

what is this relationship?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXX XXXXP
XXXXXXXX.

RESPONSE:

However,

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX,
because XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX.

This means that we have to “poke a hole” in the argument, while still accepting the facts here is true.

The economist says that the economy of Burdistan is strong, because unemployment numbers are low and the government has been creating new jobs at record rates.

HOWEVER,

these statistics do not actually support the economist's claim,

BECAUSE

the government jobs are temporary and funded from money that will soon be exhausted.

1. Here is a weaken problem.

Notice: when you think less formally about critical reasoning. It is easier!

Like the ie. Before:

What we have to weaken is: new jobs at record rates

So you bring something from outside the scope to make the argument weaker

Another question:

When people engage in activities that help others, their brain releases endorphins, the brain's natural opiates, which induce in people a feeling of well-being. It has been suggested that regular release of endorphins increases people's longevity. And a statistic on adults who regularly engage in volunteer work helping others shows that they live longer, on average, than adults who do not volunteer. However, that statistic would be what we would expect even if volunteering does not boost longevity, because _____

FACTS!!!
claim

When you see a blank, you have to FIGURE OUT how the blank fits into the argument.

USUALLY the "blank" questions are of the same types to which you've already become accustomed.

Which of the following most logically completes the argument?

- A. In the communities studied, women were much more likely to do regular volunteer work than men were, and women tend to live longer than men do.
- B. The number of young adults who do regular volunteer work is on the increase
- C. The feelings of well-being induced by endorphins can, at least for a time, mask the symptoms of various conditions and diseases, provided the symptoms are mild.
- D. It is rare for a person to keep up a regular schedule of volunteer work throughout his or her life.
- E. Some people find that keeping a commitment to do regular volunteer work becomes a source of stress in their lives.

What are we weakening?

The argument claims that volunteering (via its attendant endorphins) actually

A certain type of critical reasoning with BLANKS IN THE PRONPT

Remember: you cannot question a fact

What are we weakening?

The argument claims that volunteering (via its attendant endorphins) actually leading people's lives. Then we go to see how do we weaken a cause-effect argument:

HOW DO YOU WEAKEN A CAUSE-EFFECT ARGUMENT?

2 ways:

Example:

FACT -- can't question

On average, married men make more money than do single men in the same geographic area, generation, and socioeconomic class. Therefore, one may conclude that marriage causes men to have increased earning potential.

claim -- we are just GUESSING that this is the case.

WEAKENER #1 EXAMPLE

When men earn more, they are pursued more actively by women seeking to get married.

One way to weaken "X causes Y" is to give evidence suggesting that it's BACKWARD -- in other words, that Y actually causes X.

WEAKENER #2 EXAMPLE

The same personality traits that cause men to have high earning potential -- such as a sense of duty and responsibility, as well as a conservative temperament -- also cause them to be more likely to want to get married.

Another way is to show that SOMETHING ELSE causes BOTH "x" and "y".

WHY DID I SWITCH THE ARGUMENT?

Original argument:

Married men live longer than single men (of the same age, geographic area, etc.)
Therefore, marriage causes men to live longer.

One way to weaken "X causes Y" is to give evidence suggesting that it's BACKWARD -- in other words, that Y actually causes X.

~~"Living longer makes men more likely to get married"~~

(this works *logically*, but it's not reasonable in the real world)

Another way is to show that SOMETHING ELSE causes BOTH "x" and "y".

The same personality traits found in men who want to get married -- such as stability and future-time orientation -- also generally contribute to longer life.

A certain type of critical reasoning with BLANKS IN THE PROMPT

Then let's go back to the example:

What are we weakening?

The argument claims that volunteering (via its attendant endorphins) actually **LENGTHENS** people's lives (i.e., **CAUSES** people to live longer).

We want to weaken this argument.

Argument says **VOLUNTEER** ----> **LONG LIFE**

One way to weaken "X causes Y" is to give evidence suggesting that it's **BACKWARD** -- in other words, that Y actually causes X.

One type of weakener:

~~something that shows that living longer causes volunteerism~~

Another way is to show that **SOMETHING ELSE** causes BOTH "x" and "y".

If some quality contributes to both volunteerism AND long life, then the argument is weakened.



So A is the right one, because the first they do volunteerism and live longer all because they are females.

C is showing how this could happen. So C is actually a strengthen argument. Because it provides concrete evidence.

2. Then another question:

When there are lots of words--rephrase into your own words(in your head)

A certain type of critical reasoning with BLANKS IN THE PROMPT

2. Then another question:

When there are lots of words--rephrase into your own words(in your head)

Which of the following most logically completes the argument?

Although the pesticide TDX has been widely used by fruit growers since the early 1960's, a regulation in force since 1960 has prohibited sale of fruit on which any TDX residue can be detected. That regulation is about to be replaced by one that allows sale of fruit on which trace amounts of TDX residue are detected. In fact, however, the change will not allow more TDX on fruit than was allowed in the 1960's, because _____.

- A. Pre-1970 techniques for detecting TDX residue could detect it only when it was present on fruit in more than the trace amounts allowed by the new regulations.
- B. Many more people today than in the 1960's habitually purchase and eat fruit without making an effort to clean residues off the fruit.
- C. People today do not individually consume any more pieces of fruit, on average, than did the people in the 1960's.
- D. At least a small fraction of the fruit sold each year since the early 1960's has had on it greater levels of TDX than the regulation allows.
- E. The presence of TDX on fruit in greater than trace amounts has not been shown to cause any harm even to children who eat large amounts of fruit.

When there are LOTS OF WORDS -- REPHRASE INTO YOUR OWN WORDS (in your head).

The old rule says, "If they can detect ANY tdx, the fruit can't be sold."

The new rule says, "Trace amounts of tdx are fine."

Our argument: The new rule will not change anything.

We are arguing AGAINST the idea that the new rule will allow MORE tdx.

We need something that shows that the results of "no tdx allowed" are the SAME as the results of "trace amounts are ok".

The only difference occurs for amounts of tdx between 0 and "trace amounts".

Here what we are weaken, the X, is not in the passage.

A certain type of critical reasoning with BLANKS IN THE PROMPT

3. Then another question:

Which of the following most logically completes the argument?

The growing popularity of computer-based activities was widely predicted to result in a corresponding decline in television viewing. Recent studies have found that, in the United States, people who own computers watch, on average, significantly less television than people who do not own computers. In itself, however, this finding does very little to show that computer use tends to reduce television viewing time, since _____.

- A. Many people who watch little or no television do not own a computer.
- B. Even though most computer owners in the United States watch significantly less television than the national average, some computer owners watch far more television than the national average.
- ☒ C. Computer owners in the United States predominately belong to a demographic group that have long been known to spend less time watching television than the population as a whole does.
- D. Many computer owners in the United States have enough leisure time that spending significant amounts of time on the computer still leaves ample time for watching television.
- E. Many people use their computers primarily for tasks such as correspondence that can be done more rapidly on the computer, and doing so leaves more leisure time for watching television.

Choice A just says
"There are outliers / exceptions
to the trend."
This does NOT address anything,
because the *existence* of the
trend is a FACT.

SAME
DEMOGRAPHIC
GROUP

* computer ownership

* viewing less TV

About A: if there is a trend, then there is a trend. Some exceptions do nothing to the trend.
A is a common wrong answer.