

Argument One:

1. All secretaries type fast.
2. Nisreena types fast.
3. So Nisreena must be a secretary.

-This is an invalid argument, it's a formal fallacy, the structure seems like a valid argument but it's not, because the conclusion doesn't follow logically the premises, if the example had the same form then it would look like this:

All secretaries type fast
Nisreena is a secretary
So Nisreena must type fast

Argument Two:

1. If Hawazen had not studied, she would not have passed the exam.
2. Hawazen passed the exam.
3. So Hawazen must have studied

-This is a valid argument, because the premises follow the conclusion and since both premises are true then the conclusion must be true.

Argument Three:

1. All of the students who failed the exam had not studied.
2. Zeid passed the exam.
3. So Zeid must have studied

-This is a fallacious argument, so it's invalid, because there's a possibility that some of the students did study but just didn't do so well, either they were nervous that they forgot what they have studied or maybe the exam was too difficult and they haven't studied good enough.

Argument Four:

1. All of the people who were on the yellow bus were singing.
2. Lujain was not singing.
3. So Lujain was not on the yellow bus.

-This is a fallacious argument, so it's invalid, it's an invalid structure, because there's a possibility Lujain was on the bus but wasn't singing.

Argument Five:

1. All junk food is fattening.
2. A burger is fattening.
3. So burgers are junk food.

-This is a valid argument, both premises are true therefore the conclusion is true.

Argument Six:

- 1.All marriages in this generation end up in divorce.
 - 2.Sarah just got married.
 - 3.So Sarah is going to end up getting a divorce.
- This is an invalid argument, a formal fallacy, because there's a possibility Sarah won't get a divorce .