

Preptest 44 Review

 Chose Wrong Answer

 Right Answer

Summary: took PT 45 after a full 8 hours of sleep, technique is rusty, got destroyed by reading comprehension (stopped PT midway)

Raw Score:

Scaled Score:

Trends:

SECTION 1: Logical Reasoning

SECTION 2: Reading Comprehension

SECTION 4: Logical Reasoning

SECTION 1: LOGICAL REASONING

1. ID conclusion

Strategy: underline conclusion (first sentence) (“the obsession with consumption...has prevented us from understanding the true nature of economic well-being”)

(A) conclusion: (consumption alone is not enough)

(B) premise: (sentence 2)

(C) outside scope: (“measures” to assess consumption is not mentioned in the stimulus)

(D) outside scope/term shift: (“obsolescence” is not discussed in the stimulus) (the fact that our stuff needs to be replaced does not necessarily make them obsolete)

(E) opposite meaning

2. Weaken

Strategy:

- ID argument core
- identify main assumption

Argument Core:

1. Conclusion (last sentence) (chemicals in the atmosphere don't harm humans by increased UV exposure)
2. Premise (last sentence) (supernova had greater effect of CLF but no effect on ancestors)

Little effect by supernova ----- chemicals don't harm by UV

Assumption: because the supernova did not as much damage, and it would have been worse, the release of CLF should not harm either

(A) outside scope/wrong subject: (distinction between extraterrestrial and terrestrial influences is not mentioned or relevant to the stimulus) (also concerned about effects of ozone layer, not what's happening to the ozone layer itself)

(B) wrong subject: (concerned about effects of ozone layer, not what's happening to it)

(C) weakens the main assumption: (that if supernova was fine, these chemicals will be fine)

(D) unclear bearing on assumption/wrong subject: unclear how the regeneration rate is relevant to the effects of the ozone layer and the harm it could bear on humans; focus is on ozone layer, not the effects of ozone layer

(E) modality/unclear bearing on assumption: (too weak) (we don't know if these genetic changes are ones that better equip us now to deal with the chemicals, or if it made our ancestors predisposed to deal with the chemicals)

3. NA

Strategy:

- ID argument core

Argument Core:

only supervisor in the department (S3)----- task must be assigned to Parker
& Larson can't (S1)
& Frank can't (S2)

Assumption(s)

- Only supervisors can be assigned
- If Larson & Frank both can't, Parker must do the task

(A) premise booster (it doesn't matter if they're qualified, we need to know what happens if Frank/Larson is unavailable) (NT: Larson does NOT have the assertiveness the task requires)

(B) NT (the task CAN be assigned to anyone other than a supervisor in the shipping department) (this NT destroys the argument because then we cannot conclude that Parker must be assigned to the task)

(C) premise booster (S2; we already know he doesn't have the assertiveness) (NT: if Frank had the assertiveness the task requires, Frank would NOT be assigned the task)

(D) premise booster (explains why Frank can't do it) (NT: The task CAN be assigned to someone who has any kind of scheduling conflict)

(E) ~explains conclusion ("assertiveness this task requires": does not explain if Parker has the assertiveness required, nor are we told that this trait is relevant to being assigned the task) (NT: No one who is not a supervisor does NOT have the assertiveness this task requires)

4. Describe method of reasoning

Strategy:

- ID argument core

P - P - P - IC - P - MC

Opposing Point - IC - P - MC

- presents argument that the rest of the stimulus will counter
- uses same premises to come to a different conclusion (as consumption decreases, argument 1 says x will happen, author says y will happen)

AC: consumption decreases -- corporate earnings decrease -- flow into investments other than stocks

(A) "questions truth of its premises" -- author uses premises to come to a different conclusion

(B) "self-serving reasons" (outside of scope; author does not mention reasons for analyst reasoning)

(C) "alternative conclusion" -- author uses premise to come to an alternate conclusion

(D) intermediate conclusion (optimistic. THEREFORE, money flows elsewhere)

(E) opposite meaning (argues against analyst conclusion)

6. Disagree

Strategy: identify individual conclusion, figure out the element that is shared (usually subject matter), and then figure out where they disagree about the subject matter (must be addressed in both passages)

M: exaggerate → pop music fails to represent reality (is bad)

T: performs other functions → pop music isn't meant to represent reality (is not bad)

Is pop music bad art because it fails to represent reality?

(A) outside scope/term shift ("consoling illusions" vs. "fails to represent reality accurately")

(B) Maria only

(C) broad scope (we don't know what all art should do)

(D) matches argument core (addresses the "represent reality" fact, and whether or not that quality speaks to "good art")

(E) N/A (both take it as given that popular music is an art form)

7. Describe

AC: too burdensome to put everything on list ----- proposal should not be implemented

(A) opposite meaning (does not want to "achieve the objectives of the proposal")

(B) matches argument core (too burdensome = absurd consequences)

(C) opposite meaning (does not want to achieve the ends of the proposal; does not use specific examples)

(D) not addressed (there is no analogy)

(E) not addressed (does not question motivation of those)

8. MBT

- Diagram (if possible)
- Summarize premises

Diagram:

Trust $\rightarrow$ MR	/MR $\rightarrow$ /Trust
LLR $\rightarrow$ Trust	/Trust $\rightarrow$ /LLR
LLR $\rightarrow$ NA	/NA $\rightarrow$ /LLR
LLR $\rightarrow$ MR & NA	/MR or /NA $\rightarrow$ LLR

(A) contrapositive (/MR or /NA $\rightarrow$ LLR) (lacks NA)

(B) outside scope ("presupposes trust")

(C) converse (MR & NA $\rightarrow$ LLR)

(D) comparative (we don't know what is longer lasting between the relationships)

(E) converse (NA $\rightarrow$ LLR)

9. Principle

counterexample + $\rightarrow$ inappropriate use
"as so and so said" or "as saying goes"

(A) no counterexample

(B) no counterexample (counterexample would be that they shouldn't be surprised)

(C) no counterexample

(D) no counterexample

(E) direct counterexample (ski trip did not end well)

10. Disagree

R: freedom $\rightarrow$ decline in great quality

J: inferior has not been forgotten $\rightarrow$ contemporary art isn't actually inferior

Contemporary art -- inferior or good quality?

(A) matches core

(B) R only

(C) R only

(D) J only

(E) outside scope (neither addresses if one can correctly "assess" quality)

11. Parallel Flaw

Avg. cost increases → individual costs increases

Flaw: whole - part

(A) whole - whole

(B) no flaw

(C) whole - part

(D) no flaw

(E) no flaw

12. Weakens

quick recovery +
slow decomposition

→

dioxin not cause of abnormalities

Assumption: dioxin can't cause abnormalities because not in environment

(A) premise booster (explains quick recovery)

(B) premise booster (explains slow decomposition)

(C) not in vicinity of mill but in downstream

(D) background (we don't need to know recovery or not, we need to know why they might need to recover)

(E) attacks premise (given that there is some relationship between hormone concentrations and reproductive abnormalities)

13. Flaw

Successful → adapted OR revived

Right conclusion: /Adapted & /revived → /Successful

Conclusion: /successful → /adapted & revived

Contrapositive

(A) opposite (if either one did it, there's a possibility it could be successful)

(B) not flaw (does explain)

(C) outside scope (does not mention "aesthetic work" or "commercial success")

(D) challenges premise (this is given to us)

(E) fancy wording for contrapositive (not satisfying one sufficient condition does not preclude its satisfying a different sufficing condition)

14. Strengthen

Permit → reveal information & poses minimum risk

/RI or /PMR → study should be prohibited

Assumption: study needs to either /RI or /PMR

- (A) outside scope (other sufficient conditions)
- (B) weaken (this might suggest that the study poses minimal risk)
- (C) outside scope (informed consent not relevant in this stimulus)
- (D) background booster (we don't care about hormonal imbalances and their effects; we care about this one drug that might be able to do something about them)
- (E)** strengthens (this suggests that we don't know the risks, meaning that it potentially be very risky)

15. Flaw

drivers have right to use roads → (won't have the right) → remedy unfair

- (A) unrelated to main premise and conclusion (even if speed bumps don't reduced speed, how does this make the remedy unfair)
- (B) contradicts stimulus (we can presume that speed bumps were installed because drivers caused high speeds)
- (C) unrelated to main premise and conclusion (complain → fairness?)
- (D) term shift (right to use vs. right to restrict)
- (E)** addresses assumption

16. Weakens

judge unworthy → not publish, destroy immediately

Assumption: if they judge it to be unworthy, it probably is unworthy

- (A) detail creep (adds detail to background unrelated)
- (B) narrow scope ("who achieve fame"); might strengthen (if they know it's going to be published, that might be even more reason for them to destroy it)
- (C)** exactly (same premise -- judge to be unworthy, different conclusion -- it actually is not unworthy)
- (D) attacks premise (suggests that authors would not judge something unworthy)
- (E) attacks background (stimulus addresses heirs who do decide to publish)

17. Conclusion

Background -- Conclusion -- Premise

- (A) premise
- (B) conclusion
- (C) premise (contrapositive)
- (D) background
- (E) opposite of premise

18. Weakens

flint beyond hunting use → aesthetic sense

- (A) attacks premise (are highly polished)
- (B) detail creep (how does unadorned cave paintings relate to the idea of aesthetic sense)
- (C) strengthens (display for religious purposes is for aesthetic reasons)
- (D) suggests that polish is for other uses that might need further polishing
- (E) detail creep (how does poor understanding of the aesthetic sense relate to the fact that they have the aesthetic sense)

19. Strengthens

more forests + better air now than 5 years ago (environment policy) → believe people that doubt environmentalists

Actual AC: environmental policy not super draconian work → draconian policies diminish wealth

Assumption: evidence supports that environment isn't doing terribly

Actual Assumption: environmental policies impact wealth

- (A) addresses actual assumption
- (B) broad scope ("technology" vs. "wealth"; "social programs" vs. "environment policies")
- (C) modality/contradicts stimulus (majority of disasters = heavily forested and less acid rain?) (environmentalists did help economy)
- (D) temporal scope/addresses premise (current policy would not have worked, but we know it did work)
- (E) weakens (environmental policies impact wealth in a positive way)

20. Flaw

instances of history embodying prejudices of authors → can't accept objectivity

false explanations → history not objective

Is embodying prejudices not objective?

- (A) unrelated for main assumption in argument (attacks background)
- (B) modality (we don't know if this undermines, we just don't know how it relates)
- (C) outside scope (no mention of methodologies)
- (D) those false explanations could intentionally be false because they are subjective historians
- (E) opposite meaning (stimulus is limited to those explanations that are false)

21. Sufficient Assumption

sometimes meteor /- mass extinctions → Geological record shows no causal link

- (A) contrapositive (link → always MMIs & MMEs)
- (B) modality (not 100% tight; what happens if some MMIs are linked to MMEs)
- (C) attacks premise/wrong subject (we are talking about mass extinctions of which there is a record)
- (D) outside scope (goes beyond the conclusion of the argument) (AC: SM/MI → Geo Record → **MMIs can't precede MEs ever**)
- (E) opposite of conclusion

22. MBT

Rain → crops to fail → F/S/T lose business
Contrapositive: F/S/T/ → /crops fail → /rain

- (A) converse ($F \rightarrow CF$)
- (B) detail creep (does "below average" = "lack of rain")
- (C) outside scope/detail creep (no discussion of individual responsibilities)
- (D) outside scope (dependence on agriculture, major economic crises)
- (E) drought (= lack of rain) → other thing besides crops (F/S/T)

23. Sufficient Assumption

$P \rightarrow SOIC$
 $MR \rightarrow BC$

Conclusion: we can't know what's morally right. Why? Because we can't know if something has the best consequences?

- (A) modality/outside scope ("morally wrong" vs. "morally right")
- (B) modality/contradicts conclusion (we can't ever know)
- (C)

P → SOIC
SOIC → /BC
/BC → /MR

Best consequences → actions we don't perform
(D) term shift ("immediate consequences" vs. "best consequences")
(E) detail creep/opposite of conclusion (no one can know)

24. Flaw

DNA does not always distinguish between two different people → don't use DNA test when you're trying to match DNA to one person

- (A) opposite (does assume that evidence can be mistaken)
- (B)** two different tests!
- (C) outside scope ("all methods")
- (D) detail creep/outside scope ("nonexperimental conditions")
- (E) opposite (suggests other evidence should be considered)

25. Parallel Flaw

harm + knowledge (would do different action) → unintentional

- (A) "important part"
- (B) some -- everyone -- some (some -- none -- some)
- (C)** some -- none -- some
- (D) modality difference (all -- some)
- (E) L → PO → /CC (answer is opposite -- CC → L)

26. Strengthens

rapid population increase → bad
Overloaded services
Unaccommodating budgets

- (A) detail creep ("budget shortages" ≠ unaccommodating budgets)
- (B) detail creep (new ideas is an added reason for why rapid pollution increase is bad, but doesn't use the given information)
- (C) detail creep/comparison/wrong subject (focus is on small cities)
- (D) background info (why people move, we're interested in what happens when they move)
- (E)** explains why budgets are unaccommodating and why that hurts the community

SECTION 2: Reading Comprehension

Passage 1 Discussion: Relief Aid Program

MP: there needs to be a shift (short term to long term) in relief giving to maximize efficacy

AO: Its success depends on how donors will respond (45-47); donors should incorporate dialogue to maximize efficiency (57-59)

Passage Structure:

P1: Background + traditional view

P2 & P3: Critic view

P3: Author's opinion

Point of View: 3

SS: synthesis passage

Argument Core:

_____ traditional relief (poorly implemented + too short-term) → necessitates reform

Author's Attitude: optimistic but cautious (agrees we need reform but reform hinges on other variables)

1.1 MP Question

Strategy: looked at lines 45-47 & 57-59

(A) narrow scope (paragraph 3) (doesn't address donors, or shift)

(B) term shifts ("great quantities" don't hurt as much as uncoordinated shipments (23))

(C) subject shift (those who should engage in the dialogue are the donors); opposite meaning (author would argue that there are some hiccups but it is possible to focus on long-term needs)

(D) lines 45-47, 57-59

(E) detail creep (role of mediators)

1.2 Match Example (Principle)?

Strategy: look at paragraph 3

active community members → stated desires → shift focus to long term
& grassroots dialogue

(A) contractor plan = outsider (talking about community members)

(B) long-term = planning ahead

(C) "untrained volunteers" (addresses the problem outlined in paragraph 2)

(D) "private relief agency" -- wrong subject (should focus on community members)

(E) "local companies" -- wrong subject (should focus on community members) (no mention of long-term solution)

1.3 MSS/MBT

Strategy: reference each AC to passage

- (A) opposite (38)
- (B) opposite (50)
- (C) detail creep/not quite right (passage: dialogue → discovering better ways to utilize aid) (AC: confidence → more aid)
- (D)** paragraph 2
- (E) opposite (53-54, 58)

1.4 Role

Strategy: look at line, come up with verb

- Recognize importance of donors
- Present call of action for donors

- (A) too strong (“resisted changes”)
- (B) too strong (“contrast profoundly”)
- (C)** lines 57-59
- (D) detail creep (unclear what donors would consider proper response methods -- all we know is they like to give out immediate aid)
- (E) opposite (author is optimistic it will happen)

1.5 MBT

Strategy: answer ahead

- an improvement, but also needs donor cooperation (45-48)

- (A)** 45-48; 54-59
- (B) detail creep (author makes no mention of reduction, language is too strong, no mention of medicine)
- (C) opposite (long term does address mismanagement by focusing on grassroots connection) (42-44)
- (D) opposite (author is optimistic that donors would be receptive) (54-59)
- (E) outside scope (no mention of reversing structure, or structures anywhere -- rather, we’re told there are pretty much no structures in place)

1.6 MSS

Strategy: answer ahead

- need to be reevaluated

- (A)** outside scope (no mention of limited resources); term shift (it’s not money so much as structural problems)
- (B) detail creep in paragraph 3 (we don’t know why community hasn’t been involved, just that they need to be)
- (C) opposite (whole passage talks about how money alone hasn’t solved everything)

(D) unsupported/opposite (we don't know who these critics are challenging traditional viewpoints)

(E) "dramatic illustrations" (4); "little accountability" (6-10)

Passage 2 Discussion: Hippocratic Oath

MP: besides some changes relevant to the times, we should keep the hippocratic oath

AQ: historical component should be dismissed (34-36); retain core value of beneficence (47-52)

Passage Structure:

P1: Background + traditional view

P2: Author's opinion + counterview

Point of View: 2

SS:

Argument Core:

new authors every generation + → retain Hippocratic oath
core idea of beneficence

Author's Attitude: dismissal of critics; certain that HO should be retained

2.7 MP

Strategy: look at argument core

(A) opposite (49-52 suggests that it does not need to be reevaluated on the whole)

(B) 34-36 + 47-52

(C) broad scope (focused on one code of ethics)

(D) term shift ("assurance" vs. "beneficence")

(E) opposite (49-52: retain HO to keep core value)

2.8 Method of reasoning

Strategy: background -- critic view -- counterargument

(A) opposite (does not adopt criticisms)

(B) opposite (does not dismiss criticisms -- author provides criticism)

(C) opposite (does not desire to modify response)

(D) opposite (does not reject criticism -- author provides criticism)

(E) matches organization (P1: tradition; P2: criticism + defense)

2.9 Role

Strategy: turn to line 48

(A) outside scope (no mention of community)

(B) opposite (this is where critics and author would disagree)

(C) outside scope (no mention of pay)

(D) 48 "beneficence"

(E) opposite (this is where critics and author would disagree)

2.10 Primary Purpose

Strategy: think about verb

- look for verb “defend”

(A) line 48: “should be retained”

(B) too strong (“chastise” vs. accepting some aspects of the uncertainty of the text)

(C) narrow scope (focused on first half of P2)

(D) too neutral (does more than outline; does not mention cons)

(E) opposite (says should be revised but hopes the essence of it stays)

2.11 MBT

Strategy: look at topic sentence

(A) opposite (38)

(B) opposite (50)

(C) opposite (recognizes changes in the medical profession (55-57))

(D) term shift (more flexible vs. safer/more effective techniques) (55-57)

(E) topic sentence of second half (47-52)

2.12

Strategy: relate each answer choice to the passage

(A) line 16

(B) opposite (critics argue that HO should be rejected **because** it’s archaic)

(C) line 13

(D) line 13-14

(E) line 21

** missed this question because I rushed and didn’t check each answer to the passage

2.13 Author’s Attitude

Strategy: look at what you wrote

(A) opposite (no support)

(B) too extreme (“bemused”)

(C) reasoned disagreement (accepts argument, and provides reasons that validate the disagreement)

(D) opposite (not neutral/objective)

(E) opposite (no agreement)

2.14 Title

Strategy: look at main point

- (A) first part is wrong (not ancients versus moderns; critics versus authors)
- (B) narrow scope (paragraph 1)
- (C) outside scope/narrow scope (genetic fallacies are never introduced; historical element is first half of paragraph 2)
- (D) opposite (argues the relevancy of HO)
- (E) facelift = minor revises versus major surgery (what critics advocate)

Passage 4: Trials of Aboriginal Rights in Canada

MP: lines 11-18

AO: lines 11-18; lines 23-25; lines 40-43; lines 58-63

Passage Structure:

P1: Background + thesis

P2: Example 1

P3: Example 2 + conclusion

Point of View: 1

SS: 2 examples (both relating to ownership of land)

Argument Core:

burden of translation → inconsistent establishment of aboriginal rights

Author's Attitude: neutral up until P3 ("regrettably")

4.20 MP

- (A) narrow scope (paragraph 3)
- (B) narrow scope (paragraph 3)
- (C) lines 11-18
- (D) narrow scope (paragraph 3)
- (E) narrow scope (paragraph 3)

4.21 Role

Strategy: 11-14

- (A) modality ("rarely conform") -- we're only given one type of constitutional right that doesn't conform
- (B) source of systemic problem = enormous burden
- (C) broad scope (not all constitutional reforms, just those pertaining to aboriginal rights)
- (D) narrow scope (paragraph 3)
- (E) broad scope (not all aspects of Canadian constitution, just those pertaining to aboriginal rights)

4.22 MBT

Strategy: lines 30-31

- (A) opposite meaning (44-47)
- (B) equivocation/narrow scope (paragraph 3)

(C) lines 30-31

(D) not consequence; recognition

(E) outside scope (no mention of local governments)

4.23 Author Attitude

Strategy: “regrettably”

(A) neutral/positive attitude

(B) neutral attitude

(C) neutral attitude

(D) neutral attitude

(E) lines 57-63

4.24 MBT/MSS

Strategy: refer answers back to stimulus

(A) opposite (are answerable because they are incorporated in constitution)

(B) lines 37-40

(C) modality (“full protection” / “all customs”)

(D) opposite (underlines self-government)

(E) “more carefully delineate” (does not delineate -- and reforms should apply to all)

4.25 Strengthen

Strategy: look at right line

use (not own) → conservative ruling

(A) assumption is that not saying these things makes conservative (when compared to other interpretations, this is conservative)

(B) outside scope (logging by timber)

(C) weakens (use vs. sell means this is the norm, not conservative)

(D) background (does not address whether these claims are conservative or not)

(E) background

4.26 MSS - 1984

Strategy: “regrettably”

(A) too strong (directly contravened vs. regrettable conservative interpretation)

(B) opposite (provincial courts are allowed to self-govern, lower courts gave decisions)

(C) outside scope (documentary evidence has no bearing) (attempting to link P2 & P3)

(D) ad hominem (no mention of motivations, we don’t know why)

(E) misconstrue (distinction between “use” and ownership, which the author doesn’t think exists, and is something the Supreme Court would note)

4.27 Structure

Strategy: look for noun (description, examples)

- (A) outside scope (no mention of advocates)
- (B) outside scope (no mention of efforts)
- (C)** look back at main point (this is exactly what it does -- examines problems associated with protecting aboriginal rights)
- (D) term shift ("revising" vs. "implementing")
- (E) term shift ("correct" vs. "describe")