids, except for tryptophan. **Premise:** Tryptophan then slips into the brain uncontested and is transformed into the chemical serotonin, increasing the brain's serotonin level. **Conclusion:** Sugars can play a major role in mood elevation, helping one to feel relaxed and anxiety-free. At this point in your preparation, you should constantly be on the lookout for new elements that appear in the conclusion. This problem contains the new conclusion element of "a major role in mood elevation, helping one to feel relaxed and anxiety-free." Because this element immediately follows the assertion that the brain's serotonin level has been increased, you should attack the answer choices by looking for an answer that fits the Supporter relationship that an increase serotonin leads to an elevated mood. Only answer choices (A) and (D) contain these two elements, and you should examine them first as you seek to accelerate through this problem: Answer choice (A): Although the author assumes that raising the level of serotonin is sufficient to elevate mood, this

answer claims that it is necessary. Hence, this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. The author states that after the action of the sugars, more serotonin enters the brain. The author then concludes that this leads to a mood elevation. Thus, the author assumes that serotonin has an effect on the mood level. Answer choice (B): The argument refers to what happens when sugars are ingested. No assumption is made about what occurs when foods rich in sugars are not ingested. Answer choice (C): Although the argument states that tryptophan is transformed into serotonin, no assumption is made that this is the only way serotonin is produced. Answer choice (E): The author does not assume the statement in this answer. We know from the first sentence of the stimulus that ingested protein is broken down into amino acids which compete to enter the brain. This competition could result in mood elevation even without the ingestion of sugars since some amino acids will enter the brain (some could be tryptophan, for example). Thus, since the author's argument contains a scenario that would allow for the opposite of this answer choice to occur, this answer is not an assumption of the argument.

51. This is a challenging problem because two of the wrong answer choices are attractive. The argument itself is not overly complex, but you must pay attention to the language. Consider the conclusion of the argument: "Publicity campaigns for endangered species are unlikely to have much impact on the most important environmental problems." Ask yourself, why is it that these campaigns are unlikely to have much impact on the most important problems? According to the premises, the reason is that "it is more difficult to elicit sympathy for other kinds of organisms [than large mammals]." The reasoning shows that the author believes there is a connection between the important problems and organisms that are not large mammals. This Supporter connection is perfectly reflected in answer choice (A), the correct answer. Again, when faced with an Assumption question, remember to look for connections between rogue elements in the argument, and then seek that connection in the answer choices. Answer choice (B): The argument is about eliciting sympathy, and no assumption is made about microorganisms experiencing pain. Answer choice (C): This is a Shell Game answer. The conclusion is specific about "publicity campaigns for endangered species" as they relate to environmental problems. This answer refers to "publicity campaigns" in general—a different concept. It may be that the most effective publicity campaign for the environment has nothing to do with organisms. Consequently, this answer is not an assumption of the argument. Answer choice (D): This answer choice is worded too strongly and is an Exaggerated answer. "Ignore" goes further than what the author implies. The author indicates that it is "more difficult to elicit sympathy for other kinds of organisms," but the author does not say it is impossible to get sympathy from individuals if a non-large mammal is involved. Further, the argument is

specific about the impact on the "most important" problems, and this answer goes well beyond that domain. Answer choice (E): The microorganisms discussed at the end of the argument are an example ("such as"); therefore, the author does not assume this type of relationship must be true in order for the conclusion to be true.

52. The conclusion of the argument asserts that Leibniz and Newton each independently discovered calculus, and in drawing the conclusion the author addresses the possibility Newton may have influenced Leibniz, and then rejects that possibility. A review of the argument does not reveal any conspicuous flaws, and so upon encountering the question stem, you should expect to see a Defender answer. As such, do not spend time trying to prephrase an answer—just make sure you know the facts of the argument. Answer choice (A): The argument is about the independent discovery of calculus; the author makes no assumption that Leibniz did not tell anyone else, and indeed the fact that Newton did tell Leibniz is not accepted by the author as undermining the conclusion. Answer choice (B): Negate the answer: "A third person independently discovered calculus prior to Newton and Leibniz." Would this negated answer attack the argument? No, the author would just assert that three different parties independently discovered calculus. Answer choice (C): The author cites Newton's letter as evidence that Newton felt he had disclosed ideas to Leibniz prior to Leibniz's publication date. No assumption is made that Newton felt that what was disclosed allowed Leibniz to learn something important. If you are uncertain of this answer, negate the choice to see if it weakens the argument. Answer choice (D): This is clearly not an assumption of the argument because the author discusses Newton's letter to Leibniz prior to Leibniz's publication date. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. The answer can be difficult because it is somewhat similar to answer choice (B), which many people already eliminated by the time they reached this answer. Answer (E) is different from answer (B) because it involves learning details from a third source. This is important because the conclusion references the independent discovery of calculus, and so the author must believe that neither Newton nor Leibniz learned anything substantial about calculus from other sources. This elimination of an idea that weakens the argument is the essence of a Defender answer choice. To further confirm the answer, consider the negation of this answer choice ("neither...nor" becomes "either...or"): "Either Newton or Leibniz learned crucial details about calculus from some third source." This negated answer undermines the assertion that Leibniz and Newton each independently discovered calculus. Consequently, this is the correct answer.

53. The correct answer choice is (D). This is a challenging question. The author makes the following argument: **Premise:** In 1980, Country A had a per

capita gross domestic product (GDP) that was $5,000 higher than that of the European Economic Community. **Premise:** By 1990, the difference, when adjusted for inflation, had increased to $6,000. **Premise:** A rising per capita GDP indicates a rising average standard of living. **Conclusion:** The average standard of living in Country A must have risen between 1980 and 1990. The author has fallen into the trap of believing that an increase in the difference between GDP's means that the actual GDP of Country A has increased. Since that is not necessarily the case based on the number, you should look for the answer that assumes the total GDP of country A has not decreased. Answer choice (A): The stimulus is clear that the GDP is a "per capita" (per person) figure. Hence, the author does not need to make an assumption regarding actual population increases. Answer choice (B): The author does need to assume this is true because a bigger GDP gap does not prove that either must have fallen; the actual GDP of both Country A and the European Economic Community (EEC) could rise and the author's argument would still be valid. Answer choice (C): In the argument the author uses the GDP of the entire EEC. Since the figure for the EEC would necessarily be an average drawn from the numbers of multiple countries, the author does not need to make any assumptions about figures for individual countries within the EEC. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. In order to conclude that an increasing difference in GDP translates to an actual increase in GDP, the author must assume that the GDP of the point of comparison, the EEC, did not fall dramatically. Consider the following example, which assigns actual numbers to the GDP of each group in 1980, and then shows a variety of possibilities for the numbers in 1990:

	1980	#1: 1990	#2: 1990	#3: 1990	#4: 1990
GDP of Country A	105	107	156	96	105
GDP of the EEC	100	101	150	90	99
Difference		+5	+6	+6	+6	+6

Each of the four examples for 1990 is consistent with the claim that there is a $6000 difference between the GDP of Country A and the GDP of the EEC. The first two examples for 1990, #1 and #2, show that the total GDP of Country A, and therefore the standard of living as defined in the stimulus, has risen. Example #3, shows that even though the gap has increased between the two groups, the actual GDP of Country A has decreased, and therefore the standard of living in Country A has decreased. This is inconsistent with the author's conclusion, so the author must be assuming that this type of scenario cannot occur. In example #4, we see a second example that is incompatible with the author's conclusion, one where the gap remains at $600, but the GDP of Country A remains the same. The author must assume that the fourth scenario also cannot occur, and that the GDP of the EEC cannot drop by the $1000 that is the amount of the increase in the gap. Hence, the author must assume that if the GDP of the EEC drops, it drops by less than $1000, and therefore answer choice (D) is correct. This is

clearly a confusing answer, but do not forget that you can always apply the Assumption Negation Technique to any answer choice in an Assumption question. Answer choice (D), when negated, reads: "The per capita GDP of the European Economic Community was lower by more than $1,000 in 1990 than it had been in 1980." This negation would definitely weaken the argument because it would create a scenario like #3 or one even worse than #4. Because the answer choice weakens the argument when negated, it must be the correct answer. Answer choice (E): This answer is incorrect for the same reason cited in answer choice (C): since the figure for the EEC would necessarily be an average drawn from the numbers of multiple countries, the author does not need to make any assumptions about the figures for individual countries within the EEC, regardless of year.

54. The structure of the argument is simple, and it is easy to see why the premise does not undeniably prove the conclusion. The answers contain several predictable forms, and this is the type of question you should quickly destroy. You do not need to spend a great deal of time trying to find a specific pre-phrased answer because there are so many possibilities, and the answers can be eliminated without a great deal of time spent considering which are Losers and which are Contenders. The stimulus uses a premise about success rate to form a conclusion about Carl's competency as a detective. Ask yourself—does the premise prove the conclusion? No, because there are many factors that could have affected Carl's performance. In this sense, the stimulus has incomplete information, and we should try to discover a relevant piece of information in one of the answer choices that will shed more light on why Carl's success rate is so low. Use this knowledge to make a general pre-phrase that indicates you are looking for a piece of information that shows Carl's success rate is not as low as it seems or that other factors limited Carl's performance. Answer choice (A): **This is the correct answer.** We discover that Carl receives the hardest cases, and one would expect that the hardest cases would yield a lower success rate. Notice that this answer does not attack the premises. Even though they are still true, the conclusion is undermined by the new evidence. This is typical of most Weaken questions answers—the premises are not addressed and the focus is on the conclusion. Answer choice (B): This answer is irrelevant. It tries to use the opinion of others about Carl's performance in one capacity to refute facts about his performance in another capacity. Personalize the answer—is this the answer you would offer to weaken the argument against Carl if he was your friend? Answer choice (C): This is an Opposite answer that strengthens the claim that Carl is incompetent by showing that Carl was not deprived of certain resources for solving cases. Answer choice (D): This is another Opposite answer that strengthens the claim that Carl is incompetent. This time, the answer shows that Carl has a previous record of poor performance. Answer choice (E): This answer goes beyond the scope of

the argument by discussing the promotions of other officers. These promotions do not impact Carl's job and no information is given about Carl's promotions. If you are thinking that perhaps Carl's poor performance is a result of dissatisfaction over the promotions of others, then you are assuming too much.

55. The conclusion of this argument is the final sentence, which contains the conclusion indicator "therefore," and the conclusion contains a qualification that the threat of suffocation will be eliminated after the switchover is complete. The premises supporting this conclusion are that the new plastic rings will be used by all companies and that the rings disintegrate after three days' exposure to sunlight. Personalize this argument and ask yourself—are there any holes in this argument? Yes, there are several. The most obvious is, "What if an animal becomes entangled in the new rings before they can disintegrate?" In this question, however, that avenue of attack is not used (this was a two-question stimuli and that idea was used in the other question) but there is no way to know this prior to attempting the question. Answer choice (A): This answer does not hurt the argument because the author qualified the conclusion to account for the date of the switchover, thereby inoculating against this avenue of attack. From a personalizing standpoint, imagine what would happen if you raised this issue to the beverage company representative—he or she would simply say, "Yes, that may be the case, but I noted in my conclusion that the program would be effective once the switchover is complete." This is an attractive answer because it raises a point that would be a difficult public relations issue to address. Regardless, this does not hurt the argument given by the beverage company representative, and that is the task at hand. Answer choice (B): **This is the correct answer.** Most people select answer choice (E), but as you will see, (E) is incorrect. This answer undermines the representative's conclusion by showing that even after the switchover is complete, the threat to animals from plastic rings will persist. Note the carefully worded nature of the conclusion—the representative does not say the threat from new plastic rings will be eliminated, but rather the threat from plastic rings, which includes both old and new rings. Answer choice (C): This out-of-scope answer addresses an issue that is irrelevant to the representative's argument. Answer choice (D): While this is nice information from a customer service standpoint (you do not want your six-pack of beer falling apart as you walk out of the store), this answer does not affect the conclusion because it does not address the threat of suffocation to animals. Answer choice (E): This is the most commonly chosen answer, and it is a perfect example of a Shell Game. In this case, the answer preys upon test takers who fail to heed the advice: "Read closely and know precisely what the author said. Do not generalize!" Many test takers read the conclusion and think, "So when they start using these new rings, it will make things better for the animals." When

these test takers get to answer choice (E), the answer looks extremely attractive because it indicates that the implementation of the new rings will also have a harmful effect. With this thinking in mind, many test takers select answer choice (E) thinking it undermines the conclusion and they are certain they have nailed the question. However, the conclusion is specifically about suffocation, and answer choice (E) does not address suffocation. Instead, answer choice (E) is a shell game that attacks a conclusion that is similar but different than the actual conclusion. Remember, one of the rules for weakening arguments is to focus on the conclusion, and knowing the details of the conclusion is part of that focus. Finally, the placement of answer choice (E) is no accident. Most students do not immediately identify answer choice (B) as the correct answer, and even those that keep it as a Contender often feel it could be stronger. Then, just when things are starting to look bleak, answer choice (E) pops up sounding fairly reasonable. Most people breathe a sigh of relief and select the answer without carefully examining the contents. Never choose answer choice (E) just because the first four answers are not overly attractive! Always make a thorough analysis of every answer choice and remember that the test makers know that people get nervous if none of the first four answer choices jump out at them. Do not let the test takers draw you into a trap! Answer choice (E) is only attractive if you make a mistakenly broad interpretation of the conclusion. Answer choice (E) is a great place for the test makers to place an attractive wrong answer because (E) is the last answer that a student will read, and the contents of (E) "reverberate" in the test taker's mind and begin to sound reasonable. In that same vein, answer choice (A) is a great place to put the correct answer if the stimulus is exceedingly difficult to understand or if the question stem is extremely unusual. Why? Because most test takers use the first answer choice in a difficult problem to get a handle on what they are reading and the type of answers they will see. If a problem is tough, it can be difficult to immediately identify answer choice (A) as correct. Then, by the time they have read all five answers, they are prone to have forgotten the details of the first answer choice.

56. As always, the key to success is to isolate the conclusion, which appears in the last sentence: "companies producing carpet will be able to gain market share in the carpet market only through purchasing competitors." As you should have noted while reading, the conclusion contains a conditional indicator and is thereby conditional in nature. The conclusion can be diagrammed as: GMS = gain market share in the carpet market, PC = purchasing competitors. **GMS□PC**. According to the author, to gain market share in the carpet market a company must purchase a competitor. Answer choice (C) is often selected by students, but it does not attack this idea. To attack a conditional statement you must show that the necessary condition is not actually necessary for the sufficient condition to occur. Answer choice (C)

simply suggests that when companies purchase their competitors the endeavor is often financially unsuccessful. Essentially, answer choice (C) fails to prove that purchasing competitors is unnecessary to gain market share. Answer choice (D), on the other hand, does suggest a way for companies to gain market share without purchasing competitors, thereby attacking the conditional statement given in the stimulus. **Thus, answer choice (D) is correct.** Answer choice (A): This answer goes beyond the scope of the argument, which is limited to the carpet market (and not other floor coverings). Answer choice (B): This is an Opposite answer that strengthens the argument. If there are no remaining niches to fill, then there is no way to expand other than to purchase a competitor. Answer choice (C): This attractive answer is wrong for two very strong reasons: 1. A Shell Game is played with the details of the conclusion. The conclusion is about market share. Answer choice (C) is about a decline in profits and revenues. The two are not the same, and so the information in the answer choice does not weaken the conclusion. 2. Even if you assume that market share is the same thing as profits and revenues, a second Shell Game is played because the answer then attacks a conclusion that is similar but different than the given conclusion. If the conclusion were as follows: **PC□GMS,** then answer choice (C) would be correct (again, assuming market share is the same thing as profits and revenues). But, the above is a Mistaken Reversal of the conclusion, and so the attack is made on a statement that uses the same terms as the conclusion but puts them in a different relationship. This is a great example of the cleverness displayed by the test makers. Fortunately you can avoid this answer if you know what to look for when attacking conditional reasoning. One point worth noting is that it is no accident that the most tempting wrong answer choice appears just before the correct answer. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. If price reductions drive out some of the carpet producers, then other producers can take the market share left behind. This scenario shows that a company can gain market share without purchasing a competitor, thus attacking the necessary condition in the conclusion. Answer choice (E): This Opposite answer strengthens the argument. If the consumers are resistant to new styles, then one fewer possibility exists if a company is trying to increase market share. By eliminating this option, the conclusion is strengthened (by eliminating an idea that would hurt the argument, one can strengthen the argument because it has fewer "competitors.").

57. This problem is similar in form to the carpet market problem. The conclusion appears at the end and is conditional in nature: "a business that wishes to retain its power as long as it can, must act responsibly." This relationship can be diagrammed as: WRP = business wishes to retain power as long as possible, AR = act responsibly. **WRP□AR.** Hopefully, you identified this conclusion as conditional when you read the stimulus. As you read the

question stem, you should have immediately pre-phrased an answer that would allow the sufficient condition to occur without the necessary condition, namely that a business that wishes to retain power does not necessarily have to act responsibly. Let us examine the answer choices with this idea in mind: Answer choice (A): Because this answer addresses government institutions, this cannot hurt the conclusion, which is about businesses. If anything, this may slightly support the argument. In the middle of the stimulus, the Speaker mentions that "The law's application to human institutions certainly stands confirmed by history." This answer affirms that statement by adding governments to the named list of human institutions. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. If a public relations program can cause society to think an institution is socially responsible even when it is not, then an institution that wishes to retain power could act irresponsibly and then get a public relations firm to cover up the activities. In this way, the institution could wish to retain power but not act responsibly. Since this scenario allows the sufficient condition to occur without the necessary, this weakens the argument. Answer choice (C): Many students hold this answer choice as a Contender. The answer is incorrect because the stimulus contemplates varying rates of power retention, especially between socially responsible and non-socially responsible institutions. If you read this answer thinking that the stimulus indicated socially responsible institutions do not lose power if socially responsible, then you made a quasi-Mistaken Reversal of the stimulus. There is never a presumption in the argument that power can be held indefinitely. If there were, this answer would be much more attractive. Answer choice (D): The conclusion is clear in saying, "a business that wishes to retain power as long as it can..." The italicized phrase allows for the idea that businesses will eventually lose power and ultimately fail. Thus, this answer does not hurt the argument. Answer choice (E): This is another attractive answer, and one that lured in many test takers. The answer states that even though some businesses acted responsibly (AR), they did not retain power (RP). If this difference between retaining power and wishing to retain power (WRP) is ignored, then this answer can be seen as attacking the Mistaken Reversal of the conclusion. As you learned from the discussion of answer choice (C) of the carpet market question, attacking the Mistaken Reversal of the conclusion does not hurt the conclusion. However, this answer is attractive because not only does it address elements of the conclusion, it also appears as the final answer choice. A test taker who did not like any of the earlier answers would find this answer quite attractive.

58. This problem is a complete conditional argument containing conditional premises and a conditional conclusion. Here is a breakdown of the argument: HT = nations that place a high tax on income, NI = negative incentive for technological innovation, FB = fall behind in the international arms race; also, wind up in a strategically disadvantageous position, LV = lose voice in world

affairs. The first sentence contains two sufficient condition indicators (the word "all") and can be diagrammed as a chain: **HT□NI□FB.** The next sentence paraphrases "fall behind in the international arms race" as "wind up in a strategically disadvantageous position" and can be diagrammed as: **FB□LV.** Because the two statements have FB in common, a single long chain can be created: **HT□NI□FB□LV.** From our discussion of conditional reasoning we know that a chain of this length contains many inferences. The conclusion, when paraphrased, tries to make a contrapositive: The phrase "nation wants maintain its value system and way of life" is a very rough equivalent of "wind up in a strategically disadvantageous position" and "lose a voice in world affairs." The paraphrase is not a perfect equivalent because the conclusion discuses values, and the premises do not. For our purposes, we will symbolize this condition as: **~FB and ~LV.** The phrase "must not allow its highest tax bracket to exceed 30 percent of income" is the equivalent of HT. Thus, the diagram for the conclusion is: **~FB and ~LV□~HT$_{30}$.** Thus, based on the chain of reasoning provided, we have a reasonable conclusion, but not a perfect one because the paraphrase was not exact. The question stem is a WeakenX, which means that four of the answers will weaken the argument and the one correct answer will either have no effect on the argument or will strengthen the argument. Answer choice (A): This answer attacks the necessary condition of the conclusion by showing that taxes could exceed 30% before problems occurred. Answer choice (B): This answer attacks the first half of the first sentence, which states that high taxes necessarily produce a negative incentive for technological innovation. Because taxes lower an individual's income, the higher the tax, the greater the relative restriction on making money. Answer choice (B) shows that higher taxes would not necessarily produce low innovation because innovators do not care about the amount they earn. Answer choice (C): This answer attacks the part of the argument that equates "fall behind in the international arms race" as "wind up in a strategically disadvantageous position." If the two are not equated, then the chain of premises breaks down. Answer choice (D): Like (C), this attacks a portion of the argument where the author equates terms. In this case, the paraphrase in the conclusion was not exact, and this answer exploits that gap. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. The answer does not hurt the argument because the stimulus specifically states that "Those nations that, through historical accident or the foolishness of their political leadership, wind up in a strategically disadvantageous position..." So, the actual reason the nation ends up in a disadvantageous position is not critical. It could be either foolishness or historical accident. So, an answer that asserts that it is foolishness and not historical accident has no effect on the argument.

59. This is a nice straightforward question to start the problem set. The conclusion of the argument appears at the end of the stimulus: human beings "cannot be made happy by anything that does not involve gratification of these [cognitive] faculties." To weaken the argument we must show that individuals can be made happy without gratification of the cognitive faculties. If you do not know the meaning of "cognitive," the problem can be challenging. Cognitive means "relating to the mental process of knowing, including reasoning and judgment." In other words, cognitive faculties are thinking and analyzing, etc. Answer choice (A): This answer attempts to attack the first premise, but fails. Although it is fantastic news that dolphins and chimps can rationally communicate, this fact has no impact on the argument at hand. Even though they have this communication ability, human cognitive faculties can still be superior. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer, and a somewhat risqué one at that. By showing that many people enjoy the physical more than the cognitive, the answer shows that people can be made happy by gratification of something other than cognitive faculties. Cognitive faculties, being mental in nature, are of course distinct from physical pleasures. Additionally, this answer has the benefit of addressing the phrase in the stimulus regarding awareness of cognitive faculties: "once humans become aware of these..." In this answer, unlike others, the individuals are known to be familiar with cognitive faculties. While we believe that recognition of cognitive faculties is inherent in adults (or some of the named types in other answers, such as serious athletes, who by definition would have to be teens or adults), this answer is stronger because it explicitly addresses the issue. Answer choice (C): A preference for a certain type of music is likely a cognition-driven preference, and this preference is expressed by an adult who would certainly be aware of cognitive faculties. And, since no suggestion is made that individuals can be made happy without gratification of the cognitive faculties, this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (D): This can be an attractive answer at first, but it depends on the assumption that the serious athletes are happy due to their athletic endeavors. However, that connection is not explicitly stated, and it could be that the serious athletes are happy because of some gratification of their cognitive faculties, in their respective sport or otherwise. Answer choice (E): This answer is similar to answer choice (D). A gourmet is a connoisseur of food and drink, and a connoisseur is a person with deep or special knowledge of a subject. In this sense, there would be a cognitive element to the enjoyment of gourmet food. As such, this answer may serve to slightly strengthen the argument because it shows that an individual with experience with the non-cognitive still retains a love of the cognitive.

60. The argument uses the premise that Baja turtles and Japanese turtles share ninety-five percent of their DNA to conclude that Baja turtles hatch in Japanese waters 10,000 kilometers away. This sounds like convincing

statistical evidence unless you realize that many organisms share DNA. For example, humans and chimpanzees share about 98% of their DNA (we share about 75% of our DNA with dogs, for that matter). Since Baja and Japanese turtles come from the same species, it is not surprising that they would share a high percentage of their DNA. Regardless of whether or not you saw this connection, you should have been skeptical of the reference to juvenile turtles traveling 10,000 kilometers. Such a lengthy trip by a juvenile animal is unlikely, and calls into question the soundness of the argument. Answer choice (A): This answer does not impact the argument because no details—DNA or otherwise—are given about the turtles at these nesting sites off the Pacific coast of North America. Answer choice (B): The fact that Atlantic turtles have nesting and feeding sites no more than 5,000 kilometers apart does not attack the argument because the argument is about Baja turtles. Answer choice (C): This answer attempts to weaken the argument by inducing you to conclude that if the Japanese hatchlings are declining but Baja sites are constant, then the Baja sites cannot be supplied by the Japanese hatchlings. But, the answer choice moves from the number of hatchlings to the number of sites. Even with a declining number of hatchlings, the number of sites could remain constant, albeit with fewer turtles at each. Because of this possibility, the answer does not undermine the argument. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. The answer shows that all turtles in the argument have the same ninety-five percent DNA, meaning that the Baja turtles did not have to take the 10,000 kilometer trip. Answer choice (E): The breeding between species was not an issue in the stimulus.

61. The first sentence is a premise, and the second sentence is the conclusion of this argument. To attack this conclusion, look for an answer choice that shows that the exclusion of knowledgeable individuals from scientific or technical issue trials is a fair way of proceeding in these trials. Answer choice (A): This is an Opposite answer that strengthens the conclusion. If specialized knowledge of these issues makes it more likely that the juror can comprehend the testimony being given, then these individuals should not be excluded from juries, and their exclusion makes trial by jury an unfair means of resolving a dispute. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. If the specialized knowledge is likely to produce a prejudice in a juror, then by all means they should be excluded from the jury. Thus, instead of trial by jury being an unfair means, it is made more fair by the exclusion of these individuals. The answer is a tricky one because most people initially think the answer agrees with the argument. It agrees with the principle of the premise, but not with the conclusion drawn from that premise. Answer choice (C): This answer simply notes that arbitrators are not a fair means of settling scientific or technical issue debates. This has no impact on the fairness of jury trials involving these same issues. Answer choice (D): This

answer is about the experts testifying at scientific or technical issue trials. This information does not attack the claim that jury trials are unfair because of the exclusion of jurors with knowledge of these issues. Answer choice (E): This answer can be eliminated by reasoning similar to that used to eliminate answer choice (D).

62. The conclusion is in the last sentence, that some people "have senses that do not respect the usual boundaries between the five recognized senses." Instead of keeping their senses distinct, these individuals have an overlap. Incidentally, the condition discussed in the stimulus is not made up: synesthesiacs (or synesthetes) have a real condition known as synesthesia. Regardless of that fact, you must find an answer choice that undermines the conclusion of the argument, something that would suggest their senses do respect the usual boundaries. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. If the synesthesiacs have a systematic impairment in their use of language it may not be that their senses overlap but rather that they lack the ability to properly express themselves. Thus, their claim to taste a banana and see blue might not be a reflection of that actually occurring but rather a reflection of the words they use to describe taste. If so, this would undermine the conclusion that the senses of synesthesiacs do overlap. This is a difficult answer to identify as correct, and less than 50% of test takers are able to do so. Answer choice (B): The appeal of this answer—and many students keep this as a Contender—is that it suggests that perhaps other senses are operating, and some test takers make the judgment that these additional senses account for the sensory overlap in synesthesiacs. Unfortunately, that judgment is not supported by the answer choice. Not enough information is provided by the answer choice to say what role, if any, is played by these other senses. Answer choice (C): This is the most popular wrong answer choice. Do not forget to personalize the argument and consider how the author would react if faced with this answer. Would he or she surrender and admit the answer overpowers the argument? Doubtful. The author would probably react to this answer by saying something along these lines, "Exactly. Since all the individuals are synesthesiacs and suffer from the same condition, it is not surprising that there would be patterns in the way the senses overlap. Just as everyone afflicted with emphysema has difficulty breathing, the sensory patterns exhibited by synesthesiacs are just a product of the condition. The fact that their senses do not follow the usual boundaries and do so in certain ways is to be expected." So, instead of surrendering to the answer, the author would indicate that the answer agrees with the conclusion. Answer choice (D): This answer is out of the scope of the argument. The "legendary" status of synesthesiacs does not shed any light on the operation of their five senses. Answer choice (E): If anything, this may strengthen the argument by indicating that the synesthesiacs are experiencing some type of phenomenon. Beyond that

point, however, no information is given to suggest that their senses do not respect the usual boundaries.

63. The stimulus sets up an interesting argument that appears fairly reasonable. A mastodon skeleton has been found containing a human-made projectile dissimilar to those of the part of Eurasia closest to North America and because Eurasians did not settle in North America until shortly before the peak of the Ice Age, the first Eurasian settlers of North America probably came from a more distant part of Eurasia than the area nearest North America. To make a very rough analogy using dialects, it is like a resident of Washington, D.C. saying, "The visitors we just met did not sound like they were from Virginia, so they must be from a much more distant part of the U.S." Reading that rough analogy, you can see that the speaker has assumed that the visitors are from the U.S. Of course, that does not have to be the case—they could be from England or France or elsewhere. The same form of assumption has occurred in the argument, and the author has assumed that the projectile is of Eurasian origin. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. This answer hurts the argument by indicating that the projectile is apparently not Eurasian, suggesting that the first Eurasian settlers could have come from any part of Eurasia, including the area closest to North America. Answer choice (B): This is the most attractive wrong answer, but regardless, this answer does not hurt the argument. Some students attempt to conclude that since the people were nomadic, they could have moved to areas farther away and found projectiles like the one in the mastodon. However, even though these individuals remained nomadic, they were apparently nomadic within the area of Eurasia closest to North America because the answer clearly states, "The people who occupied the Eurasia area closest to North America..." Hence, they did not necessarily occupy other areas and this answer does not hurt the argument. Answer choice (C): This Opposite answer supports the argument by showing that the projectile in the mastodon was not a one-time, anomalous occurrence. If other, similar projectiles come to light, then the author's position would be strengthened. Answer choice (D): This Opposite answer supports the argument by connecting other artifacts of the same age as the projectile to parts of Eurasia more distant than the area of Eurasia closest to North America. This adds further evidence to the idea that the first Eurasian settlers of North America probably came from a more distant part of Eurasia than the area nearest North America. Answer choice (E): This Opposite answer supports the argument by indicating that the part of Eurasia closest to North America may not have been inhabited just before the Ice Age. If this area was uninhabitable, then it is more likely that settlers coming to North America came from more distant regions.

64. This is a great separator question, and approximately one in three students answers this question correctly. However, some students are able to annihilate this question because they see a reference in the first line that raises an important issue that goes unanswered. That reference is to lobsters "eaten by humans." The argument asserts that diverting the sewage in the harbor is a moot point because hardly any lobsters live long enough to be harmed by the diseases caused by the sewage. This may be, but what about the humans who eat the lobsters that live in the sewage-contaminated environment? The author fails to address this point. The conclusion of the argument is near the end: "the proposal is pointless," and this is based on the premise that "hardly any lobsters live long enough to be harmed by those diseases." Answer choice (A): The argument is based on the sewage contamination of the harbor. Although other contaminants may be present, they are not addressed by the argument, and thus this answer does not undermine the author's position. Answer choice (B): This answer has no impact because the argument is about lobsters that are caught in the harbor. So, while lobsters in the open ocean may live longer, the author's point about lobsters in the harbor not living long enough to contract a gill disease is untouched. Answer choice (C): The issue is not breeding frequency but longevity. So, while we are pleased to hear that lobsters in sewage-contaminated waters breed frequently, this fact does not impact an argument based on the age and disease contraction. Answer choice (D): Although whether the lobsters contract a gill disease is a critical issue in the argument, the method of determining whether a lobster has a disease is not a critical issue. Again, keep in mind the heart of the argument: **Premise:** "hardly any lobsters live long enough to be harmed by those diseases." **Conclusion:** "the proposal [to reroute harbor sewage] is pointless." Nothing in that argument concerns the detection of the gill diseases. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. As discussed above, the author fails to address the effect of the contaminated lobsters on humans who consume them, and this answer attacks that hole. If humans become ill as a result of eating lobsters with gill diseases, and gill diseases are more likely to arise when the lobsters live in the sewage-contaminated waters, then the conclusion that the proposal is pointless is incorrect.

65. **Premise:** People with high blood pressure are generally more nervous and anxious than people who do not have high blood pressure. **Premise:** This particular combination of personality traits is called the hypertensive personality. **Conclusion:** The hypertensive personality is likely to cause a person to develop high blood pressure. The premises indicate that certain individuals have both high blood pressure and the hypertensive personality. From this information we cannot draw any conclusions, but the author makes the classic GMAT error of concluding that one of the conditions causes the other. Your job is to find the answer that describes this error of reasoning.

From the "Situations That Can Lead to Errors of Causality" discussion, the scenario in this stimulus falls under item 2—"Two (or more) events occur at the same time." As described in that section, "While one event could have caused the other, the two events could be the result of a third event, or the two events could simply be correlated but one does not cause the other." Thus, you should search either for an answer that states that the author forgot that a third event could have caused the two events or that the author mistook correlation for causation. Answer choice (D) describes the latter. Answer choice (A): This is an Opposite answer because the stimulus defines the hypertensive personality as one with the traits of nervousness and anxiety. Answer choice (B): The permanence of the traits is not an issue in the stimulus. Answer choice (C): Although the argument does act as described in this answer choice, this is not an error. On the GMAT, authors have the right to make premises that contain certain claims. Remember, the focus is not on the premises but where the author goes with the argument once a premise is created. Answer choice (D): **This is the correct answer**. The conclusion can be diagrammed as: HP = hypertensive personality, HBP = high-blood pressure, **HP□HBP.** This answer choice describes a classic error of causality: two events occurring simultaneously are mistakenly interpreted to be in a causal relationship. There are many other possibilities for the arrangement: the two events could be caused by a third event (for example, genetics could cause both a hypertensive personality and high blood pressure), the events could be reversed (the high blood pressure could actually cause the hypertensive personality), or there may be situations where the two do not occur together. Answer choice (E): Although the argument does act as described in this answer choice, this is not an error. The author is allowed to focus on nervousness and anxiety to the exclusion of other traits. To analogize, imagine a speaker says, "The Kansas City Royals have bad pitching and this makes them a bad team." The Kansas City Royals might also wear blue, but the speaker is not obligated to mention that trait when discussing why the Royals are a bad baseball team. In much the same way, the author of this stimulus is not obligated to mention other traits people with high blood-pressure may have.

66. The argument concludes that a program instituted two years ago to increase morale has ultimately caused the recent decrease in high school dropouts. You must always recognize a causal conclusion when one is presented to you! Whenever you encounter a causal conclusion, ask yourself if the relationship must be as stated by the author or if another explanation can be found. In simplified form, the conclusion appears as follows: P = program to raise high school morale, RD = reduction in dropouts, **P□RD.** Regardless of the question asked, this assessment is helpful. The question stem asks you to weaken the argument, and according to the "How to Attack a Causal Conclusion" section there are five main avenues of attack you should be

prepared to encounter. The correct answer, (A), falls into one of the most frequently occurring of those categories: the alternate cause. Answer choice (A): **This is the correct answer.** The answer attacks the conclusion by introducing an alternate cause: it was not the morale program that led to a decrease in high dropouts, but rather the fact that no jobs were available for individuals contemplating dropping out of high school. The job availability factor is important because the first sentence of the stimulus indicates that high school students who drop out go to work. Thus, if a recession led to a high level of unemployment, this could cause high school students to rethink dropping out and stay in school. Answer choice (B): At best, this answer confirms that some of the high school students had a low morale, and in that sense, the answer strengthens the argument. At worst, the answer choice is irrelevant. Answer choice (C): The argument indicates that the dropout rate is lower relative to the preceding year; there is no claim that the dropout rate ever exceeded the retention rate. Thus, to suggest that more students stayed in school than dropped out has no effect on the argument. Answer choice (D): This is a Shell Game answer. The stimulus refers to high school dropouts. This answer choice refers to high school graduates. Answer choice (E): The argument uses information about the city's overall dropout rate. Therefore, the target high schools of the anti-dropout program are irrelevant.

67. The correct answer choice is (D) The stimulus commits the classic error of assuming that because two events occur simultaneously that one must cause the other. The phrase used to indicate the causality is "responsible for." D = anti-collision device, SD = sudden disappearance of key information, **D□SD.** The question stem asks you to weaken the argument, and according to the "How to Attack a Causal Conclusion" section you should be on the lookout for one of several primary methods of attacking the argument. Answer choice (A): This answer presents another effect of the cause, but this additional effect does not weaken the argument. To analogize this answer to the argument, imagine a scenario where a speaker concludes that playing football makes a person more prone to sustaining a leg injury. Would suggesting that playing football makes a person more prone to a head injury (another effect) undermine the first statement? No. Answer choice (B): This is an Opposite answer that supports the conclusion. By showing that the key information did not disappear prior to the appearance of the anti-collision device, the argument is strengthened because the likelihood that the device is at fault is increased. Answer choice (C): This information has no effect on determining if the device causes the information to disappear from the screen because it references an event that has yet to occur. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer, and this answer falls into the third category for weakening a causal argument: "Show that although the effect exists, the cause did not occur." In this instance, the effect of information disappearing from the screen occurred prior to the creation of the supposed causal agent,

the anti-collision device. Answer choice (E): This answer choice has no impact on the argument. We cannot make a judgment based on the size of the airport because the argument did not mention airport size or anything directly related to airport size.

68. The correct answer choice is (C). The premise contains information concerning a rise in the number of calls involving violent crimes compared to last year. This is where smart GMAT reading comes into play: does the argument say there is more crime, or does it say there are more calls reporting crime? Recognizing the difference is critical for successfully solving this problem. The conclusion about citizens being more likely to be victimized by a violent crime indicates the author believes the following causal relationship: GNC = greater number of violent crimes, MC = more calls involving violent crimes. **GNC□MC**, Literally, the author believes that there are more violent crimes and therefore the police are responding to more violent crime calls. The question stem asks you to weaken the argument, and the correct answer falls into one of the five basic methods for weakening a causal argument. Answer choice (A): This is an Opposite answer that strengthens the argument. Answer choice (B): Because the argument is about "the average citizen of this town," information about victims of a certain age is not relevant. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. By showing that people are more willing to report crimes (and thus call them in for response), an alternate cause for the rise in the number of calls is given. Answer choice (D): This answer only addresses an effect of the concern over crime, and does not address the causal relationship that underlies the argument. Answer choice (E): This answer does not address a possible rise in crime or the reasons for the rise in responses to calls involving violent crime.

69. The correct answer choice is (B). The premises contain correlations, and the conclusion makes a causal claim: PC = adequate prenatal care, DR = decrease risk of low birth weight babies. **PC□DR.** The question stem asks you to weaken the argument, and the correct answer falls into one of the five basic methods for weakening a causal argument. Answer choice (A): The conclusion specifically states that mothers who had received adequate prenatal care were less likely to have low birth weight babies than mothers who had received inadequate prenatal care. Thus, although mothers who received inadequate prenatal care have a higher likelihood of having low birth weight babies, this likelihood still allows for many babies to be born of normal weight. In a later chapter we will explore the ways the GMAT uses numbers and statistics to confuse test takers, but for now, consider this analogy: The Detroit Tigers are more likely to lose a baseball game than any other team, but even so, they can still win a number of games. In the same way, the aforementioned mothers may be more likely to have low birth weight babies, but they can still give birth to babies of normal weight. Hence,

answer choice (A) does not attack the argument. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. The answer choice falls into the category of "Showing a statistical problem exists with the data used to make the causal statement." By indicating that all mothers without prenatal care records are automatically classified as mothers receiving inadequate prenatal care, the answer undermines the relationship in the argument because the data used to make the conclusion is unreliable. Answer choice (C): The conclusion is about low birth weight babies, not premature babies. Even if low birth weight babies were routinely classified as premature, that would not affect the conclusion. Answer choice (D): Similar to answer choice (A), the likelihoods discussed in the stimulus allow for this possibility. Hence, this answer cannot hurt the argument. Answer choice (E): If anything, this answer strengthens the argument since it shows that adequate prenatal care has a powerful positive effect.

70. The correct answer choice is (C). A correlation involving theta waves, TV watching, and personality disorders is presented in the premises, and then the author concludes that watching too much TV causes a rise in the risk of developing a personality disorder to rise. Answer choice (A): Although "personality disorders" are left largely undefined (which is acceptable), the term is not used ambiguously. Answer choice (B): This is not an error because the author is not obligated to define theta brain waves in order to make the argument understandable. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. Answer choice (D): There is no information to prove that the sample of data used was unrepresentative. Although the researcher says, "my data show..." it is possible the researcher's data are extensive and representative. Answer choice (E): This is a Shell Game answer because the researcher infers that the reverse is true.

71. The correct answer choice is (A). The heart of the argument is a causal claim that the reason today's newspapers are full of stories about violent crime is that violent crime has now risen to a point where it is out of control. MVC = more violent crimes, NFS = more news stories about violent crimes. **MVC□NFS.** On the basis of this relationship, the author adds for good measure that one should not leave one's home! From a form standpoint, this problem is very similar to #3 in this problem set. This is one of the keys to the GMAT—you must recognize the patterns that exist within the test and then capitalize on them when they appear. All the problems in the set include causality. From this point on, you must recognize causality when it appears and then properly respond to it. Your ability to recognize these forms will give you an advantage in both speed and confidence, and ultimately raise your score. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. This answer presents an alternate cause to the scenario presented above, namely that more comprehensive coverage leads to more news stories, not more violent

crime. Answer choice (B): This Opposite answer strengthens the argument. Answer choice (C): This answer strengthens the argument, if anything. Answer choice (D): This is an answer that many people select. The answer is incorrect because it fails to account for other violent crimes beside murder. Indicating that murder comprised a higher percentage of violent crimes in the old days than today does not address the total number of crimes being committed. Since the argument concludes that "violent crime is now out of control," this answer is incorrect. Consider the following example:

	Old Days	Today
Total number of murders	3	1,000
Total number of violent crimes	4	50,000
Percentage of violent crimes that are murders	75%	2%

In this example, although murder was a higher proportion of the violent crimes in the old days, today there are many more violent crimes. This shows that the scenario in the answer choice does not have to undermine the argument. In the chapter on Numbers and Percentages we will revisit the concept of proportion versus total numbers and discuss how the test makers use numerical ideas to attack test takers. Answer choice (E): The role played by magazines in informing the public does not address why there are so many stories about violent crime or if violent crime is now out of control.

72. The structure of the argument, in simplified form, is as follows: **Premise:** Disposable plastics make up an ever-increasing percentage of the waste they handle. **Conclusion:** Attempts to decrease the amount of plastic that people throw away in the garbage are failing. Based on our discussion of numbers and percentages, it should be clear that the conclusion is flawed: a numbers conclusion ("amount") cannot be drawn solely from percentage information because the overall total could change dramatically. As you attack the answer choices, look for an answer that addresses this error. Answer choice (A): The argument is about how people act when throwing away garbage, an issue that occurs before the waste management companies receive the trash. On the other hand, this answer discusses how the waste management companies dispose of plastics, an issue that occurs after they have received the waste. Because the two issues occur at different times in the cycle, this answer does not attack the argument and is incorrect. Answer choice (B): Like answer choice (A), this answer raises an issue that occurs after the waste management companies have received the waste. Answer choice (C): This answer addresses how people act prior to throwing away garbage, but it does not suggest that the amount of plastic that people throw away is not decreasing. The author would probably counter this statement by saying that regardless of the fact that people are more likely to save plastic containers, that tendency is only relative to glass and metal containers, and people are

still throwing away plastics in an ever-increasing percentage (and thus amount). Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. The answer indicates that the waste management companies no longer receive as much paper, glass, and metal as they used to. Since this clearly affects the amount of trash that they process, this would also affect the percentages of each type of waste. If the amount of paper, glass, and metal drops by a large amount, the percentage of plastic in the waste would rise even if the actual amount of plastic waste was reduced. The following example shows how this is possible:

	Previously	Now
Total garbage (in units)	100	20
Plastic garbage	20 (20%)	10 (50%) (in units)
Other garbage	80 (80%)	10 (50%) (in units)

In the example, plastic garbage has risen from 20% to 50%, but the actual amount of plastic waste has decreased from 20 units to 10 units. Consequently, because this answer raises a scenario that could disprove the argument, it is the correct answer. Answer choice (E): The amount of plastic being manufactured is not the issue in the stimulus; how much plastic is thrown away is the issue. In all respects this is a classic numbers and percentages Weaken problem. Accordingly, we can use this discussion to highlight a general rule for handling Weaken and Strengthen questions paired with numbers and percentages stimuli: To weaken or strengthen an argument containing numbers and percentages, look carefully for information about the total amount(s)— does the argument make an assumption based on one of the misconceptions discussed earlier?

73. The conclusion of the argument states that the rumored declines in automobile- industry revenues are exaggerated (a numerical statement), but the premises provided in support of this argument only address the market share percentages of the three groups that have automobile-industry revenues (percentage statements). The percentage statements used by the author only indicates that the percentages have changed, not whether overall revenue has changed:

	2 Years Ago	Today
Manufacturers share	65%	50%
Suppliers share	15%	20%
Service company share	20%	30%
Total market size in %	100%	100%

Although the composition of the market has changed in terms of the market share of each group, this fact tells us nothing about industry revenues because market shares will always add up to 100% regardless of the actual dollars involved. Thus, automobile-industry revenues could have risen dramatically and the percentages above could still be accurate. Answer choice (A): Although it is true that the possibility is left open that the statistics for the manufacturers share may come from a different source, this does not address the fundamental percentage-to-number error in the argument. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. The answer reveals the error of the author: the changing market shares of different groups have no impact on the actual amount of revenues. In all instances, the market shares will add up to 100%, so a discussion of shifts within this 100% is meaningless as far as making a determination of whether revenues declined. Answer choice (C): This is not a flaw of the argument. The author is allowed to simply note that the shares changed and use those facts to draw a conclusion. In the argument the conclusion is faulty, but not for the reason cited in this answer. Answer choice (D): The interrelationship of the groups named in the stimulus is not an issue in determining whether the conclusion is in error. Answer choice (E): The argument is about revenues, and information about profits will not reveal the error in the reasoning.

74. The correct answer choice is (D). The politician's argument is that the claims that price increases have averaged less than 3 percent are wrong, and in support of that position the politician cites several examples of price increases, each of which is greater than 3 percent. As mentioned in one of the chapter sidebars, "an average is a composite number, and within the average there can be a significant degree of variation and no single entity need embody the exact characteristic of the average (for example, the average weight of a 1 pound rock and a 99 pound rock is 50 pounds)." In making the argument, the politician has focused in on several individual examples while ignoring the fact that an average is a compilation of many different numbers. Answer choice (D) perfectly captures the essence of this sampling error. Answer choice (A): The argument does not contain a source or ad hominem attack. Simply stating that a position is wrong is different than criticizing the character of that person. Answer choice (B): To claim that the economists are wrong does not require showing that they are not pricing experts, and hence this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (C): The politician attempts to refute the position by providing evidence about large price increases for certain products. This process, which involves facts, is different than inferring that a claim is false because it has not been shown to be true. This answer choice would better describe an argument such as the following: "you have not proven that God exists, so there must be no God." Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. Citing several examples to refute an

average is a doomed strategy. Answer choice (E): There is no appeal to emotion present; percentages are used to make the argument.

75. As with all "Flaw in the Reasoning" questions, you must closely examine the relationship between the premises and the conclusion. In this argument, the editorial concludes that the advice of the economic advisor is untrustworthy and "the premier should discard any hope of reducing taxes without a significant decrease in government services." What support is offered for this position? Is a discussion of taxation issued presented? Is a discussion of the cost of government service provided? Is the position of the economic advisor dissected? No. According to the editorial, the only reason for ignoring the economic advisor's advice is that the advisor was convicted in his youth of embezzlement. This fact has no bearing on the argument made by the advisor, and focuses instead on attacking the person making the argument. This is a classic Source or ad hominem argument, and you should immediately seek an answer choice that reflects this fact. Answer choice (A): A proposal is not rejected in the stimulus; rather, a goal is advocated by the advisor and then the author questions whether that goal can be met by examining the background of the advisor. There is no discussion of a "particular implementation" that is likely to fail. Answer choice (B): This answer fails the Fact Test because there is no discussion of "what could happen otherwise" and no discussion of people's fears. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. The answer is a perfect description of a Source argument. Answer choice (D): This answer describes an evidence error in which a lack of evidence for a position is considered to hurt the claim. In the argument, the author improperly used evidence about the advisor, and this mistake is the error in the argument. Even though this introduced a flaw into the argument, from the author's perspective this was an attempt to use evidence against a position to hurt the position. The editorial did not state or indicate that there was a lack of evidence when forming the conclusion. Put simply, the editor thought he had a reason that undermined the claim; no argument was made that there was a lack of evidence. Answer choice (E): This answer describes Circular Reasoning. But, because the argument in the stimulus gives reasons for its position (albeit weak ones), the argument is not circular.

76. As always, look closely at the structure of the argument—specifically the relationships between the premises and conclusion. This breakdown presents the pieces in the order given in the argument: **Conclusion:** Cotrell is, at best, able to write magazine articles of average quality. **Sub-conclusion/Premise:** The most compelling pieces of evidence for this are those few of the numerous articles submitted by Cotrell that are superior. **Premise:** Cotrell, who is incapable of writing an article that is better than average, must obviously have plagiarized superior ones. Examine the

language in the conclusion ("Cotrell is, at best, able to write magazine articles of average quality") and the premise ("Cotrell, who is incapable of writing an article that is better than average"). The two are identical in meaning, and thus we have an argument with circular reasoning. Do not be distracted by the plagiarism argument in the middle of the text—that is a tool used to physically separate the conclusion and premise, making it harder to recognize that the two are identical. Answer choice (A): The argument does not ignore the potential counterevidence to the conclusion. The potential counterevidence is the few articles submitted by Cotrell that are superior, and the author dismisses them by claiming they are plagiarized. Although the reasoning used to dismiss the good articles is flawed, it is an attempt to address the evidence, and thus the argument cannot be said to "simply ignore the existence of potential counterevidence." Answer choice (B): This answer choice describes an Overgeneralization. The answer is wrong because the argument generalizes by dismissing the atypical occurrences (the superior articles), as opposed to generalizing from them. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer, and one of several different ways to describe Circular Reasoning (note that in the first problem in this set Circular Reasoning was an incorrect answer). More often than not, when you see Circular Reasoning it will be an incorrect answer choice, but you cannot be complacent and simply assume it will be wrong every time you see it. This problem proves that it does appear as the correct answer on occasion. Answer choice (D): This answer describes an Appeal to Authority. The answer fails the Fact Test because there is no reference to the judgment of experts. Answer choice (E): This answer is similar to answer choice (B). The answer starts out reasonably well—"it infers limits on ability." The argument does attempt this (depending on your definition of "infer"). But, does the argument make this inference based on a "few isolated lapses in performance?" No, the argument dismisses the few superior performances. In this sense the answer is Half Right, Half Wrong. Therefore, it is incorrect.

77. The structure of the argument is as follows: **Premise:** Food producers irradiate food in order to prolong its shelf life. **Premise:** Five animal studies were recently conducted to investigate whether this process alters food in a way that could be dangerous to people who eat it. The studies concluded that irradiated food is safe for humans to eat. **Premise:** These studies were subsequently found by a panel of independent scientists to be seriously flawed in their methodology. **Conclusion:** Irradiated food is not safe for human consumption. The author uses the fact that the studies were flawed to conclude that irradiated food is not safe for human consumption. Is this a reasonable conclusion? No. The studies purported to prove that irradiated food is safe. The fact that the studies used flawed methodology should have been used to prove that the studies did not prove that irradiated food was safe. Instead, the activist takes the argument too far, believing that because

the studies did not prove that irradiated food is safe, therefore irradiated food is not safe. Here "Some evidence against a position is taken to prove that position is false." Answer choice (A) perfectly describes this mistake. Answer choice (B): Use the Fact Test to easily eliminate this answer. Although past studies were shown to have methodological flaws, this evidence is not used to prove that methodologically sound alternatives are impossible to achieve. Answer choice (C): It's true, the argument does fail to consider the possibility that a non-flawed study might provide only weak support for its conclusion. But—and this is the critical question—is that a flaw in the reasoning of the activist? No, it is perfectly acceptable for the author to ignore an issue (non-flawed studies) that does not relate to his argument. Remember, the correct answer choice must describe a flaw in the reasoning of the argument, not just something that occurred in the argument. Answer choice (D): As with answer choice (C), the author has failed to consider the statement in this answer choice. But is this a flaw? No. The fact that animal testing is widely done and the results are accepted as indicative of possible problems with humans falls under the "commonsense information" discussed back in Chapter Two. Testing products on animals is a current fact of life, and the author made a reasoning error by failing to consider the possibility that what is safe for animals might not always be safe for human beings. Another way of looking at this answer is that it effectively states that the author has failed to consider that there is a False Analogy between animals and humans. He fails to consider it because the analogy between animals and humans is not false. Answer choice (E): Again, the activist does fail to establish this, but it is not necessary since the independent scientists only commented on the methodology of the study, not the irradiated food itself.

78. This argument contains an error of composition, one where the status-enhancing activities of most scientists are said to prove that the scientific community as a whole acts to enhance its status. Answer choice (A): This answer choice describes a compositional error, but not the one that occurs in the stimulus. The stimulus makes a judgment about the scientific community as a whole whereas this answer states that a judgment is made about each and every scientist. The community as a whole is different than each and every scientist, and thus this answer is incorrect. If you are thinking about the difference between the community as a whole and each member within the community, consider this statement: "Our community is against stealing." While that may be true, there may also be individual members of the community who are thieves and have no qualm about stealing. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer, and the answer describes the correct compositional error made by the philosopher. Answer choice (C): The answer is wrong—the author does not presume that the aim of personal career enhancement never advances the pursuit of truth. Consider the second sentence: "Accordingly, the professional activities of most scientists are

directed toward personal career enhancement, and only incidentally toward the pursuit of truth. The portion that states "only incidentally toward the pursuit of truth" indicates that the author allows for the possibility that career-enhancement activities can result in activities that pursue truth, even if only a little bit. But, since that contradicts the force of never, this answer is incorrect. This is the most frequently chosen wrong answer, as about 20% of test takers select this choice. Answer choice (D): This answer choice describes the Uncertain Use of a Term. The term "self-interested" is used only once in the argument (at the end of the first sentence), and the remainder of the argument is consistent with the generally accepted meaning of "self-interested" and uses that meaning unambiguously. Answer choice (E): The argument in the stimulus is about the relationships of parts and wholes, not about cause and effect. This answer, which describes reasoning from an effect in order to infer its cause, is therefore incorrect. An example of the reasoning described in this answer choice would be: "We know this window was broken this afternoon, and only one pane of the window was broken. We also know the pane was broken by a circular object. Therefore, a baseball was the cause of the broken window.

79. The argument opens with the classic "some people claim" construction. The legislators claim that the public finds many movies to be offensive, but the author rejects that position and concludes the legislators have misrepresented public opinion. The author uses the results of a survey as evidence. At first glance this argument looks very strong to most people, but then they encounter the question stem and realize there must be an error. This is a critical moment: when the question stem indicates an error is present but you did not realize one exists, you must go back to the stimulus and look for the error. Do not proceed to the answer choices thinking that the answers will clarify or reveal the error to you! The answer choices are designed to subtly draw your attention toward side issues, and it is far preferable that you find the error first and then find the answer that correctly describes the error. In this argument, the error occurs with the people that were surveyed in the poll. The last sentence reveals that the survey did not use an unbiased sample: "the respondents see far more current movies than does the average movie goer." As you might imagine, individuals who attend a large number of movies are by definition interested in the movies that are being shown, and are more likely to be aware of the level of violence and accepting of it. These tendencies make the sample unrepresentative of the general population—an error correctly described in answer choice (D). To help spot this error, note that the last sentence of the argument indicates that the surveyed individuals saw more movies than the average moviegoer. In other words, the survey respondents were not average. Answer choice (A): This answer describes a Source argument. The author uses survey data to attack the legislator's position and does not attack the credibility of the

legislators. Answer choice (B): The conclusion is based on the results of a survey about public opinion, not on subjective judgments of moral offensiveness. Answer choice (C): The argument is not about what causes antisocial behavior, so it is not a flaw that the argument fails to consider that violent movies increase the prevalence of antisocial behavior. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. Answer choice (E): The argument gives no data to suspect that the responses were not based on a random sampling of movies seen. The error is instead that the people surveyed represented a biased sample.

80. The premises of the argument contain a Formal Logic setup: HD = hot days in Hillview, SUL = smog reaches unsafe levels, WBE = wind blows in from the east. **HD□—s—□SUL. HD□—s—□WBE.** The combination of two "some" statements does not yield any inferences. Yet, the author draws a conclusion **(SUL□—s—□WBE)** on the basis of the relationship and you must identify the answer that explains why this conclusion is incorrect. Answer choice (A): There is no proof in the argument that the condition of WBE sometimes accompanies smog reaching unsafe levels—that is the mistake made by the author. The answer would be more attractive if it read as follows: "mistakes a condition (WBE) that sometimes accompanies hot days in Hillview for a condition that sometimes accompanies unsafe levels of smog". Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. When two "some" statements are joined, no inference can be drawn because the group common to both may be large enough that the two sub-elements do not overlap. For example, let's say there are 10 hot days in Hillview (HD), 1 day when the smog reaches unsafe levels (SUL), and 1 day when the wind blows in the east. Is it necessary that the 1 day when the smog reaches unsafe levels is the same day that the wind blows in from the east? No, but the argument concludes that is the case, and that error is described in this answer choice. For reference purposes, here is the answer choice with each abstract item identified in parentheses after the reference: "fails to recognize that one set (HD) might have some members in common with each of two others (SUL and WBE) even though those two other sets (SUL and WBE) have no members in common with each other". Answer choice (C): This answer choice describes the Uncertain Use of a Term, but the argument is consistent in its use of "unsafe." Therefore, this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (D): Each premise is plausible regardless of the truth of the conclusion. Answer choice (E): The argument does not feature causal reasoning. The conclusion clearly states that the two events happen together, but there is no attempt to say that one caused the other. If you chose this answer, try to identify the causal indicators in the argument—there are none.

81. This problem features an Evidence error. In this problem, the astronomer falls into the second error from the Errors in the Use of Evidence section, where "Lack of evidence against a position is taken to prove that position is true." Answer choice (B) describes this mistake. The astronomer's argument is structured as follows: **Premise:** I have asserted that our solar system does not contain enough meteoroids and other cosmic debris to have caused the extensive cratering on the far side of the moon. **Premise:** My opponents have repeatedly failed to demonstrate the falsity of this thesis. Their evidence is simply inconclusive. **Conclusion:** They [my opponents] should admit that my thesis is correct. Answer choice (A): The argument in the stimulus does not include a Source attack. There is a difference between stating that an opponent's argument is wrong (which is legitimate) and attacking the character of that opponent (a Source flaw). Always look to see if the author attacks the person or the position; a legitimate argument can sometimes appear questionable if the author uses weighted language such as, "My opponents are deluded in believing that my thesis is incorrect." Although that phrasing sounds like a personal attack, it is just a very strong way of stating that the author's opponents are incorrect, and it is not a Source attack. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. Answer choice (C): The astronomer's thesis asserts that meteoroids and other cosmic debris are not the cause of the cratering on the far side of the moon. By definition, therefore, the astronomer allows for alternate explanations of the cratering. Answer choice (D): There is no presumption in the argument similar to the one described in this answer. Answer choice (E): This answer describes the Uncertain Use of a Term, but the argument does not use "meteoroids" in an inconsistent way.

82. The argument contains a causal conclusion that asserts that good health is primarily caused by informed lifestyle choices (education): **Premise:** Some people believe that good health is due to luck. **Premise:** However, studies from many countries indicate a strong correlation between good health and high educational levels. **Conclusion:** Thus research supports the view that good health is largely the result of making informed lifestyle choices. The author errs in assuming that the correlation mentioned in the second premise supports a causal conclusion. Answer choice (A): A disproportionate number of people (about one in three) select this answer. Does the argument presume that to make an informed lifestyle choice a person must be highly educated? The author certainly believes that high educational levels lead to informed choices, but the answer suggests that the author thinks that the highly educated are the only people able to make an informed choice. The wording is too strong and this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (B): The author specifically notes that good health is largely the result of making informed lifestyle choices. There is no mention of poor health, nor need there be since the argument focuses on a correlation between good health and

education. Thus, overlooking the possibility mentioned in this answer choice is not an error. Answer choice (C): The author does not make the presumption that informed lifestyle choices are available to everyone, just that making good choices generally results in good health. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. Remember, the error of causality is one with many facets, and one of those errors is assuming that no third element caused both the stated cause and the stated effect. This answer choice indicates that a third element (such as money) could cause both the conditions described in the argument. Remember, if you know an error of causality occurred in the stimulus, look for the answer that uses the words cause or effect! This is the only answer to do so, and it is correct. Answer choice (E): Unlike many causal conclusions, the conclusion in this argument is not ironclad. The author specifically says that the effect is largely the result of the cause, and that statement implicitly allows other causes to lead to the effect, even if one does not make an informed lifestyle choice.

83. The stimulus is prefaced by the word "advertisement." One quirk of the GMAT is that every stimulus in GMAT history that has been preceded by this word has contained faulty or deceptive logic. Thus, whenever you see this word prefacing a stimulus, be on the lookout for misleading or flawed reasoning. The argument is constructed as follows: **Premise:** At most jewelry stores, the person assessing the diamond is the person selling it. **Premise/Sub-conclusion:** So you can see why an assessor might say that a diamond is of higher quality than it really is. **Premise:** All diamonds sold at Gem World are certified in writing. **Conclusion:** You're assured of a fair price when purchasing a diamond from Gem World. The first sentence contains a premise and conclusion that relies on the assumption that financial motivation might cause a person to lie about the quality of the item. According to the advertisement, at Gem World there is no such worry because the diamonds are certified in writing. Think for a moment—does that reasoning sound bulletproof? If you were standing there in the store and you were told that Gem World has written certification, wouldn't you ask who does the certification? This is the essence of personalizing the argument—place yourself in the situation and think how you would react. As soon as you do that in this question, the weakness in the argument becomes apparent. Then, since this is a Strengthen question, you can look for an answer choice that eliminates this weakness. Answer choice (E) addresses the hole in the argument by indicating that the individuals who provide the written certification are not the same people who are selling the diamonds at Gem World. There are other errors in the stimulus, such as assuming that a written certification equals a fair price. The certification may have no impact on the actual price of the diamond, or perhaps it could even be used to raise the price unjustly. These problems are ignored by the answer choices, and the test makers have that right. Answer choice (A): The conclusion addresses

the fair price of diamonds at Gem World, not other stores. Hence, the fact that other stores have written certification does not help the Gem World advertisement. Answer choice (B): This is an answer many people keep as a Contender. The answer is incorrect because it fails to address the point raised in the first sentence, namely that the person assessing the diamond has a personal stake in the outcome. This "accountability" issue is the central point of the argument, and without knowing the source of the certifications, this answer does not strengthen the argument. Answer choice (C): The argument asserts that a fair price is assured when purchasing a diamond at Gem World. No claim to comparative quality is made in the advertisement, and thus this answer does not strengthen the argument. Answer choice (D): If anything, this answer may hurt the argument since it indicates that a fair price may not be obtainable at Gem World due to price volatility. If prices change daily, then Gem World may be selling diamonds at a price that does not reflect current market value. However, the answer choice specifically mentions "the most expensive diamonds" and there is no guarantee that Gem World carries diamonds in this price range. So, at best, the answer choice has no effect on the argument and is therefore incorrect. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. As mentioned above, this answer addresses the separation of the certification writer from the seller and thereby strengthens the reasoning.

84. This problem is more difficult than the previous problem, in part because this is an Except question. As you recall, in a Strengthen Except question the four incorrect answers strengthen the argument and the correct answer either has no effect on the argument or weakens the argument. The statistician's statement begins with a variation of the classic GMAT construction "Some people claim..." As discussed in Chapter Two, when this construction is used, the author almost always argues against the claim made by the people. Here, a financial magazine has claimed that a survey proves that North Americans are more concerned about personal finances than politics. The statistician attacks two elements of the survey—there was a biased question and the sampling was faulty—and concludes the magazine's claim is questionable. Let us take a closer look at the statistician's two premises: 1. **One question was biased**. The key to understanding this claim is the phrasing of the question in the magazine: "the joy of earning money." By describing politics neutrally but describing earning money as a fun activity, the question inappropriately suggests to the magazine reader that one activity is more interesting than the other. This bias undermines the integrity of the survey. 2. **The sample was self-selecting**. A self-selecting sample is one in which individuals decide whether to participate. As you might expect, only those interested in the topic tend to participate and this creates a bias in the results. Because the survey was of subscribers to a financial magazine and not of the general North American population, those participating in sample

are not necessarily representative of North Americans and thus the magazine cannot reliably draw a conclusion about North Americans. Hence, the statistician's position appears reasonably strong. Nonetheless, you are asked to eliminate four answers that will strengthen it further. Earlier in this chapter we mentioned that the test makers believe in the validity of surveys, polls, etc. This question does not affect that position; in this situation the survey itself is the topic of discussion. Normally, that is not the case, and unless a survey or poll is shown to be questionable, you can typically accept the results knowing that the test makers believe survey results are valid. Answer choice (A): This answer asserts that the magazine has credibility issues and thereby supports the conclusion that there should be skepticism regarding the magazine's activities. Answer choice (B): This answer attacks the integrity of magazine surveys, and therefore supports the idea that there is reason to be skeptical of this magazine survey. Frankly, this is a weak answer because the validity of surveys in other magazines does not necessarily reflect on the validity of this magazine's survey. Nonetheless, only about five percent of test takers select this answer, as most people are able to recognize the intent of the test makers. Answer choice (C): This answer supports the argument because other surveys suggest that North Americans are not more concerned about finances than politics. Because this counters the claim of the magazine, the answer supports the statistician's conclusion that there is reason to be skeptical of the magazine's survey. Answer choice (D): Because the statistician has shown the survey to be biased and unrepresentative, this answer choice supports the statistician's conclusion. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. The answer has no impact on the statistician's argument because a third topic—social issues—was not part of the magazines' survey, nor does this answer suggest anything about the preference of North Americas for finance or politics. Because the answer has no impact, it is correct in a StrengthenX question.

85. The conclusion of the argument is based on the causal assumption that electronic devices cause a disturbance in low-power circuitry, creating an obvious danger: ED = electronic devices, I = interference with low-power circuitry, **ED□I.** The four incorrect answers will each strengthen the argument. As you attack the answer choices, look for the five causal strengthening answer types discussed earlier. Answer choice (A): This answer choice strengthens the argument by showing that when the cause is absent, the effect does not occur (Type C). Once the laptop was turned off, the cause disappeared, and according to the author's beliefs, the effect should then disappear as well. Answer choice (B): This answer strengthens the argument by showing that the data used to make the conclusion is accurate (Type E). By stating that all electronic devices emit radiation, the answer choice closes a hole in the argument. Answer choice (C): This answer choice strengthens the argument by showing that when the cause is absent,

the effect does not occur (Type C). Answer choice (D): This answer strengthens the argument by showing that the data used to make the conclusion is accurate (Type E). By showing that radiation can travel far enough to reach the cockpit, the cause is confirmed as possible. Answer choice (E): This is the correct answer. The fact that the circuitry and electronic devices became popular at the same time does not offer any supporting evidence to the contention that the electronic devices cause the interference with the low power circuitry. This answer has no effect on the argument and is therefore correct.

86. This question is much more difficult than the previous question, in part because one of the wrong answer choices is very attractive. The conclusion of the argument is a causal statement that the depletion of the ozone layer is the primary cause of the declining amphibian population: DO = depletion of the ozone layer, DA = decline of amphibian population, **DO□DA.** This conclusion is based on the fact that the ozone layer blocks harmful UV-B radiation, which amphibians are vulnerable to in both adult and egg form. Although the argument mentions UV-B radiation, which may sound impressive, the structure of the reasoning is easy to follow and no knowledge of the radiation is needed. The conclusion is clearly stated and easy to spot due to the indicator "thus." The question stem is a StrengthenX and therefore the four incorrect answers will each strengthen the argument. As with the previous question, look for answers that fit the five causal strengthening answer types discussed earlier. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. The answer fails to shed any light—positive or negative—on the connection between the ozone depletion and the amphibian population decline. Because the argument is concerned with the damage done by UV-B radiation, the fact that UV-B is the only damaging type of radiation blocked by ozone is irrelevant. Answer choice (B): This answer choice strengthens the argument by showing that when the cause is absent in non-amphibian populations, the effect does not occur (Type C). Answer choice (C): This answer strengthens the argument by showing that the areas of ozone depletion and amphibian decline match each other, thereby affirming the data used to make the conclusion (Type E). Answer choice (D): This was the answer most frequently chosen by test takers. This answer choice strengthens the argument by eliminating an alternate cause for the effect (Type A). Had the natural habitat become smaller over the years (from say, human encroachment or climatic change) then that shrinkage would have offered an alternate explanation for the decline in the amphibian population. By eliminating the possibility of habitat shrinkage, the stated cause in the argument is strengthened. Answer choice (E): This answer strengthens the argument by showing that the decline of the amphibians has mirrored the decline of the ozone layer, thereby affirming the data used to make the conclusion (Type E).

87. The theory discussed in the stimulus is a real scientific hypothesis, often called the "Pangaea Theory." Alfred Wegener, who has been the subject of other GMAT questions, theorized in 1915 that Pangaea was a "super-continent" composed of all landmasses. The theory is attractive because when the shape of today's continents is examined, the continents roughly fit together. The question stem specifically asks you to strengthen the hypothesis that South America and Africa were once joined. To do so, you must identify evidence about the landmasses, as this is the evidence that the hypothesis in the stimulus relies upon. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer, and this is the only answer that addresses the land. By tying the rock strata of each continent together, the answer supports the idea that there was once a physical connection between the two continents. A high percentage of test takers correctly identify this answer. Answer choice (B): This answer addresses people, not land. As with the earlier turtle question, the genetic similarity could be the result of humans from different areas sharing a large amount of DNA. Answer choice (C): The similarity of climates does not help establish that the landmasses were once connected. For example, the similarity could be the result of both continents largely straddling the equator. Answer choice (D): The language of the people does not mean the continents were connected. Australians and Americans share the same language, but this is because both areas were populated in modern times by English-speaking people from Britain. Answer choice (E): The resemblance of plants in both areas does not suggest or strengthen the idea that the continents were joined. Plant similarities could be the result of climate, or perhaps of man-made propagation efforts.

88. Following is the structure of the medical doctor's argument: **Premise:** Sleep deprivation is the cause of many social ills, ranging from irritability to potentially dangerous instances of impaired decision making. **Premise:** Most people today suffer from sleep deprivation to some degree. **Conclusion:** Therefore we should restructure the workday to allow people flexibility in scheduling their work hours. The first premise contains a causal assertion (not a causal conclusion), and the second premise indicates that most people suffer from the stated cause. This combination would lead to the conclusion that most people have a social ill (which could be irritability or impaired decision making, or something in between). However, the conclusion in the argument leaps over this idea to conclude that the workday should be restructured. The missing link—or assumption—in the argument is that restructuring the workday would alleviate the sleep deprivation. As always, whenever you see a gap in the argument, you can strengthen the argument by eliminating that gap. By relating sleep to work, answer choice (B) closes the gap in the argument. Answer choice (A): This is a tricky answer, and the key word is "overwork." While the author clearly believes that work schedules

affect sleep, this does not mean that employees are being overworked. For example, a person may be sleep deprived because they have to come into work at 8 A.M. Perhaps they have children so they must get up very early to take care of their family. The person might then work a normal eight hour day and be sleep deprived not because of overwork but because of rising early. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. By indicating that employees would avoid sleep deprivation with a revised workday, this answer affirms that the leap (or gap) made in the argument is not an unreasonable one. Answer choice (C): This answer may hurt the argument by suggesting that some individuals cannot be helped by the restructuring of the workday. At best, this answer has no impact on the argument because we already know that most people suffer from sleep deprivation to some degree. Answer choice (D): This answer addresses the fact that the number of hours worked per week has decreased. But the argument is not about the average number of hours worked, but rather the way that those hours affect sleep. Thus, this answer does not help the conclusion that people should be allowed flexibility in scheduling. Answer choice (E): The argument does not suggest that the workday will be shortened, only that the day will be structured so that people have more flexibility in scheduling their hours. Thus, knowing that the extent of sleep deprivation is proportional to the length of one's workday does not strengthen the argument.

89. The correct answer choice is (B) The conclusion of the argument reflects a causal relationship: MBTE = MBTE used, II = increased incidence of headaches, fatigue, and shortness of breath, **MBTE□II.** The question stem is a StrengthenX, and therefore the four wrong answers will support the argument. With a stimulus containing causal reasoning and a StrengthenX question, expect to see wrong answers that come from the five different "Causality and Strengthen Questions" categories to help the argument. Answer choice (A): This answer shows that when the cause is not present, then the effect is not present. Thus, the answer strengthens the argument and is incorrect. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. By indicating that the symptoms discussed in the stimulus can be the effects of several potentially serious public health threats, the author offers up possible alternate causes for the symptoms. These alternate causes would weaken the argument, and therefore this is the correct answer. Answer choice (C): This answer affirms that when the cause occurs, then the effect occurs. The answer therefore strengthens the argument. Answer choice (D): Like answer choice (C), this answer shows that when the cause is present, then the effect is present, and makes the case stronger by comparing that scenario to regions where the cause is absent. Answer choice (E): This answer choice strengthens the argument by showing that the data used to make the argument is accurate.

90. This stimulus also contains causal reasoning—the conclusion takes a correlation and turns it into a causal relationship: G = higher concentration of galanin in the brain, CFF = crave fatty foods, **G□CFF.** As with all causal arguments, once you identify the causality, you must immediately look to the question stem and then attack. In this instance, the author simply assumes that galanin is the cause. Why can't the fatty foods lead to higher concentrations of galanin? Answer choice (A): If anything, this answer choice may hurt the argument by showing that the cravings do not always lead to choosing fatty foods. But, since the author uses the phrase "consistently chose" to describe the choices of the rats, an answer stating that rats did not "invariably" choose fatty foods has no effect on the argument. Answer choice (B): This is a Shell Game answer because the test makers try to get you to fall for an answer that addresses the wrong issue. The argument discusses the concentration of galanin in the brains of rats; no mention is made of the fat content of the brains of rats. This answer, which focuses on the fat content in the brains of rats, therefore offers no support to the argument. Even though the brain might not contain more fat, a rat could still consistently choose and eat foods with a higher fat content. Answer choice (C): The argument is that galanin in the brain causes rats to crave fatty foods. The fact that galanin is in the food does not help that assertion and may actually hurt the argument. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. The answer strengthens the argument by eliminating the possibility that the stated causal relationship is reversed: if the rats had higher concentrations of galanin prior to eating the fatty foods, then the fatty foods cannot be the cause of the higher concentration of galanin. As discussed earlier in the chapter, this approach strengthens the argument by making it more likely that the author had the original relationship correct. Answer choice (E): This answer choice hurts the argument by suggesting that the causal relationship in the conclusion is reversed. Remember that in Strengthen questions you can expect to see Opposite answers, and this is one.

91. This problem makes the classic mistake of assuming that a larger percentage translates into a greater number (Misconception #6). According to the argument, because the Chef's Union requested a 10% raise and the Hotel Manager's Union requested only an 8% raise, the Chef's Union must have asked for more money than the Hotel Manager's Union. But, the argument never tells us how much the average member of each union makes, so the conclusion cannot be drawn with certainty, as shown by the following example:

	Chef	Hotel
Raise request	10%	8%
Average current salary	$1000	$10,000
Actual amount of raise requested	$100	$800

Even though the Chef's Union has asked for a greater percentage raise than the Hotel Manager's Union, it is still possible that the actual dollar amount of the Hotel Manager's Union request is greater. In this case, omitting the average current salary made by each member is tantamount to omitting the total amount made by the members, and thus, even though this problem uses averages, it trades on the mistake behind all the misconceptions discussed at the beginning of this chapter. To strengthen the argument, you must find an answer that indicates that the Chef's Union has a wage that is equal to or greater than the wage of the Hotel Manager's Union (the wage could also be very slightly below that of the Hotel Manager's Union). Answer choice (A): Because the conclusion is specific about the average dollar amount requested, and an average can be calculated regardless of how many members are in the union, this answer is irrelevant to the argument. Answer choice (B): The argument focuses on the size of each Union's raise request. Whether each union will receive the request is not at issue, and thus this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer. As discussed above, an answer that indicates that the Chef's Union has a wage that is equal to or greater than the wage of the Hotel Manager's Union would strengthen the argument. This is the answer you should look for when you read the question stem, and you should attempt to accelerate through the answer choices to find this answer. Answer choice (D): This answer refers to the raises given out last year. Unfortunately, this fails to address the current salaries of the union members. Answer choice (E): Like answer choice (D), this answer addresses previous raises, which does not tell us about current salaries. Both answer choice (D) and (E) attempt to lure you into the same mistake made by the author in the stimulus.

92. After you have narrowed your answer choices to the Contenders, or to the one answer choice you believe is correct, then apply the Variance Test. Do not apply the Test to all five answers! As with all questions, you must identify the conclusion of the argument. The conclusion states that if you buy a Bolter's power hedge trimmer, you know the trimmer is safe. In the question stem, we are asked to evaluate the truth of this conclusion. Each answer choice is then posed in the form of a question. The answer choice that is correct will contain the question that, when answered, will reveal whether the conclusion is strong or weak. In order to understand the application of the Variance Test, we will look at each answer choice in succession and thus we will not perform an initial analysis of the argument (on the GMAT we would analyze the stimulus closely). Also note that on the test we would not apply the Variance Test to each answer choice, only to the Contenders. For teaching purposes, we will apply the Variance Test to each answer in an effort to give you the best possible understanding of how the technique works. Answer choice (A) asks if National Laboratories has performed tests

on other machines from Bolter Industries. To apply the Variance Test, we should supply different and opposing answers to the question posed by the answer choice. First, try the answer "No." With this answer, would the fact that National Laboratories did not perform safety test on other Bolters machines affect the safety of the Bolter's hedge trimmer? No—this does not help us evaluate the safety of the hedge trimmer. What if the answer was "Yes"? Would the fact that National Laboratories performed safety tests on other Bolters machines affect the safety of the Bolter's hedge trimmer? Not at all. So, regardless of how we respond to the question posed in answer choice (A), our view of the conclusion is the same—we do not know whether the claim that the hedge trimmer is safe is good or bad. According to the Variance Test, if the answer is correct, then supplying opposite answers should yield different views of the conclusion. Since our assessment of the conclusion did not change, the Variance Test tells us that this answer is incorrect. The question in answer choice (B) is, "How important to the average buyer of a power hedge is safety of operation?" Again, apply the Variance Test and supply opposite answers to the question in the answer choice. In this case, try "Very Important" and "Not Important." If safety of operation is very important to a buyer of hedge trimmers, would that affect whether the Bolter's hedge trimmer itself is safe? No. Let's look at the opposite side: if safety of operation is not important at all to a buyer of hedge trimmers, would that affect whether the Bolter's hedge trimmer itself is safe? No. Because our view of the validity of the conclusion does not change when we consider different responses to the question posed in answer choice (B), the Variance Test tells us that answer choice (B) is incorrect. The question in answer choice (C) is, what were the results of the tests of Bolter's hedge trimmer? Using the Variance Test, supply one response that says, "Bolter's hedge trimmer failed the safety test." If this is true, then the conclusion is unquestionably weakened. Now supply a response that says, "Bolter's hedge trimmer passed the safety test." If this is true, then the conclusion is strengthened. So, depending on the answer supplied to the question posed in answer choice (C), our view of the validity of the argument changes: sometimes we view the conclusion as stronger and other times as weaker. Therefore, according to the Variance Test, this is the correct answer. In this instance, the Variance Test reveals the flaw in the argument: the author simply assumed that being tested means safety is assured. Nowhere in the argument did the author mention that the hedge trimmer passed the tests, and the Variance Test reveals this flaw. In answer choice (D), "Yes" and "No" responses do not change our view of the argument, and answer choice (D) is incorrect. In answer choice (E), "Yes" and "No" responses do not change our view of the argument, and answer choice (E) is incorrect. The key thing to note is that the Variance Test is applied according to the nature of each answer choice. Thus, with some answer choices we might supply responses of "Yes" and "No," and other

answer choices might require responses of "0%" and "100%," or "Very Important" and "Not Important." But, in each case, the answers we supply are opposites, and the correct answer is always the one that changes your view of the validity of the conclusion when those different responses are supplied. If your view of the argument does not change, then the answer choice is incorrect. Keep in mind that the Variance Test should only be applied to the contending answer choices. In the discussion above we applied it to every answer choice, but we did this simply to show how to effectively apply the Variance Test. During the actual test you would only want to apply the Variance Test to two or three answer choices at most.

93. The correct answer choice is (B). The conclusion of the argument is the first sentence: "George Orwell's book 1984 has exercised much influence on a great number of this newspaper's readers." The basis for this conclusion is that 1984 was the second most named book in a survey about influential books. The argument contains a serious error: just because 1984 came in second in the survey does not mean that "a great number" of readers selected it as influential. To illustrate this proposition, consider the following example: Number of people surveyed = 1000, Number of people naming the Bible as the most influential book = 999, Number of people naming 1984 as the most influential book = 1, In this example, 1984 has come in second, but no one would say this second place finish supports a conclusion that "1984 has exercised much influence on a great number of this newspaper's readers." You can expect the correct answer to address this issue. Answer choice (A): The survey in the argument asks readers to name the one book with the most influence in their lives; the number of books read does not affect this answer. To apply the Variance Test, try opposite answers of "1" and a large number, say "10,000." These numbers will not alter the evaluation of the argument, and thus this answer is incorrect. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer, but it can be difficult since the wording is a bit unusual. The question is intended to reveal how many people selected 1984 relative to the other choices, and this addresses the issue raised in the analysis of the stimulus. Consider how the variance test works for this answer choice: First try the response, "999." In this case, only one person selected 1984 as the most influential book, and the argument is greatly weakened. Next try the response, "501." In this instance, 499 people selected 1984 as the most influential book and the conclusion is strengthened (the other 501 people would have selected the Bible). Note that you cannot try a number larger than 501 because that would mean that the Bible was not named most often. Because the varied responses produce different evaluations of the argument, this answer is correct. Answer choice (C): This answer is not relevant to the columnist's argument. Apply the Variance Test to disprove this answer by using opposite answers of "0" and a very large number, such as "1 million." Answer choice (D): Because the

argument is about Orwell's 1984, other Orwell books chosen by the readers have no impact on the argument. Apply the Variance Test, using opposite answers of "0" and a small number such as "10" (Orwell wrote dozens of essays, but not dozens of books). Answer choice (E): The survey in the argument addresses influence, not the actual reading of the book. A person might be influenced by a book like the Bible through church teachings, etc. without actually having read the book. To apply the Variance Test, try opposite answers of "0" and "1000."

94. The correct answer choice is (A) Yang's argument is as follows: **Premise:** Important does not mean essential. **Premise:** No flying machine closely modeled on birds has worked; workable aircraft are structurally very different from birds. **Premise/Sub-conclusion:** So thinking machines closely modeled on the brain are also likely to fail. **Conclusion:** In developing a workable thinking machine, researchers would therefore increase their chances of success if they focus on the brain's function and simply ignore its physical structure." Yang's conclusion is very strong: "simply ignore the physical structure of the brain" when developing a thinking machine. As you might expect, this extreme conclusion and the relatively weak supporting evidence plays a role in the correct answer. Also note that the question stem uses the word "whether" to turn each answer choice into a question. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. The Variance Test proves the answer: If the answer is "Yes, they did provide crucial information" then developers should not ignore the physical structure of the brain because the reasoning used to make that judgment (via the flying machine analogy) is faulty. If the answer is "No, they did not provide crucial information" then the argument is strengthened because the analogy suggests it would be acceptable to ignore the physical structure of the brain. Because the varied responses produce different evaluations of the argument, this answer is correct. Answer choice (B): The conclusion is about ignoring the physical structure of the brain, and information about what constitutes thinking will not help evaluate the argument. Apply the Variance Test to disprove this answer by using opposite answers of "Yes" and "No." Answer choice (C): The relative amount of time spent on each project is not an issue in the stimulus. Apply the Variance Test to disprove this answer, using opposite answers of "Yes, as much time was spent" and "No, not as much time was spent." Answer choice (D): The argument does not involve the background of the researchers and the projects they work on, only what they should focus on when trying to succeed. Hence, this answer is incorrect. Apply the Variance Test, using opposite answers of "Yes, they are among those trying to develop thinking machines" and "No, they are not among those trying to develop thinking machines." Answer choice (E):The analogy in the argument is about flying machines that were modeled on birds. The possibility that some flying machines failed that were not modeled on birds has no place in the

argument. Apply the Variance Test, using opposite answers of "Yes, some failed" and "No, none failed."

95. The paradox in the argument is that the provinces and states that have more stringent safety requirements also have higher average rates of accidents. Even so, experts agree that the more stringent requirements actually are effective. This type of "surprisingly low/high rate of success" scenario has appeared in a number of Resolve the Paradox questions, including the following: An anti-theft device is known to reduce theft, but cars using the anti- theft device are stolen at a higher rate than cars without the device. **Explanation:** The device is placed on highly desirable cars that are prone to being stolen, and the device actually lessens the rate at which they are stolen. A surgeon has a low success rate while operating, but the director of the hospital claims the surgeon is the best on the staff. **Explanation:** The surgeon operates on the most complex and challenging cases. A bill collector has the lowest rate of success in collecting bills, but his manager claims he is the best in the field. **Explanation:** The bill collector is assigned the toughest cases to handle. These scenarios underscore the issue present in the question: other factors in the situation make it more difficult to be successful. With the car safety requirements, you should look for an answer that shows that there is a situation with the roads that affects the accident rates. A second possible explanation is that the seat belts are not actually used by a majority of drivers and the safety inspections are not made or are rubber-stamp certifications. This answer is less likely to appear because it is fairly obvious. Answer choice (A): The stimulus specifies that annual safety inspections— regardless of what is examined—are already in place. Therefore, this answer does not explain why the average rate of accidents is higher in those states. Answer choice (B): Assuming that overconfidence leads to accidents, the answer could support the assertion that states with more stringent requirements have higher accident rates. But, this answer would also suggest that the experts are wrong in saying that more stringent standards reduce accident rates, so this answer cannot be correct. Answer choice (C): This is the correct answer, and the answer conforms to the discussion above. If the roads are generally more dangerous, then the stringent requirements could reduce the accident rate while at the same time the accident rate could remain relatively high. Since this scenario allows all sides of the situation to be correct and it explains how the situation could occur, this is the correct answer. Answer choice (D): This answer supports only one side of the paradox. The answer confirms that the experts are correct, but it does not explain why these provinces have higher accident rates. Thus, it does not resolve the paradox. Answer choice (E): This answer appears attractive at first, but the number of miles of roadway in the provinces is irrelevant because the stimulus specifically references "accidents

per kilometer driven." Since the accident rate is calculated as per-miles-driven, the actual number of miles of roadway is irrelevant.

96. The paradox in this problem is that alcohol drinkers who surpass the threshold for calorie intake should gain weight, but they do not. Most people, upon reading the stimulus, prephrase an answer involving exercise or some other way to work off the expected weight gain. Unfortunately, a perfect match to this prephrase does not appear, and instead students are faced with a tricky answer that preys upon this general idea while at the same time it fails to meet the circumstances in the stimulus. Answer choice (A): Read closely! The stimulus specifies that people who regularly drink two or three alcoholic beverages a day thereby exceed the necessary caloric intake. This answer, which discusses individuals who avoid exceeding the caloric intake necessary, therefore, addresses a different group of people from that in the stimulus. Since information about a different group of people does not explain the situation, this answer is incorrect. This answer is attractive because it uses the idea of getting rid of or avoiding calories, but it violates one of the precepts of the stimulus. **Out of scope!** Remember, you must look very closely at the circumstances in the stimulus and make sure that the answer you select matches those circumstances. Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. If the excess calories are dissipated as heat, then there would be no weight gain. Hence, alcohol drinkers can consume excess calories and still not gain weight. Some students object to this answer because the situation seems unrealistic. Can heat dissipation actually work off dozens if not hundreds of calories? According to the question stem, yes! Remember, the question stem tells you that each answer choice should be taken as true. Since this answer choice clearly states that the excess calories tend to be dissipated, you must accept that as true and then analyze what effect that would have. Answer choice (C): The stimulus discusses "people who regularly drink two or three alcoholic beverages a day and thereby exceed the caloric intake necessary." This answer choice addresses a different group of people than those discussed in the stimulus. **Out of scope!** Answer choice (D): The first flaw in this answer is that it simply states that individuals consuming alcohol do not gain weight but it offers no explanation for why these people have no weight gain. The second flaw in the problem is that it addresses the wrong group of people. The stimulus discusses people who drink two or three alcoholic beverages a day; this answer addresses people who drink more than three alcoholic beverages a day. **Out of scope!** Answer choice (E): Again, this answer discusses a different group of people than those in the stimulus. The stimulus discusses people who exceed the necessary caloric intake; this answer addresses people who do not meet the necessary caloric intake. **Out of scope!**

97. The correct answer choice is (B). The paradox in the stimulus is: for manufacturers who improved job safety training during the 1980s there was an increase in the number of on-the-job accidents. Answer choice (A): This answer does not provide an explanation for the paradox in the stimulus. Some students eliminate this answer because it addresses the transportation industry, but information about the transportation industry could be used to analogically explain the issue in the manufacturing industry (but, to be correct the answer would have to offer some further relevant parallel between the two industries). Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. If the workforce is increasing, more accidents would be expected. Thus, safety training could improve the safety of the work environment (as measured by average number of accidents per worker, for example) while at the same time the number of total accidents could increase. Because this answer allows both sides to be true and it explains the circumstance in the stimulus, this answer is correct. In Chapter Fifteen we will discuss average versus total numbers, and that will further explain the construction of this question. Answer choice (C): This would explain an increase in accidents before job safety training, but the issue in the stimulus is an increase after the safety training. Answer choice (D): This answer further confuses the issue. If the fluctuation was random, that could explain how an increase in accidents could follow safety training. By stating that the increase was not random, a possible cause of the scenario is eliminated. Answer choice (E): This answer shows that the level of safety was at least minimal prior to the safety training, but this does not help explain why an increase in accidents followed the training.

98. The correct answer choice is (A). In rough terms, the paradox in the stimulus is that smokers of one pack of low-nicotine cigarettes have an identical nicotine level at the end of the day as smokers of one pack of high-nicotine cigarettes. This similarity must be explained by a similarity, not a difference. Answer choice (A): This is the correct answer. The answer choice indicates that there is a similarity in the blood such that the maximum amount of nicotine absorbed is identical for everyone. Because the maximum amount of nicotine absorbed per day is equal to the nicotine in a pack of low-nicotine cigarettes, each person absorbs the amount of nicotine equal to the low-nicotine pack regardless of the type of cigarette smoked. Additional nicotine is not absorbed into the blood of smokers of the high-nicotine brand. Since this answer explains the paradox, this is the correct answer. Answer choice (B): Read closely! The stimulus is specifically about smokers who "smoke one pack of cigarettes per day." This answer discusses smoking different numbers of cigarettes and thus it fails to meet the circumstances in the stimulus. Answer choice (C): This answer confuses the issue because it indicates that most nicotine is absorbed into the system. From this fact one would expect that those smoking high-nicotine cigarettes would have higher

nicotine levels than low-nicotine cigarette smokers. Answer choice (D): The stimulus does not address the level of tar in cigarettes, nor can we make any judgment about how tar affects nicotine levels. Answer choice (E): This would apply to any smoker, and as this addresses an effect that occurs after smoking is stopped, it does not help us understand why the nicotine rose to identical levels regardless of the kind of cigarette smoked.

99. The correct answer choice is (B). The paradox in the stimulus is that raisins contain more iron per calorie than grapes even though the two are almost identical in composition. But there is a difference: "some of the sugar in grapes is caramelized" as the grapes are dried in the sun. Since this is the only stated difference between the two that could affect the calorie count (water has no calories), you should focus on an answer that discusses this difference. Answer choice (A): This answer essentially states that grapes are bigger than raisins, and you need several bunches to equal a handful of raisins. The issue is not the size of the grapes or raisins! Answer choice (B): This is the correct answer. If the iron content in the raisins and grapes is identical, but raisins have fewer calories for counting purposes, then the iron per calorie will be higher for raisins, as highlighted by the following example:

	Raisins	Grapes
Units of Iron	100	100
Countable Calories	10	20
Iron per Calorie	10	5

Note that the paradox could have addressed any common element between raisins and grapes (such as fiber or fat), and raisins would always have the higher per calorie content since they contain fewer countable calories. Answer choice (C): The paradox in the stimulus does not involve the rate at which the body can absorb iron or any other nutrient. This answer misses the point and is incorrect. Answer choice (D): The availability of raisins and grapes is not an issue in the stimulus. The answer then discusses iron, but the point made about yearly intake is irrelevant. Answer choice (E): The comparison in the stimulus is between grapes and raisins. This answer, which brings in other food items, is irrelevant.

100. The correct answer choice is (D). The situation in the stimulus is that vervet monkeys use different calls depending on where predators come from. The correct answer must explain why the calls are different (again, difference versus similarity is an issue). Note that the stimulus does not contain a true paradox, just an odd situation that is presented without explanation. Answer choice (A): This answer states that vervet monkeys vary the calls in order to indicate the number of predators, but the answer does not explain why different calls are used for land versus air predators. This answer is attractive because it shows that different calls can be used to indicate different things, but it is wrong because it does not explain the behavior of the monkeys as

described in the stimulus. Answer choice (B): This answer addresses only land-based predators and does not explain the difference described in the stimulus. Answer choice (C): This answer states that the predators using land attacks are different from the predators using air attacks, but this information does not explain why vervet monkeys use different calls to indicate that fact. Answer choice (D): This is the correct answer. Because vervet monkeys react to predators in different ways, they would need to know if the predator was coming by land or air. Hence, the different calls are used to tell the monkeys whether they should climb trees or dive into the foliage. Since this answer explains the behavior of vervet monkeys, this answer is correct. Answer choice (E): The diet of selected predators of vervet monkeys is irrelevant and does not help explain why vervet monkeys use different calls depending on the direction of the attack.