

## **CRITICAL REASONING – DAY : 04**

### **BOLD-FACED QUESTIONS**

#### **1. B**

**Second boldface:** Position that the argument supports/the main conclusion: the number of new jobs created this year will fall short of last year's record.

**First boldface:** A prediction that if true, will support the main conclusion. How do we know it's a prediction? Because it says 'surely... X will not happen...'

Let's look at the first halves of all the answer choices: C is out because the first boldface is not an objection that the argument rejects; D is out because the first boldface supports and not opposes a position that the argument supports. E is also out because the first is not an objection rejected by the argument.

Now let's look at the second halves of the remaining choices: There is only 1 conclusion in the argument, the main conclusion, viz the second boldface. So A is also out and B is the right answer.

#### **2.D**

**First boldface:** A position/explanation/claim that the argument opposes.

**Second boldface:** A finding/evidence that supports the position that the argument defends.

The position that the argument defends: the real reason why aerospace engineers over fifty rarely produce groundbreaking work is not that they have simply aged but rather that they generally have spent too long in their field.

Let's look at the first halves of the options: E is out because the first boldface is not defended by the argument. Now let's look at the second halves of the remaining choices: A is out because the second boldface is not an objection raised against the position that the argument defends. In B, 'that position' refers to the position mentioned in the first half of the choice, which is the position that the argument opposes. But the second boldface opposes and not supports this position. So B is also out. In C, the second boldface is not a finding used to support 'that' explanation (that ageing is the reason for loss of creative capacity). C can also be eliminated. Thus, D is the right answer. According to D, the first is an explanation the argument challenges (ageing is the reason for loss of creative capacity) and the second is a finding on which this challenge is based (a disproportionately large number of the aerospace engineers who produce highly creative work beyond the age of fifty entered their field at an older age than is usual).

### 3. C

The first boldface is something that the argument says is true, but will not happen in this particular case. The prediction/main conclusion/position supported by the argument is : eliminating the state requirement that dental advertisements must specify fees for specific services would almost certainly increase rather than further reduce consumer's dental costs.' The second boldface is an event/circumstance/consideration that supports this main conclusion/position that the argument supports/defends.

Let's look at the first halves of each answer choice: B is incorrect because it says that the first boldface is something that the activist says will happen in the case at hand – but the activist is actually claiming that this will not hold true in the current case. D is also incorrect because it says that the first boldface is something that supports the argument's prediction, whereas it actually does not.

We are now left with A, C and E. Let us examine the second halves of each of these: A is incorrect because the second boldface is not a consequence of what is said in the first. In E, the 'position' refers to the 'main position that the activist defends' – but this can be found in the line beginning 'However...' – the second boldface is something that supports the main conclusion and not the main conclusion itself. So E is also incorrect, leaving us with the right answer choice C.

## **TIMED TEST – 18 minutes**

### 1. B

We need to understand the underlying assumption behind the conclusion "The governing body's decision to sell some immature works by famous artists will not diminish the quality of the museum's collection".

- A. Irrelevant to whether the quality of the museum's collection is affected.
- B. Correct. The curator has opined that certain paintings in the collection are immature and do not add to the museum's quality. So selling these paintings maybe acceptable. Negating this means that the governing body may be selling paintings that are not immature (i.e. paintings that actually add value to the museum's collection.)
- C. Who purchased the paintings. Irrelevant.
- D. Who will buy the paintings. Irrelevant.
- E. How to exhibit the paintings. Irrelevanttruly appreciated only if it is displayed in a carefully designed and well-maintained gallery.

**2. B**

- A. Other means to raise funds. Out of scope. We are concerned only whether the sale of some paintings will affect the collection's quality.
- B. Correct. If it is true that even these 'immature' works add value to the museum, selling them will affect the collection's quality.
- C. What critics thought about these at some time in the past. Irrelevant.
- D. Irrelevant.
- E. How much the works fetch. Irrelevant.

**3. D**

4 out of 5 choices weaken the conclusion. The right answer either strengthens or does not affect the conclusion in any way. The stocks recommended by the experts performed less successfully as compared to the market as a whole during a 10-year period. Therefore, one should not listen to such experts.

- A. This is just the past year's data. If anything, it weakens the argument that the experts' advice is not good.
- B. Again, weakens the argument by saying that of all portfolios selected through various means, the portfolio selected by the experts performed best. Weakens the argument.
- C. This is pointing out a flaw in the way the stock performance was measured. Again, weakens the argument.
- D. Correct. This lends support to the fact that the performance measurement was a thorough and effective process. Strengthens the argument that the experts' advice was flawed.

**4. E**

The conclusion here is the hypothesis that the Diatonic scale was developed and used thousands of years before it was adopted by western music. This the argument says because a bone flute with a structural design capable of playing the third through sixth note of the seven note Scale was found in a Neanderthal campsite.

The link that can be challenged is between the presence of such a structure vs that being indicative of developments and usage of the tone itself.

- A. That it was the only instrument is not relevant to the argument
- B. So what if there was another instrument capable of playing the diatonic scale that dated before the Neanderthal time frame? Flip this statement around – it doesn't weaken the argument. This option is irrelevant.
- C. Doesn't provide any substantiation to prove that the diatonic scale was developed thousands of years back.
- D. Doesn't help substantiate whether the flutes were capable of using / producing the diatonic scale
- E. Yes- correct. If this were found to be true – it fixes a flaw in the argument (that the bone may not have been able to play the diatonic scale). IF you flip this option – it breaks the argument.

#### 5. D

The conclusion here is that Carpenters before 1930 were more skilled than carpenters now. This is substantiated by the fact that the carpentry in the hotels from 1930 that the writer visited were generally more superior to those of recently built hotels.

The flaw here is that the sample set might be biased. If it is found that the hotels that have survived through time are the ones that were built with great quality – then that would cast doubt on the author's conclusion.

Option D does exactly this and is the correct answer.

- A. other structures- out of scope
- B. more guests – not relevant
- C. That materials were not significantly different strengths the assertion that the conclusion makes – Eliminate
- D. OA
- E. Apprenticeship – irrelevant

#### 6. A

The key here is to understand the language used “prohibited from **increasing** product's price” an explanation could be that new drugs were brought into the market!

- A. Option a does exactly this – this could explain why the expenses increased.
- B. That the population increased does not explain why the “per-capita” expense increased – Eliminate
- C. That manufacturers maintained high profits does not explain why per-capita expense went up
- D. This makes the discrepancy worse – does not explain why per-capita expense increased
- E. That they ceased making expensive drugs does not help explain why per-capita expense increased.

**7. B**

The conclusion here is that “blocking current access routes to vehicles will prevent population decline of tortoises”

- A. possessing as pets – Irrelevant
- B. if they are Not able to enforce the regulation on points other than the access points then the plan might not have the desired effect; on the other hand, if they are able to enforce  
– the plan will most probably succeed. – this option is therefore relevant.
- C. time of activity of tortoises – irrelevant: since restriction is for the entire day and not parts of the day.
- D. People on foot- irrelevant since the premise states that vehicles will be required to collect the tortoises easily.
- E. Has no relevance to the plan to introduce restrictions. – Eliminate

**8. B**

- A. We know nothing about the profits they made – no context of price is provided here – eliminate
- B. This is true – Cigarette consumption increased by 3.4 percent but population increased by 5 percent. Therefore, consumption of cigarettes didn’t keep-up with the increase in population.
- C. Proportion of nonsmokers – DKCS; we know nothing about no of smoker’s vs nonsmoker’s. We only know the increase of tobaccos sale, cigarette sale and population – Eliminate
- D. Profits is out of scope
- E. We can’t say anything about people who switched or didn’t switch. No information to support this is provided - eliminate.

**9. A**

A: Jeremy makes his uncle’s example (a single counterexample) to refute the probabilistic conclusion.

B: We don’t know if this information is unavailable to experts in the field. C:

The case that Jeremy cites is not explicitly discounted.

D: No such presupposition is evident in the argument.

E: We don’t know anything about how the physicians came to this conclusion.

**10.C**

A: The claim isn't internally inconsistent.

B: No general principles are cited in the argument.

C: The claim here is 'societies can attain more benefit than harm from a revolution'. Evidence that supports this claim is the American Revolution. This evidence is undermined by pointing out how the American Revolution isn't a very good example of a typical revolution.

D: No view is justified; there is no 'series' of examples.

E: Strengths and weaknesses of two positions are not examined here.