

## TSA Week 1 Series 2 Questions

### Question One

Nobody found this too difficult thankfully. If you boil down the argument, it looks like: If X then Y. When experiments were conducted on a simulator, there was evidence which supports the proposition that if X then Y. If you take a step back, you can quite clearly see that this assumes that simulators are reliable guides to real-life driving; if they weren't, the evidence wouldn't support the proposition! One student pointed out that there are good reasons to think people would behave differently in driving simulators - they might treat it like a video-game!

The answer is therefore A.

### Question Two

Again, not too many difficulties here. A two-month study is clearly insufficient if demand tends to rise/decrease at certain times of the year. Analogously, a two-month survey of ice-cream-van sales taken in July/August and compared to e.g. last year's December/January sales would be misleading. You need a year-on-year view. Therefore the answer is C.

### Question Three

Confusingly phrased, but actually quite simple.

Originally, Sue and Ben choose £96 worth of goods; they therefore receive the "up to £100" discount of 33%, so they pay (roughly) two-thirds of £96, which is (roughly) £64.

If they chose goods worth £102, they would be entitled to the "£100 or more" discount of 50%. They would therefore pay half-price, which is £51.

The difference between £64 and £51 is £13, so the answer is D.

### Question Four

Another quite confusing question. The trick here is to see that there is a lot of excess information provided. All you need are the values in the "Amount (£)" column.

**Her New Bill:** She halves her standard consumption; this means she'll pay half the amount, so £168 (roughly) is halved to give us £84. The "Fixed Charges" of £12.30 stay, so we're up to £96.30. She increases her off-peak consumption by 10x, so we multiple 10.06 by 10 to get roughly £100. Her Fixed Charges again remain, which is £5.45. Added all together gives us £203 (roughly), which is closest to £200, so the answer is E.

### Question Five

Everyone got this correct! You can use process of elimination to see that all the other shapes will not work because they fail to fill the gap in the centre of the star. The closest incorrect answer is E, but you can see that if you put in four of these panes they would still leave a small gap in the centre. B is incorrect because the two panes (one vertical, one horizontal) would overlap, which is obviously inappropriate for a window. The answer is A.

### Question Six

The correct answer here is B. What is clear from the data is that 78% of young people thought their parents “didn’t mind” or only “would rather they didn’t”. In fact, 63% of parents did not like it. Therefore, young people clearly think their parents disapprove less of their smoking than they actually do. A is the only other possibly correct answer, but it is less clearly borne out by the data; moreover, the only people who are polled here are “young smokers”, not all young people.

### Question Seven

A bit of a strange question in my view. As with many of the “underlying assumption” argument questions we have done in the past, the answer is (meant to be) hidden in the last two sentences:

1. RFR Emission Levels are low and safe
2. Therefore mobile phone masts are safe

The conclusion you are *supposed* to derive from this is that you can only reach (2) from (1) if there is an underlying assumption that *there are no other kinds of health risk which mobile phone masts pose to others*. The answer is therefore E.

### Question Eight

This question did pose some problems. The way to see the answer most clearly is that the argument puts forward the view that “advertising” and “consumer benefit” are pushing in different directions: advertising is detrimental to consumer benefit. You should therefore look for an argument which breaks or challenges that linkage. The two options for this are really A and B. A is a weaker option than B because it relies on what manufacturers think about their own products; this can obviously be misleading for a lot of reasons! I might think that consumers are benefited by my amazing product, but really my competitor’s product could be better. By contrast, B does not rely on anyone’s opinion: it says that competition, as a result of advertising, directly benefits consumers by improving quality of goods.

### Question Nine

This caused the most problems of all! The question is confusing. The trick here is to see that you don’t know how long the car will be parked for. I might want to move the car at 3.30pm or at

5.30pm, or at some point in between! I should therefore calculate which car park will be cheapest for both 3.5hrs and 5.5hrs.

Starting with 3.5hrs, we can see that Grove Street is £6, Victoria Square is £4, Central Park is £4, Bonningtons is £4.50, and Grange Road is £4.

Moving to 5.5hrs, Grove Street is £6, Victoria Square is £6, Central Park is £8, Bonningtons is £7.50, and Grange Road is £7.

As we can see, Victoria Square is joint-cheapest for both 3.5hrs and 5.5hrs! That is therefore the answer.

### Question Ten

The easiest way to find the answer is to work out cost per passenger for 1-6 passengers.

If there is only one passenger, he will pay £70.

If there are two passengers, the overall cost will be £80 (£70 + £10), divided by two: £40

If there are three passengers, the overall cost will be £90 (£70 + £20), divided by three: £30

If there are four passengers, the overall cost will be £100 (£70 + £30), divided by four: £25

The only graph which matches these readings is D.

### Question Eleven

The structure of this argument is: Amrik cannot have A because Too Much X; B has more X than A, therefore Amrik cannot have B either.

Everyone quickly saw that C is the correct answer: Amrik won't drink tea as it has too much caffeine; coffee has more caffeine than tea; therefore Amrik won't drink coffee.

### Question Twelve

This did cause some difficulty. The idea behind the argument is along the lines of:

1. People use a different amount of water to one another.
2. Everyone pays the same amount for water, no matter how much they use.
3. This is unfair.

You should therefore look for an answer which demonstrates the principle of paying for what you use, rather than according to a system of taxation. The only answer which reflects this is D: people should pay for the road according to how much they use it, rather than through taxation.

### Open Questions

Good answers to both questions! Performance Enhancing Drugs in particular got some interesting responses, in particular about the effects on fairness and whether this would result in dangerous outcomes for athletes and a huge amount of money being spent on the drugs. Students could have considered the impact on amateur sports and the onus to dope for amateur and junior athletes.

The second question was quite widely answered as being Climate Change, with one notable answer for Political Correctness. All were well-argued, though there could have been more imagination in selecting the threats.