

Solutions

Each answer shows the steps, then the **result**.

2.1

- what is omitted may bear directly on the claim, so the argument may hold only because the omission was made

2.2

- could these cases have been chosen because they fit the claim; if so, they cannot test it

2.3

(a)

- no

(b)

- that the source has an interest in the answer, which is part of how the figure should be weighed

3.1 B

- selection for fit removes the possibility of disconfirmation

3.2 B

- an interested source is weighed differently, though not dismissed

3.3

(a)

- selective evidence — outcomes without costs

(b)

- both the benefits and the costs, on comparable measures, since a policy that produced the outcome at any cost has not been shown to be worth adopting

3.4

- *Row A — Thesis (1)*. A defensible claim about **the evidence’s fitness for the conclusion**. **Earns it:** “The report’s figure is almost certainly true and almost certainly cannot bear the claim it is asked to carry, because a fall in collisions measures the roads only if the number of cyclists held still.” **Does not:** “The report uses statistics to persuade the reader.” *Row B — Evidence and Commentary (0–4)*. Full marks require naming what the evidence **omits** and explaining why each omission matters. The missing denominator is the central one: without exposure data, a 40% fall is equally consistent with safer roads and with 40% fewer people cycling. The reporting threshold is the second: police-reported collisions undercount, and the rate of under-reporting can itself change when infrastructure changes. A third line worth

developing is the word “*safer*”, which silently converts a count of one harm into a claim about a road’s overall condition. Responses that call the statistic “biased” without identifying the mechanism cap at 2. *Row C — Sophistication (1)*. Earned by refusing the easy verdict — recognising that selective evidence is not the same as false evidence, and that the report would be strengthened, not undermined, by the very data it leaves out. Sustaining that even-handedness while still reaching a judgment is what the point rewards