

interpretations

Twenty-year-old Alex has won a national competition that aimed to find Britain's most multilingual student. This undergraduate speaks 10 foreign languages: Greek, German, Spanish, Russian, Dutch, Afrikaans, French, Hebrew, Catalan and Italian. Alex plans to spend his award money visiting some of these foreign language speaking countries.

Alex speaks 11 languages including his native one.

If Alex speaks 10 **foreign** languages, and he has won a **national British** competition, then, it is safe to assume beyond reasonable doubt that he also speaks English (which is not mentioned in the passage).

interpretations

Twenty-year-old Alex has won a national competition that aimed to find Britain's most multilingual student. This undergraduate speaks 10 foreign languages: Greek, German, Spanish, Russian, Dutch, Afrikaans, French, Hebrew, Catalan and Italian. Alex plans to spend his award money visiting some of these foreign language speaking countries.

Without winning the competition, Alex would not have planned to visit foreign countries.

The passage does not provide us with any information regarding Alex's plans prior to the competition. He might have planned to visit these countries regardless of his win.

interpretations

Twenty-year-old Alex has won a national competition that aimed to find Britain's most multilingual student. This undergraduate speaks 10 foreign languages: Greek, German, Spanish, Russian, Dutch, Afrikaans, French, Hebrew, Catalan and Italian. Alex plans to spend his award money visiting some of these foreign language speaking countries.

If Alex met an Italian, he would be able to converse with him.

Since Alex speaks Italian, and Italian people speak Italian as well, we can assume beyond reasonable doubt that Alex will be able to converse with an Italian. Note that it is possible to come up with scenarios in which this conclusion will not follow (for example, Alex meets an Italian citizen who does not speak Italian), but in this section, you are not required to decide whether the conclusion follows absolutely and necessarily, but whether it follows beyond a **reasonable** doubt.

interpretations

Treating a stroke is a race against time. Clots that block the blood supply prevent the flow of oxygen and sugar to brain cells, which then rapidly die. Recent studies have shown that some brain cells could withstand being starved of oxygen. The aim of researchers today is to develop a drug that can imitate that same effect.

Deprivation of oxygen to the brain is the reason for stroke related impairments.

The passage states that the reason for stroke-related brain cell deaths is deprivation of oxygen **as well as** sugar. Saying that something 'is **the** reason' for something else implies that it is the only reason. Deprivation of oxygen, as far as the text is concerned, is only part of the reason for stroke-related impairments. The conclusion would have followed if it had read "Clots that block the blood supply to the brain is the reason for stroke related impairments." Because the deprivation of sugar and oxygen results from the lack of blood supply, caused by the clots.

interpretations

Treating a stroke is a race against time. Clots that block the blood supply prevent the flow of oxygen and sugar to brain cells, which then rapidly die. Recent studies have shown that some brain cells could withstand being starved of oxygen. The aim of researchers today is to develop a drug that can imitate that same effect.

If brain cells can withstand starvation, then people will not suffer from stroke-related injuries.

Although one could imagine other stroke-related phenomena that harm people's health that are not related to brain cells starvation, based on the above passage alone, this conclusion does follow beyond a reasonable doubt.

interpretations

Treating a stroke is a race against time. Clots that block the blood supply prevent the flow of oxygen and sugar to brain cells, which then rapidly die. Recent studies have shown that some brain cells could withstand being starved of oxygen. The aim of researchers today is to develop a drug that can imitate that same effect.

The drug that researchers are hoping to develop will help brain cells withstand starvation of oxygen.

The passage states that researchers today are trying to develop a drug that can imitate the "same effect", relating to the discovery of brain cells withstanding oxygen starvation.

interpretations

Treating a stroke is a race against time. Clots that block the blood supply prevent the flow of oxygen and sugar to brain cells, which then rapidly die. Recent studies have shown that some brain cells could withstand being starved of oxygen. The aim of researchers today is to develop a drug that can imitate that same effect.

If people who have suffered a stroke are not treated quickly, they will not survive.

Although the passage states that "treating a stroke is a race against time", it relates to the death of brain cells, and not necessarily the death of a person. For instance, brain cell death can result in partial damage, such as paralysis or deterioration in motor abilities. However likely as it may be for brain cell death to be connected to actual death, there is no information in the passage that supports this.

interpretations

No one has ever proven that babies who are slow to gain weight in the first few months of their lives generally don't catch up to their peers by age 13.

Babies who are slow to gain weight usually catch up with their 13-year-old peers.

The fact that no one has ever proven that babies who are slow to gain weight do not catch up with their peers does not necessarily mean that they do catch up. The only actual piece of information we have in this passage is that nobody really knows what happens to babies who are slow to gain weight compared to their peers.

interpretations

No one has ever proven that babies who are slow to gain weight in the first few months of their lives generally don't catch up to their peers by age 13.

No baby who was slow to gain weight in the first months of its life didn't catch up with his 13-year-old peers.

There is no evidence to say that all the babies (without exception) caught up with their 13-year-old peers. The passage only states that nobody has ever proven otherwise.

interpretations

No one has ever proven that babies who are slow to gain weight in the first few months of their lives generally don't catch up to their peers by age 13.

There might be babies who are slow to gain weight who do not catch up with their 13-year-old peers.

There is no evidence to say that all babies (without exception) caught up with their 13-year-old peers. Therefore, it might be possible that some babies who are slow to gain weight will not manage to catch up with their 13-year-old peers.

interpretations

No one has ever proven that babies who are slow to gain weight in the first few months of their lives generally don't catch up to their peers by age 13.

Researchers have unsuccessfully tried to prove that babies who are slow to gain weight will catch up with their peers.

This is an excellent example of how a concise paragraph, such as the paragraph above, tempts us to "fill in the gaps". Undoubtedly, some may have read the paragraph and concluded that if no one has ever proven so, that means that someone must have tried and failed. Although it may possibly be the case that researchers have failed to prove that babies who are slow to gain weight won't catch up with their peers, we cannot assert this without reasonable doubt. It is also possible that no researcher has ever attempted to prove this matter.

interpretations

In the years 2011-12, 32% of pupils entitled to free school meals (an indicator of low socioeconomic status) achieved five GCSE passes at grade C or above. This is compared with a rate of 65% among pupils who were not entitled to free school meals.

For every socially deprived pupil achieving five GCSE passes at grade C or above, there are at least two non-deprived pupils who achieved the same

The logic behind this answer is mathematical: although it is true that the percentage of non-deprived pupils who achieved five GCSE passes at grade C or above is more than twice the percentage of deprived pupils, we do not know the absolute number of pupils in each category (deprived/non-deprived). If the total number of non-deprived pupils is significantly smaller than the total number of deprived pupils, there might even be a greater number of deprived pupils than non-deprived pupils achieving five GCSE passes at grade C or above.

interpretations

In the years 2011-12, 32% of pupils entitled to free school meals (an indicator of low socioeconomic status) achieved five GCSE passes at grade C or above. This is compared with a rate of 65% among pupils who were not entitled to free school meals.

Deprived pupils succeed less in school because of their socioeconomic background.

There is no information given in the passage that relates to the cause of the low achievements of deprived pupils compared to non-deprived pupils. The socioeconomic background was used in the passage in order to divide the pupils into categories (deprived/non-deprived) and not necessarily to provide a reason for the differences between the groups. Causal inferences cannot be made from correlative information, like the information given in this text.

interpretations

In the years 2011-12, 32% of pupils entitled to free school meals (an indicator of low socioeconomic status) achieved five GCSE passes at grade C or above. This is compared with a rate of 65% among pupils who were not entitled to free school meals.

Most of the pupils who were not entitled to a free school meal achieved five GCSE passes at grade C or above.

The logic behind this answer is mathematical: the passage states that 65% of the pupils who were not entitled to a free school meal achieved five GCSE passes at a minimum of a C grade. Since 65% is greater than 50%, we can conclude that they are the majority.

interpretations

When the United States Postal Service was created in 1971 it was the largest company in America. It delivered twice as much mail as all of its domestic competitors combined. Today, the United States Postal Service delivers about 20 percent of the mail in the country.

Domestic competitors deliver more than three times as much mail as the United States Postal Service does today.

Today the United States Postal Service delivers about 20 percent of the mail domestically. Therefore, the other companies combined deliver approximately 80 percent.

$\sim 80 / \sim 20 > 3$

interpretations

When the United States Postal Service was created in 1971 it was the largest company in America. It delivered twice as much mail as all of its domestic competitors combined. Today, the United States Postal Service delivers about 20 percent of the mail in the country.

The United States Postal Service delivers less mail today than it did in 1971.

Although it is stated that in 1971 the United States Postal Service delivered a larger percentage of the mail, it is possible that the amount of mail they deliver hasn't changed, but the total quantity of mail to be delivered has increased – leading to their portion being of a lower percentage.

***Note:** Percentage \neq Amount

interpretations

When the United States Postal Service was created in 1971 it was the largest company in America. It delivered twice as much mail as all of its domestic competitors combined. Today, the United States Postal Service delivers about 20 percent of the mail in the country.

In 1971 the United States Postal Service delivered no less than 66% of the total mail in the country.

The passage notes that in 1971 the United States Postal Service delivered twice as much mail as all of its domestic competitors combined. In order for that statement to be true, it means that the very least that they delivered is 66.67%, causing all the competitors to combine to a total of 33.33% – exactly half of the mail delivered by the United States Postal Service.