Question One

Not too many difficulties caused by this question. The first sentence sets out the argument: when abroad, people should try to learn some of the language. The rest of the argument explains why they should learn the language: to find out more about the country and to function more effectively. Answer D clearly paraphrases and summarises the argument.

Question Two

The trick here is to see that, if X is travelling at 12km/h and Y is travelling at 20km/h towards each other, they are approaching each other at 32km/h. They have to travel 8km (together, not each). Therefore, you have distance and speed. Since time = distance/speed, we can see that the answer is 8/32, which is 1/4. Since the speed is in hours, we have 1/4 hour, which is 15 minutes.

Question Three

The argument can be roughly summarised as follows: Government said do X. In fact, they underestimated the fact that Y will be negatively affected by X. Stop saying do X!

The flaw in the argument is that we don't know what X does negatively affect Y; in this case, it seems implausible that just telling people to eat 5 portions of fruit and vegetables will make them eat less meat. It might even make them eat more!

The answer which best summarises this is E.

Question Four

Some difficulties caused by this. In my view, the best answer is D; some students thought it was B ("No one should ever get a body piercing because the risk outweighs the benefits"). However, that conclusion is far too absolute; the final two lines clearly demonstrate that UK-based specialists are relatively save. Therefore, a sensible conclusion to draw would be to get to a specialist/expert for your piercing.

Question Five

Also caused some difficulties. The crux of the argument is in the first two sentences: women are under-represented in leadership positions; this is unfair and bad, because the most able may not be in the most senior positions.

An underlying assumption here is that women are just as competent as men in those senior leadership positions. This assumption is required to make sense of the proposition that the most

able people are not in the most senior positions; if women were less competent than men, then the most able people (i.e. men) would be in the most senior positions. But since that is *not* the case, the assumption must be operative. The answer is therefore D.

Question Six

Without Daughter: £120 spent per week: 70% on food (£84), 20% goods (£24), 10% store cupboard (£12)

With Daughter: £138 spent per week: £84 + 20% (£100.80); £24 + 5% (£25.20) + £12

Question Seven

A difficult question to do quickly. The requirements are: two invigilators per session, one male one female, one teacher of that subject, once per day.

On Wednesday, the morning session is Maths + Latin; the afternoon session is English + Spanish.

In the morning, Marjorie and Susan *must* invigilate: they are the only ones who teach Maths and Latin. There must also be one male teacher (it doesn't matter who it is). That means Marjorie and Susan cannot invigilate in the afternoon.

In the afternoon, there must be one English and one Spanish invigilator: both Jenny and Marjorie teach English, but Marjorie has already invigilated in the morning so it must be Jenny. Susan and Keith both teach Spanish, but Susan has already invigilated.

Therefore, Keith and Jenny will invigilate, which is C.

Question Eight

Very good answers here from students to see that the correct response is C. A, B, and D are easy to cut; E can be done by slicing diagonally from top right to bottom left and then looking at the cross-section. Only C cannot be done with a single cut.

Question Nine

Very simple question. The answer to "what would weaken this argument" is very often a lack of proof. Here, the argument is roughly: X is bad because it endangers Y. What would undermine this argument is proof that Y has not been endangered or harmed. Here, there is evidence that the population of the bears has not decreased due to hunting.

Question Ten

A very amusing question which elicited some very funny answers. The correct answer is E. The argument is roughly: Laptops do not have a battery life to last an entire flight and cannot be charged on board. Therefore, they should be banned.

The obvious flaw in this argument is that, even if a flight is 10 hours long and your laptop's battery life is 6 hours long, you can still get 6 hours of use from your laptop! This is what answer E is suggesting. (However, it does sound a bit like you can use an out-of-charge laptop as e.g. a pillow...)

Question Eleven

No problems on this question. The answer is obviously along the lines of: parents need to control what their children eat and watch; the responsibility lies with them, not with advertising. Answer A clearly paraphrases that.

Question Twelve

The first thing to do is to remove the 45 non-maths and non-economics students from the original 230 who applied, which leaves 185.

127 have maths; 89 have economics. If you add these two together, you get 216. That means that at least (216-185) would have had both econ and maths: 31. That is B.

Open Questions

Quite good answers to these, particularly to A. Answers focused on the distinction between "private" and "public" and when private misdemeanours become relevant to the character or work of public servants. Most people favoured not making smokers pay for their own healthcare; we will return to this in future weeks where we have an attempt at writing longer essays.