The Redprint; How to NEVER get an offer at an Oxford/Cambridge interview.

Jamie Baek · TMUA9

The exhaustive list of what looks like interview preparation, feels like progress, and guarantees that two fellows learn nothing about you in 30 minutes.

Part of the print series: Blueprint, Redprint, Greenprint. For Y12, Y13 and gap year applicants to STEM and Economics at Oxford and Cambridge.

Free, always. tmua9.com

9.

The Redprint.

Jamie Baek · TMUA9

The following are the mistakes that I made, and that every student I have supervised made, when preparing for the Oxford and Cambridge interview. You do not need to feel embarrassed because you make these mistakes, because NOW YOU KNOW. Neither must you feel pride or be flippant about those who make them, because everyone, myself included, made every single one. On top of that, I believed most of these to be the correct way to prepare, just to realise that the opposite was the truth. Remember; winners simply lose more than losers.

This document is named the Redprint because it lists the red flags, alongside being a nice contrapositive to the Blueprint. The TMUA Redprint listed how to guarantee failure on a sheet of paper with a stopwatch. This one lists how to guarantee failure in a room with two fellows, a whiteboard, and your own mouth. The arenas are different, so the mistakes are different, and that is the first thing most people get wrong: they bring the TMUA preparation into the interview room and wonder why the engine that got them a 9.0 is suddenly worth nothing.

When you are attaining your goals, a pronounced minority of individuals just get there faster, and for the vast majority it appears almost saintly. The reason is simply that they acknowledge in advance the mistakes that beginners are prone to making. It is wise to know these potential pitfalls beforehand. You are inevitably going to make them, and you should be able to climb your way out of the rut.

In the Redprint, we will cover:

1. **31 mistakes that you have been making, or will make, consciously or unconsciously.**
2. **Why we make them.**
3. **How to correct ourselves, and what the proper approach is.**

---

1. The misalignment.

I will start with the most important misalignment. Your goal is not to solve the problem they give you. Whether you solve it has surprisingly low bearing on how you are graded. Your goal is not to "show them how you think" either; that is a vacuous platitude, because nobody tells you what "how you think" consists of. Your aim is the mission statement that the Interview Blueprint preaches:

ARTICULATE THE NON-VERBAL IN REAL TIME,
AND GENERALISE EVERYTHING I AM GIVEN.

Everything below is a way of not doing that. Below is the cluster of beliefs you most likely hold right now. Read them and notice which ones you nodded at.

- You think the interview is an exam with a human marker, so you prepare for it the way you prepared for the TMUA: alone, silent, fast.
- You think the fellows want the right answer, so you go quiet until you have it.
- You think a hint means you have failed.
- You think "they just want to see how you think" is an instruction.
- You think being confident is the point, so you perform confidence.
- You think reading around the subject will come up.
- You think that olympiad people have an unfair advantage and that this cannot be you.
- You think your emotions walking out of the room tell you how it went.
- You think a mock interview needs someone who knows the maths.
- You think the concept of talking fluently for 30 minutes while solving a problem you have never seen is unfathomable.

I say this as somebody who believed everything above, barely saving myself from the swamp. To restate the opening statement of the Blueprint:

Mainstream advice is not meant to provide a guideline that yields the anomalous results we are aiming for. Normal advice brings normal actions, thus normal results that are merely mediocre.

It is better to know the truth in advance and prepare in accordance, than to pretend you do not know the truth and avoid confrontation. The following is an exhaustive list of what looks like interview preparation, feels like progress, and produces marginal improvement in the only thing being assessed: what leaves your mouth and lands on the board.

---

2. The 31 mistakes.

In the room: vocalisation.

1. **Going silent until you have the answer, then saying "I think it is 12".** The fellows learned nothing. They cannot assess what they cannot hear. This is

the single most expensive mistake in the room and it is the default behaviour of every strong problem solver.

2. **Solving silently, then narrating.** The post-match report. They did not want a report; they wanted the live commentary. Synchrony is the skill, and you just demonstrated that you do not have it.
3. **Saying "it is quite obvious if you think about it".** Nothing is obvious out loud. If it is obvious, say the reason in one sentence. If you cannot, it was not obvious, it was intuition, and you just refused to translate it.
4. **Pointing instead of naming.** "This and this and this triangle have to be the same." "This dot here is on this line." The fellow cannot grade a gesture. Name the object: "triangles ABC and ADE are similar because angle A is shared and the sides are parallel."
5. **Not restating the question before touching the pen.** You skipped comprehension, the one stage that is free, costs ten seconds, and tells them you read the question properly.
6. **Finishing the wrong line to see where it goes.** You suspected it was wrong at second 20 and said so at second 90. Those 70 seconds are the gap they are measuring.
7. **Saying "um, so, like, you kind of..." and letting the idea die in your mouth.** Translation failure. The idea existed; you had no words filed next to it. That is a database coherence problem, not a nerves problem.
8. **Filling silence with noise.** The opposite failure. Talking about nothing to avoid silence. Four seconds of silence is allowed. "I have gone quiet, what I am thinking is..." is the fix, not babble.

In the room: attitude.

9. **Treating a hint as a deduction.** You visibly deflate, apologise, slow down. In the right picture a hint is a teammate saying "try the small case". The students who got offers took hints; they took them fast and did something with them.
10. **Visibly relaxing when you get the answer.** You just told them the answer was the point. For a fellow who has set this question for eleven years, the answer was never the point. What you do in the second after you find 12 is the point.
11. **Stopping at the answer.** No "is there a second way?", no "does this still hold if we replace 2 with p?". The only sentence in the room that could have been yours, you never said.
12. **Refusing to conjecture because it might be wrong.** Every conjecture you make out loud that turns out false is evidence that you make conjectures, and making conjectures is the job. You need to be wrong in the interview. Not carelessly. Boldly.
13. **Defending a wrong line because you said it out loud.** Pride. The student they want says "no, that is wrong, because n = 1 gives a negative count"

and pivots in the same breath.

4. **Performing confidence.** Fellows have seen a thousand confident wrong students. They are looking for the correction reflex, not the posture.
5. **Sitting on the wrong side of the desk in your head.** You picture a desk, them on one side, you on the other, a question fired across it. Wrong picture. Right picture: a whiteboard, the problem on it, three people in front of it, two of whom have seen it before.
6. **Reading your emotions in the room as data.** Walking out feeling it went terribly means nothing. Your emotions in the room are independent variables from your outcomes. Execute in the thin slate of the present; feel later.

In preparation: intuition.

7. **Preparing for the interview the way you prepared for the TMUA.** Alone, silent, timed, on paper. You are training the one thing they cannot observe, and letting the only thing they can observe rot.
8. **Memorising past interview questions.** You will never meet the same question. The aim is cognitive infrastructure: an algorithm you can run on whatever they put on the board.
9. **"Reading around the subject".** The interview's version of "just do more maths". Everything you read goes through the WHAT, HOW, WHY machinery or it is consumption, not preparation.
10. **Doing lots of easy questions that make you feel fluent.** Fluency on easy questions is not transferable. The room will give you something you cannot do, on purpose, to watch what you do when you cannot do it.
11. **Collecting past interview question banks without a clear weakness to fix.** Same disease as collecting PDFs for the TMUA. Asking "what is the best resource?" instead of "where exactly do I go quiet?"
12. **Skipping the generalisation after every problem.** You solved it, you moved on, and the one move that distinguishes an offer from a rejection (the converse, the extreme case, the change of number) was never practised, so it will not fire in the room.
13. **Believing that olympiad people are geniuses and that this cannot be you.** Intuition is a database lookup: scale times coherence. Olympiad people have scale. Most of them have no bridge. You are not competing on scale in the next six weeks; you are competing on the bridge, and the bridge is cheap.

In analysis: metacognition.

14. **Never recording yourself.** You have no idea what you sound like. You have never heard the 40 second silences and the "um, so, basically". The gap between Knowledge and Speaking has never been made audible to you, so it has never been closed.
15. **Recording yourself and never listening back.** The recording was the autopsy. You skipped the autopsy because it hurts. That is the anaesthetic for

cognitive pain, and you must stop taking it.

6. **Analysing only the maths, never the speech.** Your backtest says "I should have tried the small case". It never says "I went quiet for 35 seconds at minute 4 and said nothing about it". The second one is what cost the offer.
7. **Not measuring the gap between suspecting you were wrong and saying so.** At which second did you first suspect? At which second did you say it? That number is the metacognition score. If you do not measure it, you cannot close it.
8. **Doing the WHAT without the HOW and WHY.** You found where you diverged from the model line and stopped. You never asked which cue should have triggered the leap, or which theorem the leap really is. So the circuit was never built and the same divergence will happen again.

In logistics.

9. **Doing mock interviews only with people who know the maths.** They do not need to know maths. They need to stop you when you go silent and say "what are you thinking". Your sibling can do it. Your phone can do it.
10. **Doing one mock the week before.** Vocalisation closes in about two weeks of daily reps. One mock is a diagnosis, not a treatment.
11. **Preparing alone when a room of other applicants exists.** The TMUA9 Discord and Polymatique supervisions are rooms where you can be wrong in public for free, forty times, before it counts. Not using them is choosing to be wrong in public for the first time in front of a fellow.

---

3. Why?

Why do we make these mistakes? Because for the TMUA at least the wrong answer was visible: a cross on a mark scheme. In the interview the failure is invisible to you. You walk out, the maths felt fine, you got most of it, and you are rejected, and nobody tells you that the reason was 35 seconds of silence at minute four, "it is obvious" at minute nine, and no generalisation at minute twenty. There is no mark scheme for what left your mouth, and you were not listening to it, because you were busy thinking.

The journey from reading the question to arriving at the answer is all in your head. Mathematical revelation is non-verbal, capricious and messy; it happens in an implicit part of you that does not speak. The TMUA rewarded that part directly. The interview rewards only what is explicitly expressed. So the entire failure mode is one thing wearing 31 masks: **the engine ran and the bridge was never built.**

And the reason the bridge is never built is that nobody trains it, because it is not relevant to mathematical intuition itself. Your teachers trained the engine. Your olympiad training trained the engine. The model solutions you

read show only the WHAT of the ideal chain, never the HOW or WHY, and certainly never the sound of someone saying it. So you have ten years of silent reps and zero spoken ones, and the room asks for the spoken ones.

The limbic response, when you watch someone talk through a problem fluently, is to call it talent. It is not. It is a filing system where every idea has a sentence stored next to it, plus a reflex that says "I have gone quiet" before the fellow has to. Both are installed by repetition. You simply have not done the repetitions, because they are embarrassing, and embarrassment is an anaesthetic too.

---

4. The corrections.

Each cluster above has one fix. Not thirty-one fixes; one per cluster, repeated until it is a reflex.

Cluster	The fix	The rep
Vocalisation (1 to 8)	Live commentary, not a post-match report. Restate, then speak every thought as it occurs, including the stupid ones. Name objects, never point.	Phone on the desk, voice memo running, one problem, every session. Listen back once. Two weeks daily.
Attitude (9 to 16)	Problem at the centre, you in the crowd. Hints are teammates. Answers are not endings. Be wrong boldly and pivot in the same breath.	After every problem: one generalisation out loud, even if it fails. Post conjectures in the Discord; let them get shot down; say thank you.
Intuition (17 to 23)	WHAT, HOW, WHY on interview-style problems, STEP, Trinity specimen papers. Scale through reps, coherence through extraction. File by principle, not topic.	Daily assignment stream (email and worksheets). Every question into the journal under its reaction circuit.
Metacognition (24 to 28)	Backtest the speech, not just the maths. Measure the seconds between suspecting and saying.	Listen to every recording once. Log: silence longer than ten seconds, "obvious", pointing, the suspect-to-say gap. Close the gap.
Logistics (29 to 31)	Mock interviews with anyone who can hold a pen and stay quiet. Weekly minimum. Supervisions with other applicants.	One mock a week, recorded. One Polymatique supervision a week. Discord voice channel for two-person mocks.

The Blueprint gives the full machinery for each of these. The Greenprint gives the prompts and the question batches to run them on. This document exists so that when you catch yourself doing one of the 31, you know its number, and you know the fix.

> **You do not rise to your ambitions. You fall to the reality of your daily actions.** Strip out the hours spent dreaming about the offer, the hours spent motivated, the hours spent worried, and what is left is the number of spoken reps you actually did. For most people that number is zero. Set an anchor: one problem, out loud, recorded, every day, same time. Without the anchor the density of the work becomes sporadic, and sporadic does not build reflexes.

Notes.

Everything referenced here is free at tmua9.com: the Interview Blueprint and Greenprint in the Galleria, the Common Lectures and mock interviews on the TMUA9 and Polymatique YouTube channels, the Discord where you can be wrong in public, and Polymatique supervisions where you can do it with a room. None of it is AI slop. Every PDF other than NOIR PREMIERE is free and will always stay free.

You do not need to be a genius to avoid any of the 31. You need a phone with a voice memo app, a problem, and the willingness to hear yourself be bad at it for two weeks. I am rooting for you from afar. May God be with you.

"But as for you, be strong and do not give up, for your work will be rewarded."
2 Chronicles 15:7 NIV

Best, Jamie. TMUA9.

9.