

## Arguments

Should employees who have over five years of experience in the company be bound by law to give employers an advance notice of 60 days upon resignation?

Yes. Research has shown that requiring employees to give advance notice forces them to rethink their choice, which often causes them to change their minds. This makes workplaces more stable environments, especially when it comes to valuable experienced employees.

This argument is both relevant to the subject and important. Therefore, it is a strong argument.

## Arguments

Should employees who have over five years of experience in the company be bound by law to give employers an advance notice of 60 days upon resignation?

Yes; senior employees are a great asset to a workplace and employers need sufficient time to find them an adequate replacement.

This argument is both directly related to the question and is important. Therefore, it is strong

## Arguments

Should employees who have over five years of experience in the company be bound by law to give employers an advance notice of 60 days upon resignation?

No. People should be able to leave their workplace whenever they want.

Though this argument may be related to the question, and though you may agree, it lacks content, and hence lacks importance. It does not explain what would be the advantages or disadvantages of people leaving their workplace whenever they want, or present any supporting arguments, rendering this argument weak.

## Arguments

Should the government station speed cameras alongside main roads to reduce the amount of fatal car accidents?

No; stationing speed cameras alongside main roads promotes a false sense of security.

Even if this is true, as you are supposed to assume, the argument does not explain further what the implications would be on fatal car accidents, and so it is not directly related to the subject. For the argument to be strong, you are required to make a logical jump that is not presented in the argument (that a false sense of security will cause more accidents).

## Arguments

Should the government station speed cameras alongside main roads to reduce the amount of fatal car accidents?

No; research has shown that a significant percentage of fatal car accidents are not solely a result of speeding.

This argument touches upon a main issue of the statement—the relation of fatal car accidents to speed. However, there is no direct stated relation to speed cameras. Moreover, the main reason this argument is weak is on account of triviality—a significant percentage of fatal car accidents are not only a result of speeding. That is, they are a result of many factors, one of them which is speed. This by itself is not reason enough to reject stationing speed cameras along main roads.

## Arguments

Should the government station speed cameras alongside main roads to reduce the amount of fatal car accidents?

Yes; main roads with speed cameras tend to have fewer fatal accidents than main roads with no speed cameras.

This argument may be directly related to the subject, but it only mentions correlation, not causation. As such, it is not important enough. Simply because main roads with speed cameras tend to have fewer fatal accidents than main roads with no speed cameras, does not mean stationing speed cameras alongside main roads **will** reduce fatal car accidents.

## Arguments

Should the government station speed cameras alongside main roads to reduce the amount of fatal car accidents?

Yes; speeding is the main cause of fatal car accidents and speed cameras have been proven to reduce average speed by 10%

This argument is strong as it is both of high importance and is directly related to the question.

## Arguments

Should parents put their children in preparation courses for gifted tests, in order for them to reach their full potential?

Yes; parents are responsible for their children's future and should do whatever they can to help them succeed in life.

This argument, though of great general importance, is not directly related to the question. The question specifically asked about preparation courses for gifted tests, and the argument does not even mention them. If, for example, the argument made the connection between preparation courses and success, the argument would have been strong. Since it does not, it is weak.



## Arguments

Should parents put their children in preparation courses for gifted tests, in order for them to reach their full potential?

No; children who participate in a preparation course often get accepted to gifted programs without being sufficiently qualified.

Even when considered as true, this argument lacks relevance to the main question. Unlike the previous question, it mentions the preparation courses. However, it fails to discuss the children's potential. The implications of a child getting accepted to gifted programs without sufficient qualifications are not explained. Unqualified children could still learn important skills, and fulfill their potential. Moreover, according to the argument, some children who got accepted are qualified, and their potential can be fulfilled too. The argument does not answer these questions. Therefore, it is weak.

## Arguments

Should parents put their children in preparation courses for gifted tests, in order for them to reach their full potential?

Yes; preparation courses are a great way of learning new skills and developing talents, so will highly benefit children.

Remember that we are looking for an argument that is both directly related to the question, and is important. This argument is both. It claims that parents should indeed encourage their children to participate in these courses because children will learn new skills and develop new talents, namely, they will reach their potential.

## Arguments

Should parents put their children in preparation courses for gifted tests, in order for them to reach their full potential?

Yes; gifted students have access to small classes, extra hours and enrichment programs.

This argument deviates from the main issue of the statement. The statement deliberates on whether parents should send their children to preparation courses. The argument, however, discusses the advantages of being in a gifted class. If the argument made a connection between the preparation classes and getting into the gifted classes, it could have been strong. Since it did not, it is weak.

## Arguments

Should a company grant its employees some free time to spend in any manner of their choosing?

No—employees are likely to use the free time to clean their homes, run errands, and meet with friends, and thus bring no benefit to the company whatsoever.

The above question can be summarized as "should a company do X?" The importance of the answer can also be summarized as "no, since it would bring the company no benefit whatsoever". Since all companies seek to benefit, an argument of "no benefit" is strong and relevant. Note that the first part of the argument includes trivial aspects (what people will do with their free time). If the argument had stopped there, it would have been weak argument, but since it expands the topic and stretches out the implication ("no benefit"), it becomes strong.

## Arguments

Would frequent changes in government improve the general welfare of the people in the country?

No; a frequent change in government would make it harder to pass laws regarding healthcare and financial allocations of the annual government budget.

One of the main reasons for hunting is to profit from selling the desirable parts of a It is common knowledge that welfare is constituted from several aspects, where medical care is among them. The argument is relevant and focuses on an important aspect of the dilemma presented.

## Arguments

Should the government provide free education for its citizens?

No; people do not work as hard to keep their jobs when they know their children will receive an education anyway.

At first the argument seems to be strong, as it addresses the subject, but after reading it in full we can see that it doesn't focus on the main aspect of education, but rather an insignificant possible 'side effect' free education might have on society. Therefore, the argument is weak.

## Arguments

Should the government provide free education for its citizens?

Yes; in countries where the government pays for education, parents don't have to pay for their children's education.

The argument is more a statement of a fact, rather than an argument at all. It provides no reasoning whatsoever in regard to the subject at hand.

## Arguments

Should employers look at Facebook and Twitter profiles of candidates to find out more information about them as part of recruitment and selection decision making?

No, an employer has no right to intrude in the private lives of his candidates.

The argument is a slogan. It presents no reasoning as to why employers shouldn't use social media as part of recruitment and decision-making.

A strong argument would be: "No, Social media is a personal platform in which candidates may post posts of a personal nature, but they may behave differently when they are in a professional environment."



## Arguments

Would differential cash bonuses for high productivity be beneficial to the workplace?

No; differential cash bonuses have been found to create a hostile working environment which leads to a decrease in the quality and quantity of products.

The argument offers a relevant, important reason why differential bonuses are not a good idea. It explains the massive negative effects they would have on the workplace, and is thus a strong argument.

## Arguments

Would differential cash bonuses for high productivity be beneficial to the workplace?

Yes; differential cash bonuses are a great way to create a healthy competition in the workplace leading to higher profits.

Similar to the previous argument, this one presents an important and relevant argument, only it specifies the positive effects differential bonuses would have on the workplace. Remember, you are to regard each of the argument as true, and disregard your own opinion in the matter.

## Arguments

Would differential cash bonuses for high productivity be beneficial to the workplace?

No; high productivity leads to low-quality products and a decrease in revenue.

Though if true, this is a very important argument, it is unrelated to the question. The question asked about how differential cash bonuses would affect the workplace, not how high productivity would affect it.

## Arguments

Should the government close ageing and polluting power stations even if the result is more energy imports?

No; power station closures could mean a 10% fall in energy capacity in the near future.

This argument has a relevance problem. It does not relate directly to the conflict presented in the statement. Although it argues that closing power station will result in a drop in energy capacity, it does not state the implications of this result on energy imports or otherwise (implications on environmental issues, society etc.).

## Arguments

Should the government close ageing and polluting power stations even if the result is more energy imports?

No; competing for energy imports on the global market is likely to cost more.

The argument addresses one of the main issues presented in the statement—importing energy. It states that importing energy will result in an increase in energy prices, thus offering a sound reason for opposing the closure of ageing power plants. Remember, even if you do not agree with the argument, you must regard it as true.

## Arguments

Should the government use software solutions, designed to track online behaviors on social networks, in order to prevent threats to national security?

Yes—national security is of high enough importance to justify the violation of civil liberties and freedom of thought.

Here you have a reference to the ethical problems involved in data mining in which, unlike in the first question in this set, the ethical aspect is presented in relation to the main question - preventing national security threats. In other words, this argument is related to the question and the consequence it described are important. For this reason, it is a strong argument.

## Arguments

Should the government use software solutions, designed to track online behaviors on social networks, in order to prevent threats to national security?

Yes—national security is of high enough importance to justify the violation of civil liberties and freedom of thought.

Here you have a reference to the ethical problems involved in data mining in which, unlike in the first question in this set, the ethical aspect is presented in relation to the main question - preventing national security threats. In other words, this argument is related to the question and the consequence it described are important. For this reason, it is a strong argument.

## Arguments

Should employers look at the Facebook and Twitter profiles of candidates to find out more information about them as part of recruitment and selection decision making?

Yes. Candidates must be careful to monitor their social profile so that their activities will not be detrimental to their career opportunities.

This argument, though it may be important for job candidates, does not answer the question. It provides no reasons in favour or against looking at candidates' social media, but shifts the discussion to another matter that is not directly related to the question.



## Arguments

Should employers look at the Facebook and Twitter profiles of candidates to find out more information about them as part of recruitment and selection decision making?

Yes. Social networks are a legitimate part of today's social fabric, offering another perspective on the suitability of a candidate to a certain position.

This argument is both important and relevant to the subject of the statement. First, the argument targets the main subject of the statement, which is the employers' objective to distinguish between suitable and unsuitable employees using Facebook and Twitter. Secondly, the argument offers a sound reason in favor of using social networks as an alternative source of information on employees—they offer a legitimate different perspective on the candidate, a perspective that perhaps is overlooked at personal interviews and assessment centers.