

# LR Guide

**Framework for understanding LR (this is just 1 idea; you should add or change as you go):**

2 main types!

**Complete arguments:** Have a full argument (premises + main conclusion) in the stimulus (subsets: perfect vs imperfect arguments)

- **Imperfect:** first step is ID the gap/hole in the argument (first ID P and C)
  - **Flaw**
  - Necessary or Sufficient Assumption (*more likely than not strong*)
  - PSA (stronger; find the rule: more general; apply the rule: more specific)
  - Evaluate
  - Parallel Flawed MoR (*match strength of wording*)
  - Principle
  - Strengthen (*could strong*)
  - Weaken (*could strong*)
  - Resolve, Reconcile, Explain (*could strong*)
- Could be Perfect, but don't have to be: our job is not to decipher if it's a good argument
  - **Main Conclusion**
  - Argument Part
  - Point at issue: agree or disagree
  - Method of Reasoning
  - Parallel Method of Reasoning (match strength of wording)

**Incomplete Arguments** (don't necessarily have a main conclusion in the stimulus; they're just a string of premises so do NOT ID conclusion): (lean toward weaker wording in correct AC)

- **Most Strongly Supported**
- Fill in the Blank
- Must be True
- Must Be False
- Inference

**What to do when you don't know what to do:**

- reread stimulus; rephrase into own words
- highlight red flags in each AC and fully eliminate 4 wrong answers
- rephrase ACs into your own words
- down to 2 ACs: first get into your own words what the difference between them is (break them down every few words into precise language and pit them against each other)
- diagram, draw overlapping circles, jot down a chart or quick Spectrum of Support
- ...

**Question Stems**

tag	Bailey's Approach	Main issues:	Common question stems	My approach:	Tips and tricks:	Notes:
-----	-------------------	--------------	-----------------------	--------------	------------------	--------

## Main Conclusion

1) **Identify** premises and conclusion.

1) "WHY" TEST: Do I have reason in the stimulus to believe this? (If yes, it's at least a conclusion. Now we gotta see if it's the main conclusion or a subconclusion...)

2) "A THEREFORE B" TEST: Does knowing *this* make me more likely to believe \_\_\_\_\_ [*another potential conclusion*], or is it the other way around? (if it does give you reason to believe something else, that "something else" is the main conclusion and you are dealing with the sub-conclusion.

2) **Fully predict** your answer to the question. The sentence you are predicting should line up almost exactly with the correct AC, as it is straight from the stimulus.

picking wrong MC out of sub and main

1. Which one of the following most accurately expresses the main conclusion of the argument?
2. Which one of the following most accurately expresses the conclusion of the argument as a whole?
3. Which one of the following most accurately expresses the overall conclusion of the argument?

[https://coda.io/d/The-Main-Conclusion\\_dZiXmYMyBGH/Theme-Defining-support\\_suGDC#\\_lu8KY](https://coda.io/d/The-Main-Conclusion_dZiXmYMyBGH/Theme-Defining-support_suGDC#_lu8KY)

Argument  
Part

1) Underline or highlight the phrase they are asking about in the stimulus.

2) **Identify** premises and conclusion. To test a sentence...

1) Do I have reason in the stimulus to believe this? (If yes, it's at least a conclusion. Now we gotta see if it's the main conclusion or a subconclusion...)

2) Does knowing this make me more likely to believe \_\_\_\_\_ [another potential conclusion], or is it the other way around?

3) Ask yourself why the author bothered to include the phrase in the first place? Answer in general terms to **partially predict**.

*"what role does this sentence play in the argument," they will always have a specific sentence/fragment that you are deciding if it's a premise or conclusion, basically*

- ☐ FIRST, we want to make sure the AC has listed the correct part of the argument (Premise? ☒ Conclusion? ☒ Counterexample? ☒ And so on...)
- ☐ THEN, we want to make sure the rest of the AC is actually true. In the stimulus, is this phrase actually doing what the AC claims that it is doing? Go word-by-word or phrase-by-phrase to see if the AC actually lines up with the stimulus. Again, rephrase in your own words!!

### Most Strongly Supported

1) **Remember** that these stimuli are just strings of premises (and sometimes sub-conclusions, alternative explanations, counterexamples, etc) WITHOUT conclusions. It's your job to find a conclusion among the ACs.

2) **Go beyond identifying premises** by using general Argument Part-style wording to describe what each sentence in the stimulus is effectively doing (is it a counterexample? Assumption? proposed hypothesis?) Have a structural breakdown of what the stimulus is attempting to convey.

3) **(Very) partially predict** a few options for correct AC's! Chances are you can't fully predict, but getting a feel for the **direction** or theme the stimulus is trying to get at can really help you in this case. Finally, keep in mind that the right AC could include additional info that wasn't originally in the stimulus, but we are deciding if it's most supported.

4) **HIGHLIGHT your evidence** in the text for these!! Might be just a couple words throughout the stimulus, but there should be concrete support. ALSO lean towards weaker wording (it's easier to support... may, can, might, some, etc)

picking wrong MC out of last 2 ACs

*q's that say "MSS" but are referring to the ACs as the thing we are trying to support could also include those fill in the blank questions (whichever has a \_\_\_\_ in the stim)*

*"Which **one** of the following **conclusions** is **most supported** by the information above?" (04.01.19)*

*"Which **one** of the following **inferences** is **most supported** by the information above?" (04.01.22)*

*"The economist's statements [above], if true, **most strongly support** which **one** of the following?" (61.04.10)*

- Your job before reading the ACs is to get as **thorough and accurate** of an understanding of the stimulus as possible!
- So, I recommend putting pen to paper and **mapping it out visually** in some way (if you're a visual learner) or rephrasing in your head (if you're not!)
  - Logic diagrams, Venn diagrams, little charts and graphs, mental mapping... any of these might help!
- I'm going to emphasize again to **HIGHLIGHT** the (multiple) places in the stimulus where you find proof your AC is supported!
- <https://7sage.com/lesson/mcmss-the-spectrum-of-support/> in untimed practice, put every AC on a little sketched out spectrum of support and write down your evidence (word choice etc) as to why it goes there
- Read the stimulus- take everything at face value DO NOT consider anything that is outside of the stimulus completely anchor down on what I am reading -Put it in layman's term in need
- Identify the premise and try to COMPREHEND what the stimulus is saying and identify the scope of the argument
- Once I get an understanding go straight to ACs be picky with wording, level of assumption and support.
- Eliminate AC that are not anchored in the stimulus, make sure I can identify a viable reason to eliminate an AC
- If I am stuck between two answer choice, Identify the spectrum of support

[https://coda.io/d/Most-Strongly-Supported-Fill-in-the-Blank\\_d5SR0pw-l3y/Must-Be-True-LR\\_sufIj#\\_luOE\\_](https://coda.io/d/Most-Strongly-Supported-Fill-in-the-Blank_d5SR0pw-l3y/Must-Be-True-LR_sufIj#_luOE_)

## Strengthen

- 1) **Identify** premises and conclusion.
- 2) **Find the gap or hole:** answer **fully**, in your own words, **what is wrong with this argument?** In other words, why doesn't this all add up? What's the glaring hole in the reasoning? If I were in an argument with this person right now, what would I say back to point out how they made a sh\*tty argument?
- 3) **Pre-phrase:** "I'm looking for **something that** strengthens the argument by..." introducing [sometimes new] info that makes this argument more likely to be true. In other words, imagine that the person making the argument in the stimulus is, say, President Biden, and you are his speech writer. We know he might struggle to make a cohesive argument on his own, so we have to **ADD a line** to what he wants to say to **tie up the loose ends** and **make the argument follow!**
- 4) Go AC by AC, **eliminating** if it WEAKENS or DOES NOT EFFECT the argument and **keeping** AC's with additional info (even if it seems to be too far out of the scope of the argument at first).
- 5) **Evaluate!** Ask yourself if and how the AC actually strengthens the argument. Does it rule out alternative explanations of a phenomena? Does it fill a gap or hole in the reasoning? Does it make the argument more believable or address a key concern you had originally? **Remember**, unlike

*could say most strongly supported, BUT is referring to the conclusion that already is in the stimulus as the thing we are trying to support or strengthen; or it says "strengthen" "lends the most credence to" AND ALWAYS will include a little "if true" or "if valid" "if assumed," etc to imply that we are adding something NEW to the argument, going ONE step further than Flaw*

put a scale on your paper of S——N——W  
and pit each AC against each other

Common flaws:  
past > present

Assumption questions, the right answer *doesn't have to make the argument perfect or tie up every single loose end*, but it must make the argument *stronger* and *more likely to be accepted*!!

---

## Weaken

- 1) **Identify** premises and conclusion.
- 2) **Find the gap or hole:** answer **fully**, in your own words, **what is wrong with this argument?** In other words, why doesn't this all add up? What's the glaring hole in the reasoning? If I were in an argument with this person right now, what would I say back to point out how they made a sh\*tty argument?
- 3) **Pre-phrase:** **"I'm looking for something that** weakens the argument by..." introducing [sometimes new] info that makes this argument worse and more likely to be thrown away. Here, I like to imagine the person making the argument is, say, my little brother (I love proving him wrong). What am I going to bring up right away to **shoot down** his argument? It might be something additional or extra, as long as it really has **bearing on how likely we are to accept his conclusion!**
- 4) Go AC by AC, **eliminating** if it STRENGTHENS or DOES NOT EFFECT the argument and **keeping** AC's with additional info (even if it seems to be too far out of the scope of the argument at first).
- 5) **Evaluate!** Ask yourself if and how the AC actually weakens the argument. Does it introduce an alternative explanation that's stronger than the original? Does it emphasize or widen a gap or hole in the reasoning? Does it make the argument less believable or intensify a key concern you had originally?

*"most weakens" or  
"most seriously calls into  
question" "most  
undermines", ALWAYS  
will include a little "if  
true" or "if valid" "if  
assumed," etc to imply  
that we are adding  
something NEW to the  
argument, going ONE  
step further than Flaw*

put a scale on your paper of S——N——W  
and pit each AC against each other



**Remember**, unlike [the negated AC's for] Assumption questions, the right answer *doesn't have to absolutely destroy the argument or make it so the argument cannot follow*, but it must make the argument weaker and less likely to be accepted!!

---

RRE -  
resolve  
reconcile  
explain

1) **Identify** premises and conclusion (and what the strange phenomena at hand is... what is contradictory about it?)

2) **Find the gap or hole**: answer **fully**, in your own words, **what is so far unexplained by this argument?** In other words, what isn't adding up? What are we missing between point A (premises) and Point B (conclusion)?

3) **Pre-phrase**: **"I'm looking for something that** resolves the paradox by..." introducing [sometimes new] info that answers the questions in the back of our heads and ties up the loose ends. In this case, you can give yourself stake in the argument by imagining you are a paradox expert hired to come in and figure out what's missing in our arguments. You've been doing this for years and you treat it like a science: ID the paradox, predict what we might need to solve it, and figure out which of the options at hand works! It might be something additional or extra, **as long as it really does resolve, reconcile, or explain the seemingly contradictory argument!**

4) Go AC by AC, **eliminating** if it DOES NOT EXPLAIN the argument and **keeping** AC's with additional info (even if it seems to be too far out of the scope of the argument at first).

5) **Evaluate!** Ask yourself if and how the AC actually explains the paradox. Does it introduce third variable that explains a correlation/causation between

*which one, if true, most resolves/reconciles/explains the apparent discrepancy/paradox above?*

the first two? Does it close a gap or hole in the reasoning? Does it touch on (does not have to explicitly state, but must show awareness of) both the premises and conclusion?

**Remember**, unlike Assumption questions, the right answer *doesn't have to make the argument absolutely perfect*, but it must make the argument *make sense* and *explain the paradox*!

<b>Flaw</b>	<p>1) <b>Identify</b> premises and conclusion.</p> <p>2) <b>Fully predict</b> your answer to the question by answering in your own words: <b>what is wrong with this argument?</b> In other words, why doesn't this all add up? What's the glaring hole in the reasoning? If I were in an argument with this person right now, what would I say back to point out how they made a sh*tty argument?</p> <p>3) check ACs with two tests: true? (if not entirely descriptively accurate, ELIMINATE!) Flaw?</p>	<i>"most vulnerable to criticism" / "flaw"</i>	<a href="https://7sage.com/lesson/21-common-argument-flaws">https://7sage.com/lesson/21-common-argument-flaws</a>
<b>Parallel Flaw</b>	<p>1) ID premises, conclusion, and gap/hole in the argument</p> <p>2) IF APPLICABLE: use Lawgic mapping or another visual to help you cement your understanding of the argument</p> <p>3) Fully predict by putting the flaw into your own words</p> <p>4) the right AC likely matches the structure (although it doesn't have to... and order doesn't matter at all), but <b>MUST</b> match the flaw of the stimulus</p>	<i>which one exhibits flawed (pattern of) reasoning most similar to the stimulus</i>	eliminate ACs that are good arguments <b>BECAUSE</b> the stimulus is a bad argument

**Parallel**

1) ID premises and conclusion (and whether its a good argument)  
2) use Lawgic mapping (more generic forms) or another visual to help you cement your understanding of the argument  
3) get the argument structure into your own words  
4) match the right AC to the stimulus and start with the strength of the conclusion:  
ORDER does not matter, TOPIC does not matter,  
STRUCTURE/FORM is the only thing that matters and we need to match!

The pattern of reasoning in which one of the following arguments is most similar to the reasoning above?

eliminate ACs that are bad arguments if the stimulus is a good argument

## MBT

- 1) remember, there may not be a main conclusion!
- 2) **No need to predict** for these! Just go into the AC's thinking **"I'm looking for something that ABSOLUTELY 100% HAS TO BE TRUE based on the information above!"**
- 3) **Evaluate** each AC. First, ask yourself **does this have to be true?** Does the author absolutely HAVE to agree with this?
- 4) Put pen to paper and use some sort of **visual mapping** to keep track of the logic for these! It doesn't have to be an if → then Lawgic map. Venn diagrams, concentric circles, graphs or charts, etc ALL HELP! Even a silly little sketch. Jot down the spectrum of support (MBT far left, CBT/CBF middle, MBF far right) and place each AC on it to compare. **Get creative; your goal is to add another dimension of understanding, NOT to overcomplicate!**

*"must be true" "properly inferred" "if everything above is true, what else follows?"*

[https://coda.io/d/Most-Strongly-Supported-Fill-in-the-Blank\\_d5SR0pw-l3y/Must-Be-True-LR\\_sufIj#\\_luOE\\_](https://coda.io/d/Most-Strongly-Supported-Fill-in-the-Blank_d5SR0pw-l3y/Must-Be-True-LR_sufIj#_luOE_)

**MBF**

- 1) **Identify** premises and conclusion.
- 2) **No need to predict** for these! Just go into the AC's thinking **"I'm looking for something that ABSOLUTELY 100% HAS TO BE FALSE based on the information above!"**
- 3) **Evaluate** each AC. First, ask yourself **does this have to be true?** Does the author absolutely HAVE to agree with this?
- 4) Put pen to paper and use some sort of **visual mapping** to keep track of the logic for these! It doesn't have to be an if → then Lawgic map. Venn diagrams, concentric circles, graphs or charts, etc ALL HELP! Even a silly little sketch. Jot down the spectrum of support (MBT far left, CBT/CBF middle, MBF far right) and place each AC on it to compare. **Get creative; your goal is to add another dimension of understanding, NOT to overcomplicate!**

*"Each of the following could be true EXCEPT"*  
*"must be false"*

**MOR  
(method of reasoning)**

- 1) Put into your own words what the method of reasoning employed in the argument is. Ask yourself how the author got from a to b to c. Think: what words are general enough to pick up from this argument and be placed onto another
- 2) go AC by AC, mapping it back onto the stimulus and making sure there are NO red flags and it's supported, "too general" is NOT a red flag

*"method of reasoning,"*  
*"\_\_\_ makes their argument by \_\_\_,"*  
*"\_\_\_ responds to \_\_\_ by..." "the argument proceeds by..."*

## PSAr: Find the rule

1) **Identify** premises and conclusion.

2) **Find the gap or hole:** answer **fully**, in your own words, **what is wrong with this argument?**

These are the best examples of questions where you can picture the correct AC as a **missing sentence** from the stimulus. What principle or general rule would you add to make it all make sense?

3) **Pre-phrase:** "I'm looking for **something that** connects the premises to the conclusion with a general rule!"

4) Go AC by AC, **eliminating** if it does not tie up the loose ends and **keeping** AC's that, if we add to the stimulus, actually have some bearing on the argument and make me more likely to accept it!

5) **Exhaust!** Ask yourself if and

*if you see the word "principle" or "generalization" in the question stem AND implying that the principle you are finding among the ACs will close that gap or hole in the stimulus "which one of the following principles, if valid, helps to justify"*