

IIFT 2014 has partially followed the 2013 paper pattern where the paper had four sections with a slight twist in the tale. Earlier IIFT tests used to have DI and LR as two sub-sections of one section whereas IIFT 2014 had DI and QA as sub-sections. LR was a separate section altogether. Like before, VA was a common section comprising two sub-sections - VA and RC. The section on VA was easier but more time consuming compared to 2013. While DI did not involve very large numbers typical to IIFT, it was definitely calculation-intensive and time consuming. LR was tougher and more time-consuming compared to earlier exams. Surprisingly, GK was simpler compared to IIFT standards. The QA section was of moderate difficulty level with more or less standard but wordy questions. Overall, question selection was the crucial factor in this paper.

The tradition of having different number of questions in each section and different marks for questions in different sections continued.

The paper surprisingly, was not sealed. Hence, students opportunistically glanced at the paper when the invigilator was not looking.

Summary	
Number of Sections	4 (with sub-sections)
Options per Question	4
Negative Marking	1/3rd of marks for the question
Total questions	118
Total marks	100
Marks per Question	Variable
Expected Overall Cut-offs	37-39

1. Reading Comprehension:

The RC section, like every year, had 4 very long passages. The passages were from areas as diverse as sports, history, Indian culture and banking and every passage had 3-5 questions. While the questions were mostly factual, the huge length of the passages (1.5-2.5 pages each) made it challenging to find this data. It would have been a good strategy to identify a couple of passages and attempt them well instead of trying to attempt all four partially. The passage on the daily schedule of the judge should have been attempted while the passage on Garibaldi could have been avoided. 8-9 attempts in 15 minutes would be a good performance.

2. Verbal Ability:

The VA section contained 20 questions, of which around 60% were vocabulary-based. Though these were simple, they tested every aspect of vocabulary i.e. spelling, analogies, word creation, odd man out (based on synonyms) and antonyms. Most of the grammar questions were based on parallelism errors. There were two questions on a jumbled sentence, where the first and last fragment was fixed and two questions on jumbled paragraphs. These were on the easier side. This entire section could (and should) have been attempted in 10-15 minutes.

3. Data Interpretation:

The data interpretation section was slightly different because it did not involve very large numbers typical to IIFT. However, it did involve a lot of calculations and was each set was based on understanding followed by calculations. The set on distance between different cities seemed lengthy but was easy, if you looked at the questions first. Some questions in this set could be solved directly by using comparison of ratios. The set on energy consumption and imports (though difficult-looking) was simple but every graph in this set was jumbled (both in terms of energy sources and years). Hence, there was potential for calculation errors. However, even this set could have been solved faster by looking at the questions first and then calculating only the relevant data. Finally, the set on mergers and acquisitions, though conceptually the simplest, was the most time-consuming. However, even in this set, a couple of questions could be answered with minimal calculations. On the whole, instead of attempting only one set completely, it would have been prudent to attempt the simplest questions from all three sets. Using this strategy, 9-10 questions could have been attempted in around 30 minutes.

4. Logical Reasoning:

This section was a mix of some very easy and a few very difficult sets. The complex arrangement set (students from different cities) was the toughest of the lot and could have been avoided taking into account the other questions in this section. The set on sequential output tracing had an unusual pattern and could have tested the student's self-belief, even after finding the pattern. The sets on the transport department (observation based), on CEOs and MDs and on selecting Associate Editors were simple and should definitely have been attempted. There was a very easy single question on completing a letter series, but it was sandwiched between two very lengthy sets, and could have been missed. The syllogism and critical reasoning based questions were also manageable. 12-13 questions should have attempted in 25-30 minutes.

5. General Knowledge and Current Affairs:

The G.K section covered a wide range of questions including sports, banking, history, politics, society and industry, but the focus was clearly on current affairs and events of the last 4-6 months. In fact, this section was easier compared to the typical IIFT GK section. For the 'match the column' type of questions, some of the options could be eliminated rather easily. One could have attempted 11-12 questions, irrespective of background.

6. Quantitative Ability:

The focus this year was on Modern Maths, which comprised nearly half the section. Also, half the questions on Modern Maths were based on sequence, progressions and series (mostly formula-based) with the remaining questions being from the other areas like sets, probability and P & C. The other half of this section was evenly distributed between Arithmetic and Geometry with hardly any weightage given to Algebra. The 6 arithmetic questions were quite easy to moderate. 9-10 questions could have been attempted in approximately 25 minutes.