Argument Part Challenge Explanation   15.2.14

First, translate.

> *So people who breed pedigreed dogs, including working dogs, have to follow rules set by pedigree groups. These rules are usually just about appearance and don't talk about stuff like the traits that let working dogs perform their working tasks. Dog breeders only try to keep the traits the pedigree groups care about, and all other traits risk being lost, so traits like herding ability could be lost for pedigreed dogs. So pedigree groups should require working ability in order to be called a working dog.*

So the author is trying to get pedigree groups to care about the fact that working ability is being lost since the groups only care about looks. They want pedigree groups to change the rules so dogs have to have working ability in order to be called working dogs. But what if the pedigree groups just don't care? There's nothing forcing them to change the criteria if looks are still all that matter to them. It's an Assumed Universal Goals situation.

LOOPHOLE   What if the pedigree groups don't care about preserving working ability?

Now we see it's Argument Part, so let's see what they want us to identify. We need to identify what "certain traits like herding ability risk being lost among pedigreed dogs" is doing in the stimulus. Notice the "since" that starts the sentence where this phrase appears. The "since" is modifying the two premises that come right before our phrase. Those two premises are doing some work to prove our phrase, meaning it's some kind of conclusion. But then right after our phrase is the main conclusion, that pedigree organizations should change their rules for working dogs.

That means our phrase is an intermediate conclusion. There are premises supporting it and it is supporting the main conclusion. Perfect! Let's go find it in the answer choices.

A)   *So it's a claim the argument depends on that isn't supported. Nope, we found support for the phrase.* **A** *isn't provable.*

B)   *So it's a sub-conclusion that supports the main conclusion. This is exactly what we're looking for! A sub-conclusion is the same thing as an intermediate conclusion. That's what our phrase is, so we're in business.* **B** *is provable.*

C)   *So it acknowledges an objection to the conclusion. No, it's supporting the conclusion. There weren't any abjections to the conclusion in the stimulus.* **C** *isn't provable.*

D)   *So it summarizes what the conclusion is arguing against. No, it's supporting the conclusion, not going against it.* **D** *isn't what our phrase is doing.*

E)   *So it's evidence to support a claim from earlier in the stimulus. No, the conclusion (the thing the phrase is supporting) comes after, not before.* **E** *isn't provable.*

B is the correct answer. Our phrase is an intermediate conclusion and **B** hits that characterization right on the head.