

## CLIR Drill Answer Key JUNE 2007, SECTION 2

---

1. Economist: **IC** [Every business strives to increase its productivity.] **P1** [for this increases profits for the owners and the likelihood that the business will survive.] **C** [But not all efforts to increase productivity are beneficial to the business as a whole.] **P2** [Often, attempts to increase productivity decrease the number of employees, which clearly harms the dismissed employees as well as the sense of security of the retained employees.]

**Correct Loophole**     **B**     What if the efforts' upsides outweigh the downsides enough to be beneficial to the business as a whole?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **A**     What if the retained employees hold a longstanding grudge that damages company productivity?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It strengthens the conclusion instead of destroying it.

2.     **P1** [All Labrador retrievers bark a great deal.] **P2** [All Saint Bernards bark infrequently.] **P3** [Each of Rosa's dogs is a cross between a Labrador retriever and a Saint Bernard.] **C** [Therefore, Rosa's dogs are moderate barkers.]

**Correct Loophole**     **B**     What if traits don't mix to produce 50/50 results?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **A**     What if Rosa's dogs also have another breed of dog in their pedigree?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It questions the truth of the premises.

3.     **P1** [A century in certain ways is like a life.] **P2** [and as the end of a century approaches, people behave toward that century much as someone who is nearing the end of life does toward that life.] **P3** [So just as people in their last years spend much time looking back on the events of their life.] **C** [people at a century's end \_\_\_\_\_.]

**Correct Inference**     **B**     Look back over the last century.

**Incorrect Inference**     **A**     Look back over their lives.

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It mimics the wrong part of the analogy.

4. Consumer: **P1** [The latest Connorly Report suggests that Ocksenfrey prepackaged meals are virtually devoid of nutritional value.] **P2** [But the Connorly Report is commissioned by Danto Foods, Ocksenfrey's largest corporate rival, and early drafts of the report are submitted for approval to Danto Foods' public relations department.] **P3** [Because of the obvious bias of this report,] **C** [it is clear that Ocksenfrey's prepackaged meals really are nutritious.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if Danto's bias doesn't affect the truth?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if Ocksenfrey's meals aren't nutritious?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It just negates the conclusion.

5. Scientist: **P1** [Earth's average annual temperature has increased by about 0.5 degrees Celsius over the last century.] **C** [This warming is primarily the result of the buildup of minor gases in the atmosphere, blocking the outward flow of heat from the planet.]

**Correct Loophole**     **B**     What if something else is causing the warming?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **A**     What if the warming isn't serious?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     Whether the warming is serious doesn't matter; we care about the cause of the warming, not its severity.

6. **P1** [An undergraduate degree is necessary for appointment to the executive board.] **P2** [Further, no one with a felony conviction can be appointed to the board.] **C** [Thus, Murray, an accountant with both a bachelor's and a master's degree, cannot be accepted for the position of Executive Administrator.] **P3** [since he has a felony conviction.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if the Executive Administrator isn't subject to the same qualifications as the executive board?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if Murray's felony conviction would keep him from doing his job?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It strengthens the conclusion instead of destroying it.

7. Ethicist: **P1** [The most advanced kind of moral motivation is based solely on abstract principles.] **P2** [This form of motivation is in contrast with calculated self-interest or the desire to adhere to societal norms and conventions.]

**Correct Inference**     **A**     Something based on abstract principles contrasts with self-interest and adherence to societal norms.

**Incorrect Inference**     **B**     Someone who follows societal norms can never be moral.

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     "Never be moral" is way too powerful; it's not provable from this stimulus.

8. **P1** [Proponents of the electric car maintain that when the technical problems associated with its battery design are solved, such cars will be widely used] **P2** [and, because they are emission-free, will result in an abatement of the environmental degradation caused by auto emissions.] **P3** [But unless we dam more rivers, the electricity to charge these batteries will come from nuclear or coal-fired power plants.] **P4** [Each of these three power sources produces considerable environmental damage.] **C** [Thus, the electric car \_\_\_\_\_.]

**Correct Inference**     **B**     Will also produce environmental damage, unless we dam more rivers.

**Incorrect Inference**     **A**     Will spur further innovation in green technology.

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     "Green technology" is out of nowhere; it's not provable from this stimulus.

9. **P1** [Although video game sales have increased steadily over the past 3 years,] **C** [we can expect a reversal of this trend in the very near future.] **P2** [Historically, over three quarters of video games sold have been purchased by people from 13 to 16 years of age,] **P3** [and the number of people in this age group is expected to decline steadily over the next 10 years.]

**Correct Loophole**     **B**     What if the way it's been historically has changed recently so people outside 13-16 are buying?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **A**     What if the video game industry shifts focus in an attempt to attract older customers?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It's not powerful enough; we have no guarantee the industry's attempt to attract older customers will work.

**10.** **C** [Double-blind techniques should be used whenever possible in scientific experiments.] **P1** [They help prevent the misinterpretations that often arise due to expectations and opinions that scientists already hold.] **P2** [and clearly scientists should be extremely diligent in trying to avoid such misinterpretations.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if there's another way of preventing misinterpretations?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if double-blind techniques are expensive?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It could still be worth doing even if it's expensive; cost rarely matters on the LSAT unless it's explicitly addressed in the stimulus.

**11.** **P1** [It is now a common complaint that the electronic media have corroded the intellectual skills required and fostered by the literary media.] **P2** [But several centuries ago the complaint was that certain intellectual skills, such as the powerful memory and extemporaneous eloquence that were intrinsic to oral culture, were being destroyed by the spread of literacy.] **C** [So, what awaits us is probably a mere alteration of the human mind rather than its devolution.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if there's a difference between the oral-literary shift and the literary-electronic shift?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if a powerful memory isn't as useful as extemporaneous eloquence?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     A comparison between the two oral qualities isn't relevant to the conclusion.

**12.** **P1** [Suppose I have promised to keep a confidence and someone asks me a question that I cannot answer truthfully without thereby breaking the promise.] **P2** [Obviously, I cannot both keep and break the same promise.] **C** [Therefore, one cannot be obliged both to answer all questions truthfully and to keep all promises.]

**Correct Loophole**     **B**     What if that hypothetical question that requires promise breaking is never actually asked?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **A**     What if you could both keep and break the same promise?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It negates a premise instead of finding a way around it.

**13.** **P1** [Standard aluminum soft-drink cans do not vary in the amount of aluminum that they contain.] **P2** [Fifty percent of the aluminum contained in a certain group (M) of standard aluminum soft-drink cans was recycled from another group (L) of used, standard aluminum soft-drink cans.] **P3** [Since all the cans in L were recycled into cans in M and since the amount of material other than aluminum in an aluminum can is negligible.] **C** [it follows that M contains twice as many cans as L.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if some of the aluminum is lost in the recycling process?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if the other 50% of the aluminum contained in M (not the aluminum from L) was of very poor quality?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     Whether the aluminum is of "poor quality" doesn't matter for the amount of aluminum in the can.

**14.** **P1** [A cup of raw milk, after being heated in a microwave oven to 50 degrees Celsius, contains half its initial concentration of a particular enzyme, lysozyme.] **P2** [If, however, the milk reaches that temperature through exposure to a conventional heat source of 50 degrees Celsius, it will contain nearly all of its initial concentration of the enzyme.] **C** [Therefore, what destroys the enzyme is not heat but microwaves, which generate heat.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if microwave heat is different from conventional heat in a way that kills lysozyme?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if the destruction of lysozyme has been linked to radiation that also causes cancer?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     Potentially causing cancer isn't relevant to whether it's heat or microwaves destroying the lysozyme.

**15.** **P1** [A new government policy has been developed to avoid many serious cases of influenza.] **P2** [This goal will be accomplished by the annual vaccination of high-risk individuals: everyone 65 and older as well as anyone with a chronic disease that might cause them to experience complications from the influenza virus.] **P3** [Each year's vaccination will protect only against the strain of the influenza virus deemed most likely to be prevalent that year.] **C** [so every year it will be necessary for all high-risk individuals to receive a vaccine for a different strain of the virus.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if the same strain is prevalent for more than one year?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if a particular strain is so virulent that it is fatal to any high-risk individual who's exposed to it?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**

Virulence doesn't affect whether it's necessary to switch the strain every year.

**16.** Taylor: **P1** [Researchers at a local university claim that 61 percent of the information transferred during a conversation is communicated through nonverbal signals.] **C** [But this claim, like all such mathematically precise claims, is suspect,] **P2** [because claims of such exactitude could never be established by science.]

Sandra: **P1** [While precision is unobtainable in many areas of life, it is commonplace in others.] **P2** [Many scientific disciplines obtain extremely precise results, which should not be doubted merely because of their precision.]

**Correct Controversy**      **B**      whether simply being precise necessarily makes a claim suspect

**Incorrect Controversy**      **A**      whether 61% of information is necessarily transferred nonverbally

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**

We don't know Sandra's opinion whether the 61% claim is true.

**17.** Hospital executive: **P1** [At a recent conference on nonprofit management, several computer experts maintained that the most significant threat faced by large institutions such as universities and hospitals is unauthorized access to confidential data.] **P2** [In light of this testimony,] **C** [we should make the protection of our clients' confidentiality our highest priority.]

**Correct Loophole**      **A**      What if we shouldn't listen to computer experts about hospital management (invalid appeal to authority)?

**Incorrect Loophole**      **B**      What if the computer experts were biased toward creating business for themselves (ad hominem)?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**

The problem with this stimulus is that they're assuming what the computer experts say is true. We can't assume the computer experts are necessarily biased, but we shouldn't assume they're a relevant authority on the most significant threat faced by large institutions either.

- 18.** **P1** [Modern science is built on the process of posing hypotheses and testing them against observations—in essence, attempting to show that the hypotheses are incorrect.] **P2** [Nothing brings more recognition than overthrowing conventional wisdom.] **C** [It is accordingly unsurprising that some scientists are skeptical of the widely accepted predictions of global warming. What is instead remarkable is that with hundreds of researchers striving to make breakthroughs in climatology, very few find evidence that global warming is unlikely.]

**Correct Loophole**      **B**      What if global warming is correct and can't be disproven?

**Incorrect Loophole**      **A**      What if scientists are very close to a breakthrough on global warming?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**      Whether they're very close or not doesn't matter. The conclusion is about whether or not it's remarkable that they haven't found anything yet.

- 19.** Historian: **P1** [The Land Party achieved its only national victory in Banestria in 1935.] **P2** [It received most of its support that year in rural and semirural areas, where the bulk of Banestria's population lived at the time.] **P3** [The economic woes of the years surrounding that election hit agricultural and small business interests the hardest, and the Land Party specifically targeted those groups in 1935.] **C** [I conclude that the success of the Land Party that year was due to the combination of the Land Party's specifically addressing the concerns of these groups and the depth of the economic problems people in these groups were facing.]

**Correct Loophole**      **A**      What if people don't vote based on the issues?

**Incorrect Loophole**      **B**      What if the Land Party was unpopular with urban voters?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**      It strengthens the conclusion instead of destroying it.

- 20.** Gamba: **P1** [Muñoz claims that the Southwest Hopeville Neighbors Association overwhelmingly opposes the new water system, citing this as evidence of citywide opposition.] **P2** [The association did pass a resolution opposing the new water system, but only 25 of 350 members voted, with 10 in favor of the system.] **P3** [Furthermore, the 15 opposing votes represent far less than 1 percent of Hopeville’s population.] **C** [One should not assume that so few votes represent the view of the majority of Hopeville’s residents.]

**Correct Loophole**      **B**      What if it’s a representative sample?

**Incorrect Loophole**      **A**      What if some members of the Neighbors Association were in favor of the measure?

**What’s wrong with the wrong answer?**      It’s restating a premise, which doesn’t affect the conclusion.

- 21.** Driver: **P1** [My friends say I will one day have an accident because I drive my sports car recklessly.] **P2** [But I have done some research, and apparently minivans and larger sedans have very low accident rates compared to sports cars.] **C** [So trading my sports car in for a minivan would lower my risk of having an accident.]

**Correct Loophole**      **A**      What if it’s the type of driver who purchases a minivan that causes minivans to be safer?

**Incorrect Loophole**      **B**      What if some minivans perform worse than sports cars in certified crash tests?

**What’s wrong with the wrong answer?**      How minivans perform when accidents occur doesn’t affect their low accident rate.

- 22.** Editorialist: **P1** [News media rarely cover local politics thoroughly, and local political business is usually conducted secretly.] **P2** [These factors each tend to isolate local politicians from their electorates.] **P3** [This has the effect of reducing the chance that any particular act of resident participation will elicit a positive official response, which in turn discourages resident participation in local politics.]

**Correct Inference**      **B**      The news media’s lack of coverage of local politics influences resident participation in local politics.

**Incorrect Inference**      **A**      If the news media covered local politics more, our democracy would be enlivened.

**What’s wrong with the wrong answer?**      We don’t know anything about democracy enlivening; it’s not provable from the stimulus.

**23.** Philosopher: **P1** [An action is morally right if it would be reasonably expected to increase the aggregate well-being of the people affected by it.] **P2** [An action is morally wrong if and only if it would be reasonably expected to reduce the aggregate well-being of the people affected by it.] **C** [Thus, actions that would be reasonably expected to leave unchanged the aggregate well-being of the people affected by them are also right.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if an action can be morally neutral, neither morally right nor morally wrong?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if morally wrong actions don't always reduce well-being?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It questions the truth of the premises.

**24.** **P1** [Car companies solicit consumer information on such human factors as whether a seat is comfortable or whether a set of controls is easy to use.] **C** [However, designer interaction with consumers is superior to survey data;] **P2** [the data may tell the designer why a feature on last year's model was given a low rating, but data will not explain how that feature needs to be changed in order to receive a higher rating.]

**Correct Loophole**     **A**     What if designer interaction with consumers also wouldn't explain how the feature needs to be changed?

**Incorrect Loophole**     **B**     What if almost no seats are rated comfortable?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     It doesn't affect whether designer interaction is better than surveys.

**25.** **P1** [During the nineteenth century, the French academy of art was a major financial sponsor of painting and sculpture in France; sponsorship by private individuals had decreased dramatically by this time.] **P2** [Because the academy discouraged innovation in the arts, there was little innovation in nineteenth century French sculpture.] **P3** [Yet nineteenth century French painting showed a remarkable degree of innovation.]

**Correct Resolution**     **B**     What if painters are less reliant on sponsors because their materials cost less?

**Incorrect Resolution**     **A**     What if innovation in sculpture requires more experience than innovation in painting does?

**What's wrong with the wrong answer?**     Differing levels of experience don't matter; money is the difference.