



1.

Food producers are resisting pressure to reduce still further the levels of salt in food. Although it is proven that salt intake must be reduced by those with hypertension, there is no evidence that reducing salt intake prevents hypertension. So why should we all be deprived of the pleasures of salt in food? We certainly need to identify those with hypertension and give them advice on their salt intake, but why should everyone else be deprived of salt? Food producers are right to resist the pressure.

Which one of the following best illustrates the principle underlying the argument above?

- A Adding fluoride to drinking water has reduced tooth decay, but fluoride is unwelcome to some people. Instead, dentists should advise patients with tooth problems on better tooth care.
- B The requirement to wear seatbelts has reduced deaths in car accidents but was unpopular when first introduced. People eventually accepted such changes even if it has not benefited them personally.
- C Advice to wear sun block to protect the skin from harmful rays is ignored by some people. Those people should be charged for medical treatment for skin cancer.
- D Passive smoking is still a problem for people who share a home with a smoker. The law should be extended to make smoking illegal even in the home.
- E Retailers cannot sell alcohol to people under 18 years, but providing more general advice on alcohol in schools would be better, as it would encourage young people to be self limiting in their consumption of alcohol.

IMAT Q15 (2015)

Here, the answer is A.

The passage argues that although salt intake should be reduced in those with hypertension, salt intake if reduced does not necessarily prevent hypertension. Therefore, only those with hypertension should be advised to reduce salt intake. This principle is applied in statement A.



2.

Undercover police investigators sometimes commit 'crimes' in order to convince the 'real criminals' that they are on the same side as them. Some of these activities have victims, although in the main these are other criminals – rival gang members for example. In committing what are technically offences the officers are preventing many more serious crimes by helping to convict and imprison dangerous criminals who might otherwise remain at liberty. But that is not really the point. A breach of the law is a breach of the law, whoever commits it and for whatever reason. Preventing a crime does not make it right to commit another crime.

Which one of the following is the general principle underlying the above argument?

- A An act is criminal only if it is committed for criminal reasons.
- B Serious crime must be prevented by any reasonable means.
- C The police have a duty to protect law-abiding citizens from violence.
- D There is no such thing as a victimless crime.
- E The end does not justify the means.

IMAT Q18 (2015)

Here, the answer is E.

The paragraph summarises that committing a crime by the police in order to convict and imprison other dangerous criminals does not justify the crime in the first place. This is summarised and highlighted in the text. Therefore, the ends of the police to commit crimes does not justify the means to imprison criminals. Therefore, statement E is correct.



3.

What is a clone but a twin? What is genetic engineering or selective breeding but assisted evolution? How often do we hear these trite excuses for man's arrogant interference with natural processes? Too often. It is time to call a halt and consider just what limits need to be placed on the break-neck progress of bio-technology, if 'progress' is even the right word for it. The big question for science should not be 'What's in it for us?' but 'Could this have happened naturally?' And if the answer is 'No' then we should not bring it about just because we have found that we can. If we do we may live a bit longer or grow more food per acre, but we don't know where our meddling will end.

Which one of the following is a principle which underlies the above argument?

- A Nature will have its own way in the long run.
- B Meddling with nature could only ever end in disaster.
- C Science should not progress beyond what is natural.
- D It is time to call a halt on bio-technological advances.
- E Cloning, genetic engineering and selective breeding are not 'progress'.

IMAT Q12 (2016)

Here, the answer is C.

The passage concludes that if there are things that could have not occurred naturally but have rather been catalysed with science, then they should have not been allowed to occur in the first place. Therefore, it is fair to say that science should allow things within our natural means but not go beyond them. This is summarised in statement C.

Statement A is incorrect because there is no mention of what will happen in the long run.

Statement B is not correct because we cannot assume that disaster will occur just because we are going beyond our natural means. This is not mentioned or directly implied in the text.

Statement D is incorrect because the passage explains that science is alright as long as we use it within our natural parameters.

Statement E is incorrect because although the author does not specifically state that cloning, genetic engineering and selective breeding are not progress but is rather not content with the use of the term for the discussed examples.



4.

High profile members of society can raise awareness of worthy causes better than members of the public, because they have their opinions listened to and respected more readily by a larger number of people. Celebrities should not be shy about drawing attention to charities and foundations to which they donate their time and money, because it may encourage other people to do the same.

Which one of the following best illustrates the principle underlying the argument above?

- A People should value their superiors' opinions on all matters because they have been successful in one or more fields.
- B If your boss does not commit any virtuous acts then neither should you.
- C If you can help someone else by donating your disposable time and money, it will help improve society.
- D Directors of companies should encourage their employees to recycle more by visibly doing so themselves.
- E Companies with the most employees should be put under pressure to commit to the most social change.

IMAT Q20 (2016)

Here, the answer is D.

The paragraph explains that if celebrities raise awareness and draw their attention to certain charities, that it will make it more likely for the general population to do the same. The reasoning behind this is the general population respects and listens to celebrities more. Therefore, the principle of the argument is that if you see people who tend to be more generally respected, their actions will be replicated by others. This will lead to an increase likelihood of that action being implemented. This same underlying principle is used in statement D. The example used is if directors in companies recycle more visibly, this will ultimately encourage more employees to do the same.



5.

Car drivers understandably become very annoyed at high sales taxes on fuel. In the interests of fairness, money raised from fuel taxes should be spent on maintaining roads or even on subsidising public transport. In fact much of it is put to other uses, such as providing healthcare or improving national defence.

Which one of the following is an application of the principle underlying the above argument?

- A Money raised by taxing fuel should be spent on improving roads rather than on public transport.
- B Better transport is more important than national defence.
- C Maintaining roads should be a higher priority than spending on healthcare.
- D Profits from sporting events should be spent on encouraging people to participate in sport.
- E There should be no sales taxes on consumer goods.

IMAT Q17 (2017)

Here, the answer is D.

The highlighted sentence in the passage suggests that any money raised from fuel taxes should be injected back into the road user system, whereby, revenue raised should be spent on 'maintaining roads or even on subsidising public transport.' This suggests that a tax imposed on a specific variable should mean that the money raised from these taxes should be reinvested back into the same variable. This same principle is applied to sporting events and sports in statement D.



6.

Food manufacturers should reduce sugar levels in processed foods. This is because there are too many overweight and obese people. Since people are unable or unwilling to make sensible decisions for themselves, manufacturers must take responsibility for rectifying a problem to which they contribute.

Which one of the following illustrates the principle used in the above argument?

- A Cigarette packets should have plain packaging and display government health warnings.
- B In order to reduce sugar intake, foods with high sugar content should be taxed more heavily.
- C Power tools should have clear instructions in order to reduce the number of accidents caused by incorrect use.
- D Labelling on food should be improved so that consumers are clear about the level of sugar in a product.
- E To reduce the number of deaths caused by excessive speed, car manufacturers should incorporate speed limiters in vehicles.

IMAT Q7 (2018)

Here, the answer is E.

The passage argues that people are unable to control their own actions regarding controlling their sugar intake in processed foods. Therefore, this must be controlled at the manufacturing level rather than the consumer level. Hence, it is the manufacturers responsibility to reduce the sugar content in the foods they sell. This same principle is present in statement E, whereby it is assumed that road traffic accidents death are due to excessive speeding, which can only be controlled by incorporating speed limiters in vehicles. It assumes that people are not responsible or cannot be held accountable for their own actions and so speed limiters need to be installed in vehicles in order to reduce the number of deaths caused by excessive speeding.