**Kaplan Progress Test 7 (#18) -- 1/6/2014**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **1** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE1647** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1647 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Listen to a dialogue between a student and a research assistant.   **Student (male):** Hello. I'm here about the sleep experiment. Can you tell me more about it?  **Assistant (female):** Oh great. But first, where did you see our advertisement?  **Student:** Uh, I read about it on a flyer on the bulletin board in the Student Union building.  **Assistant:** Okay. Well, let me describe the experiment to you. And if you qualify, and are still interested after you hear about it, you'll need to sign consent forms before beginning.  **Student:** Okay. Well, tell me what it's all about. The flyer didn't say much.  **Assistant:** You see, Professor Hirsch is conducting the experiment with his students as part of a psychology seminar. I'm his research assistant, Jodie Miller.  **Student:** Hi, Jodie. I'm Steve. And by the way, I'm not a psych major.  **Assistant:** That doesn't matter. As long as you're between the ages of 18 and 25, in good health, and a nonsmoker, you can participate.  **Student:** Well, I'm all of the above. So what are you going to do to me?  **Assistant:** Well, the purpose of the experiment is to see the effect of certain foods on a person's sleeping positions.  **Student:** Oh! You mean how much tossing and turning I do after eating four pieces of pepperoni pizza and drinking two milkshakes or something?  **Assistant:** Yeah, something like that. Professor Hirsch has described the experiment in detail on the consent form, which I'll let you read in a minute.  **Student:** How much sleep do I need to do?  **Assistant:** We'd like you to come in for five nights. We'll provide the meals for you and then you can get a full night's sleep until the next morning.  **Student:** If I'm lucky, of course.  **Assistant:** Different groups of people will get different meals. Of course, you will be monitored throughout the night and your sleeping will be videotaped.  **Student:** Videotaped! That'll make a boring movie.  **Assistant:** Not for us. We will be able to compare how dramatically the sleeping patterns shift among people who eat different types and amounts of food.  **Student:** Who knows how some people will react, eh?  **Assistant:** Exactly. Of course, all information about our participants will be strictly confidential, including the tapes.  **Student:** Whew! I wouldn't want that tape getting out!  **Assistant:** Don't worry about that. And best of all, we pay all our participants 100 dollars - but you only get the money if you show up for all five nights - it's not 20 dollars a night.  **Student:** Okay then! Paid room and board, all in the name of science. Where's that consent form? |
| Stem / Prompt | How long will the student be asked to participate? |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | One night |
| Option 2 | Five nights |
| Option 3 | One week |
| Option 4 | Two weeks |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **2** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE1648** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1647 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | How will the researchers collect data for the experiment? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | By interviewing the participants |
| Option 2 | By asking the participants to fill out questionnaires |
| Option 3 | By videotaping the participants |
| Option 4 | By requiring the participants to keep a journal |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **3** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIN1649** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1647 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIN |
| Stem / Prompt | What can the researchers learn from their experiment? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | If a full night of sleep can help students do work |
| Option 2 | If losing sleep can have a negative effect on students |
| Option 3 | If food choices can affect a student's ability to sleep |
| Option 4 | If a lack of food can affect the way students sleep |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **4** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIM1650** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1647 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIM |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the dialogue again, and then answer the question.   **Student:** Hi, Jodie. I'm Steve. And by the way, I'm not a psych major.  **Assistant:** That doesn't matter. As long as you're between the ages of 18 and 25, in good health, and a nonsmoker, you can participate.  **Student:** Well, I'm all of the above. So what are you going to do to me?   What does the student mean when he says this:   **Student:** Well, I'm all of the above. |
| Stem / Prompt | What does the student mean when he says this: |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | He thinks he is superior to all the other students. |
| Option 2 | He is overqualified for the experiment. |
| Option 3 | He has the characteristics needed for the experiment. |
| Option 4 | He is over 25 years old. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **5** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIM1651** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1647 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIM |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the dialogue again, and then answer the question.   **Assistant:** We'll provide the meals for you and then you can get a full night's sleep until the next morning.  **Student:** If I'm lucky, of course.   What does the student mean by this:   **Student:** If I'm lucky, of course. |
| Stem / Prompt | What does the student mean by this: |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | He feels lucky to be part of such important research. |
| Option 2 | He believes he has good luck in general. |
| Option 3 | He will need luck to complete the experiment. |
| Option 4 | He will be lucky to get a full night's sleep. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **6** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE1652** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1652 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Listen to a dialogue between two students.   **Man:** What exactly is it that we're looking at?  **Woman:** Uh, it's a painting called... *Deforestation*.  **Man:** I know that, but... I don't get it. It's a brown canvas with one green triangle in the middle.  **Woman:** Well, there you go. Deforestation.  **Man:** Now wait. If you didn't read that title in the guidebook, would you really know what that painting is all about?  **Woman:** Frankly, no. At least not until I thought about it more deeply, perhaps. But that's not the point.  **Man:** What is the point then? Isn't art supposed to be clear and obvious?  **Woman:** I'm no expert, but I think you can look at a painting, think about its title, and get impressions from the colors and shapes that help you see its meaning.  **Man:** Like the triangle is the shape of a tree, sort of.  **Woman:** Something like that.  **Man:** I can't help it. I prefer to see paintings that are much more realistic. Sometimes I think a little kid could just paint something like this.  **Woman:** I guess the greatest museums in the world then have incredible paintings that you would think could be painted by kids.  **Man:** Well, I can't help it. I like realism. I guess Professor Jordan paints in the... what could I call it... abstract or minimalist style. I thought he was more down to earth than that.  **Woman:** Down to earth! You just said it. That's one thing this painting represents.  **Man:** Huh?  **Woman:** Professor Jordan painted the earth bare of all trees, and the one in the middle is like the sole survivor.  **Man:** Threatened by the barrenness around it. Okay, I get it. But -   **Woman:** But what?  **Man:** Professor Jordan should have put dollar signs in the earth.  **Woman:** Dollar signs?  **Man:** You know, for every tree that was cut down by a hungry corporation, more money springs up.  **Woman:** Dollar signs instead of trees. Hmm, I think you have an artistic sense of the abstract in you too.  **Man:** No, just a lucky guess. But I did take art history with Professor Jordan last year, and maybe some of his style rubbed off on me!  **Woman:** I didn't take his course, but I heard him lecture last week and I think he made brilliant connections among different artists across the centuries.  **Man:** Well, I'm glad I'm here to see his first exhibition, even if I can't understand his work without your help.  **Woman:** No problem. Now let's see what his next painting has to say. |
| Stem / Prompt | What is the subject of the painting the students are discussing? |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | National parks |
| Option 2 | Destroyed forests |
| Option 3 | New woodlands |
| Option 4 | Natural disasters |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **7** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE1653** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1652 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | What kind of paintings does the man prefer? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | Children's paintings |
| Option 2 | Abstract paintings |
| Option 3 | Realistic paintings |
| Option 4 | Minimalist paintings |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **8** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE1654** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1652 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | How do the students know what the painting is called? |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | They read the title in a guidebook. |
| Option 2 | The professor announced the title in a lecture. |
| Option 3 | The professor told them the title in their art history class. |
| Option 4 | They studied the titles of the paintings before the exhibit opened. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **9** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIN1655** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1652 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIN |
| Stem / Prompt | What will the students probably do next? |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | Take an art history class |
| Option 2 | Go to see the professor |
| Option 3 | Learn how to paint |
| Option 4 | Look at another painting |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **10** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIM1656** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLDE1652 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIM |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the dialogue again, and then answer the question.   **Woman:** Professor Jordan painted the earth bare of all trees, and the one in the middle is like the sole survivor.  **Man:** Threatened by the barrenness around it. Okay, I get it. But -   Why does the man say this:   **Man:** Okay, I get it. |
| Stem / Prompt | Why does the man say this: |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | To state that he wants to buy the painting |
| Option 2 | To make a comparison between himself and the tree |
| Option 3 | To prove that he remembers the professor's point |
| Option 4 | To indicate that he understands what the woman means |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **11** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLMI2101** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2101 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LMI |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Listen to part of a talk in an ecology class.   **Professor (female):** All right. Um... so today we're going to be going over some of the details of Rachel Carson's life. Carson, as you may know, was one of the most influential people of the 20th century. She was a writer, a scientist, and an ecologist, until her death in 1964. So, anyway, now we're going to first focus on what led to her writing *Silent Spring*, and um, and then discuss the controversy surrounding her work, and lastly, go over the cons... consequences of her work. And, oh, after that, I'll put you in pairs to reflect on some discussion questions - you know, about ethics, or, uh, moral leadership in our society.   Okay. Well, Carson was practically born to be an ecological activist... I mean, growing up in a rural river town in Pennsylvania... and her lifelong love of nature - which she shared with her mother - that really influenced her development. After she graduated with a degree in biology and an M.A. in zoology, she worked for the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries as a scientist and editor during the Depression... uh... the Great Depression - around the 1930s.   **Student A (male):** What's that - the Depression?  **Professor:** Well, the Great Depression was, uh, there was a stock market crash in, I think, in the late 1920s. Following that, in the early 1930s, there was a period of falling prices - deflation - triggering falling production and widespread unemployment....  **Student B (female):** So it was something like a recession?  **Professor:** Well, yes. But a huge recession - a recession on an unprecedented scale. That's why it is referred to as the Great Depression.   After that, after the Depression, back to our topic, Carson wrote *Help Your Child to Wonder* in the 1950s, and... *Our Ever-Changing Shore*... 1957, I think. But it was the wide use of synthetic chemical pesticides, in particular DDT, um, after World War II, that made Carson decided that it was extremely important for the public to know about these chemicals. She wanted the public at large, as well as the government and agricultural scientists, to be aware of the chain effect that pesticides have on animals, plants, and humans - our ecological system. So, I guess what I'm saying is that she changed her focus when she decided to write *Silent Spring*. I mean, she was really challenging the agricultural scientists and the government to change their practices, which, especially at that time, wasn't... wasn't an easy thing to do, you know? So, I'd say that it was this irresponsible use of DDT that led Carson to publish *Silent Spring*.  Well, of course, like with any controversy, after the publication of *Silent Spring*, everyone - scientists, politicians, lawmakers, those in the chemical industry and the media - everyone both applauded her and made her out to be a villain. Some of the criticisms weren't even really valid. Those, I mean, um, some of the critics that made her out to be a villain sometimes attacked her science background, and were annoyed that she would dare question the authorities about our technological and industrial society being irresponsible towards our natural surroundings.   **Student A (male):** It seems that their attacks were illogical.  **Student B (female):** I'd say they were just looking out for their profit margins.  **Professor:** Exactly. To digress a bit, one notable person who did take Carson's work seriously was President John F. Kennedy. Because of Carson's *Silent Spring*, Kennedy appointed Jerome Weisner, his scientific advisor, to study pesticides and create regulations and recommendations for pest control. I mean, there were many others who applauded her work, but getting the president's attention is a big deal, right?  While her work finally started getting the respect it deserved, Carson unfortunately passed away in 1964. And then, in 1972, thanks or no thanks to *Silent Spring*, depending on who you are and how you look at it, DDT was banned. In any case, I think you'd agree that Carson was one of the important people who made environmentalism a significant issue in today's society. |
| Stem / Prompt | What is the talk mainly about? |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | Agricultural science |
| Option 2 | Rachel Carson's work |
| Option 3 | The Great Depression |
| Option 4 | The use of chemical pesticides |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **12** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2102** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2101 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the professor, what is the significance of *Silent Spring*? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | It made the author a famous zoologist. |
| Option 2 | It radically changed the author's focus. |
| Option 3 | It made people aware of the effects of DDT. |
| Option 4 | It drew attention to political corruption. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **13** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLRF2103** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2101 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LRF |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Student B (female):** So it was something like a recession?  **Professor:** Well, yes. But a huge recession - a recession on an unprecedented scale. That's why it is referred to as the Great Depression. |
| Stem / Prompt | What is the professor doing? |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | Defining an unfamiliar term |
| Option 2 | Changing the subject |
| Option 3 | Making a connection between economics and psychology |
| Option 4 | Describing why Rachel Carson was always worried about money |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **14** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2104** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2101 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | Who was Jerome Weisner? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | A famous ecologist |
| Option 2 | Rachel Carson's publisher |
| Option 3 | John F. Kennedy's scientific advisor |
| Option 4 | The author of *Our Ever-Changing Shore* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **15** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIM2105** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2101 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIM |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Professor:** While her work finally started getting the respect it deserved, Carson unfortunately passed away in 1964. And then, in 1972, thanks or no thanks to *Silent Spring*, depending on who you are and how you look at it, DDT was banned. |
| Stem / Prompt | What does the professor imply? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | Carson's death was caused by DDT. |
| Option 2 | The decision to ban DDT preceded Carson's death. |
| Option 3 | Some people were not happy that DDT was banned. |
| Option 4 | The readers of *Silent Spring* fought for the ban on DDT. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **16** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDM2106** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2101 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDM |
| Stem / Prompt | Why did Rachel Carson write *Silent Spring*? |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | To protest the government's role in World War II |
| Option 2 | To make the public aware of the dangers of pesticides |
| Option 3 | To inform lawmakers about the widespread use of industrial chemicals |
| Option 4 | To challenge the agricultural scientists who made her out to be a villain |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **17** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLMI2107** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2107 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LMI |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Listen to part of a talk in a history class.   **Professor (male):** We're going to start today by talking about Machiavelli and his famous work, called *The Prince*. *The Prince* is Machiavelli's book of advice on how princes should behave, especially once they come into power.... First, though, let's go back and talk a little bit about Machiavelli himself.   He was um, born in Italy. His full name is Niccolo Machiavelli. He lived during the Renaissance, so, um, that was four, no, five hundred years ago. Now Machiavelli wasn't a nobleman. He was of humble birth, but he worked his way to a mid-level position, working for the Prince of Florence.... Anyone know the name of the Prince of Florence? Anyone?   **Student A (female):** Was it Lorenzo de Med... Medici?  **Professor:** Yes! Good. Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* as a way of placating de Medici, after, uh, he had fallen out of favor with him.   Anyway, getting back to the book, *The Prince* is arguably, um, one of the most important works in the history of political writing and it, uh, helped define some ideas that we today call Machiavellian principles.  Now, the major theme of Machiavelli's book... um, his main piece of advice to the Prince de Medici is that "you can get away with murder." He believed that there was no such thing as divine sanction or punishable sin. He didn't believe in what Eastern religions would call karma, or even the so-called Golden Rule.... This was an enormous departure from the Christian beliefs of the time... and most of the beliefs of every society at this point were governed by mores, codes of ethics and religious tenets. Machiavelli didn't buy any of this. He wrote that it doesn't matter how you get to your goal, just that you get there.  Here's a quote from Machiavelli's writing, just to give you an idea of what I mean. He wrote, those "who can acquire, they will be praised or not blamed." He really felt that a prince should do whatever he needed to do to get what he wanted and could, uh, do so without fear of reprisals or punishment from God or society.  So, what about when a prince comes into power.... How does Machiavelli feel the prince should treat his benefactors; how should he treat the people who have supported him? Anyone? Yes?   **Student B (male):** Well, he believed that new princes come to power, with, uh... what did he call them... oh, yeah, "lukewarm defenders," and that these supporters, because they had already helped him, had expectations for... of benefits... you know, that their support would be repaid.  **Professor:** So, according to Machiavelli, who can the prince turn to for support?  **Student B:** Um, he thinks that the prince can get more support from former detractors or enemies who are afraid of losing their jobs, or, um, even their lives. These people have more to lose, so they have more reasons to work harder.  **Professor:** Brilliant! Isn't that brilliant?  **Student B:** I don't think so. It's terrible. He has no sense of ethics or loyalty or, you know, justice.  **Professor:** Well, sure. He has no sense of our ethics, right now, but ethics are still an important issue for Machiavelli, although we may not agree with his ideas about them.... But whether you agree with him or not, he is saying something revolutionary, for a guy working in the Christian - dominated world of the, uh, Renaissance. He is talking about the best way to go about this business of being a prince.  **Student B:** But there is no virtue....  **Professor:** No. No. Virtue is very important to Machiavelli. Just because he has different definitions of virtue, doesn't mean that virtue doesn't exist for him, right? For instance, Machiavelli believed that a prince's virtue depended on his ability to stay out of debt - so he shouldn't owe money to his family or debtors. He also thought that a prince should avoid being entirely dependent on his inheritance, so that he can act in accordance with his own best judgment, rather than having to keep his supporters or family happy all the time. For Machiavelli, virtue is not part of the mandate of God, or a by-product of nature or any of the reigning classical and Christian concepts of the day. Instead, he saw virtue very differently. Who can give me an example of something Machiavelli would consider virtuous?  **Student A:** Well, he believed that a prince should learn when he should be nice and when he should not be nice to his people.  **Professor:** Yes! And this brings us to the idea of generosity... or being liberal. The key to understanding Machiavelli is knowing when to be good and when not to be, when to be virtuous... whatever that means... and when not to be, when to be liberal and when not to be. He believed it was the manifesto, or the job... of the prince to know when and how to be these things. This is the key to understanding what he is trying to say.... |
| Stem / Prompt | What is the main idea of the talk? |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | Machiavelli's thoughts about government have no relevance to the political world of today. |
| Option 2 | Machiavelli's ideas of how a prince should behave are often in conflict with our own ideas of morality. |
| Option 3 | Machiavelli's principles about rulers were deeply shocking to his contemporaries. |
| Option 4 | Machiavelli's regrets about failing to achieve a position of power led him to write his book. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **18** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIN2108** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2107 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIN |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Professor:** Now Machiavelli wasn't a nobleman. He was of humble birth, but he worked his way to a mid-level position, working for the Prince of Florence.... |
| Stem / Prompt | What can be inferred about Machiavelli? |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | He had first-hand experience of how to gain power. |
| Option 2 | He would later become even more influential. |
| Option 3 | He was not respected by his contemporaries. |
| Option 4 | He did not receive a thorough education. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **19** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2109** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2107 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the talk, why did Machiavelli write *The Prince*? |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | To criticize Lorenzo de Medici |
| Option 2 | To criticize the behavior of contemporary society |
| Option 3 | To support current religious beliefs |
| Option 4 | To gain favor with Lorenzo de Medici |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **20** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIE2110** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2107 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIE |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Professor:** ... most of the beliefs of every society at this point were governed by mores, codes of ethics and religious tenets. Machiavelli didn't buy any of this.   What does the professor mean by this:   **Professor:** Machiavelli didn't buy any of this. |
| Stem / Prompt | What does the professor mean by this: |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | Machiavelli did not agree with societal rules. |
| Option 2 | Machiavelli persuaded the prince to become religious. |
| Option 3 | Machiavelli was punished for his opinions. |
| Option 4 | Machiavelli lacked the resources to gain power. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **21** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLRF2111** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2107 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LRF |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Student B:** Um, he thinks that the prince can get more support from former detractors or enemies who are afraid of losing their jobs, or, um, even their lives. These people have more to lose, so they have more reasons to work harder.  **Professor:** Brilliant! Isn't that brilliant?  **Student B:** I don't think so. It's terrible. He has no sense of ethics or loyalty or, you know, justice.   Why does the professor say this:   **Professor:** Brilliant! Isn't that brilliant? |
| Stem / Prompt | Why does the professor say this: |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | Because this is Machiavelli's most important idea |
| Option 2 | Because Machiavelli is his favorite author |
| Option 3 | Because he wants to provoke discussion |
| Option 4 | Because he thinks the student made an intelligent comment |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **22** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2112** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2107 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | Which of the following are mentioned as part of Machiavelli's concept of virtue for a prince? |
| Correct Answer | 14 |
| Option 1 | Knowing when to be liberal |
| Option 2 | Rewarding his supporters |
| Option 3 | Showing an interest in religion |
| Option 4 | Being independent of his family |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **23** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLMI2113** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2113 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LMI |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Listen to part of a talk in a biology class.   **Professor (female):** Our bodies use the food we eat for two purposes. The first is to provide materials to make and repair various body tissues. The most important foods for this task are those containing protein, such as meat, eggs, and legumes, um... or beans and peas. The second purpose of food is to provide the body with energy to, uh, power its muscles and other cells. Now, this energy comes from carbohydrates like breads, vegetables, and fruits, and from fats like butter and oil.  At first, the hundreds of different molecules contained in the food we eat exist as *macromolecules*. What is a macromolecule? You guessed it; it's a large, complex molecule formed from simpler molecules. The useable parts of our food, which are known as *nutrients*, cannot be absorbed into the body's cells and tissues until they are digested - and changed into smaller and simpler chemical units. In order to make this happen, the macromolecule has to be broken up... and this happens in the process we call *digestion*.  Now there are basically two types of digestion: physical - also called mechanical digestion - and chemical digestion. Let's look at physical digestion first.   Okay, so physical digestion is what we do when we chew - we use our teeth to chew, churn, and grind large chunks of food into smaller fragments. We also do some of this work with our stomachs - our stomachs churn the food into even smaller pieces.   Now here's the important point: physical digestion breaks food into smaller pieces, but it doesn't change them chemically. However, it is still a really important step in the process of digestion. This is because the smaller pieces have a much greater total surface area, and this allows the chemical part of digestion to occur faster and more easily.  So physical digestion breaks food into smaller pieces. Chemical digestion is mainly carried out by special biological chemicals, called *digestive enzymes*.   What are enzymes? Basically, they are molecules, produced by the body, that help the body break down food. They work by breaking large molecules into smaller chemical units that the body can then use. You have tons of enzymes - each stage in the digestion of food involves one or more enzymes that is, uh, specific to the type of food molecule and pH conditions found in a particular part of the digestive system.   Okay, let me go through the whole process for you from the beginning: digestion begins in the mouth. Here, chewing breaks food into smaller pieces. And as I said, the physical digestion process is important because it enables chemical digestion to occur more quickly. The chemical side of digestion actually begins in the mouth too, because saliva contains enzymes that break starch down into glucose or sugar. Saliva also moistens food and makes it easier to swallow.  At any rate, once the food has been chewed and mixed with saliva, it passes into the stomach, where the work of physical digestion - in the form of muscular churning by the stomach walls - continues to take place. But this is also where the majority of chemical digestion actually takes place. *Hydrochloric acid*, which is present in the stomach, kills bacteria and helps digest proteins. Luckily, it doesn't damage the stomach because the stomach walls contain a protective mucous coating. Now, at the same time the hydrochloric acid is doing its thing, other enzymes are digesting proteins and carbohydrates by breaking amino-acid bonds into smaller amino-acid chains. Everyone remembers that amino acids are the building blocks of protein, right?  Okay, good. So this mixture of acid and broken-up food particles then travels to the small intestine, where various enzymes decompose the remaining materials. The small intestine has enzymes that attack proteins, convert starch to simpler sugars, split fats into smaller fatty acids, and so on. This completes the task of chemical digestion. The small intestine is where most nutrients that are products of digestion, such as amino acids and simple sugars, are absorbed. These nutrients then pass into the bloodstream and are distributed to the body's cells to be used for growth and energy. |
| Stem / Prompt | What is the talk mainly about? |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | How the body turns food into nutrients |
| Option 2 | The importance of nutrients to the body |
| Option 3 | How human anatomy is adapted to different functions |
| Option 4 | The difference between physical and chemical digestion |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **24** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLRF2114** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2113 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LRF |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Professor:** What is a macromolecule? You guessed it; it's a large, complex molecule formed from simpler molecules.   Why does the professor say this:   **Professor:** You guessed it. |
| Stem / Prompt | Why does the professor say this: |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | She is not sure if the students really understand. |
| Option 2 | She is pointing out that what she is saying is obvious. |
| Option 3 | She wants the students to draw conclusions for themselves. |
| Option 4 | She is emphasizing that this is a very important point. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **25** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2115** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2113 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the professor, what benefit does physical digestion provide to the body? |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | It changes food into simpler chemical units. |
| Option 2 | It activates enzymes that help break down proteins. |
| Option 3 | It completes the process of breaking down macromolecules. |
| Option 4 | It allows chemical digestion to occur faster and more easily. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **26** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLRF2116** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2113 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LRF |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Professor:** Everyone remembers that amino acids are the building blocks of protein, right? |
| Stem / Prompt | Why does the professor say this? |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | To reinforce an important concept |
| Option 2 | To ask the students if they have any questions |
| Option 3 | To introduce a new topic |
| Option 4 | To return to her original argument |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **27** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2117** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2113 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | What point does the professor make about the small intestine? |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | It has a large surface area. |
| Option 2 | It contains hydrochloric acid. |
| Option 3 | It is protected by a mucous lining. |
| Option 4 | It completes the task of chemical digestion. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **28** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLII2118** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2113 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LII |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the professor, which of the following are features of the human digestive system? |
| Correct Answer | 245 |
| Option 1 | Physical digestion takes place only in the mouth. |
| Option 2 | The majority of chemical digestion takes place in the stomach. |
| Option 3 | Nutrients are mainly absorbed through the stomach wall. |
| Option 4 | Different enzymes are found in different parts of the body. |
| Option 5 | Saliva begins the process of chemical digestion. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **29** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLMI2119** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2119 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LMI |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Listen to part of a talk in an astronomy class.   **Professor (male):** Welcome. Today we're going to cover one of my favorite topics: asteroids.   Okay, so let's get started. Asteroids are objects that orbit the sun but are too small to be considered planets. They're mostly found in a belt - the so-called asteroid belt - between the orbits of the planets Mars and Jupiter. Astronomers estimate there are at least a hundred thousand asteroids in the asteroid belt. They range in size from a diameter of about a thousand kilometers, down to a few tens of kilometers. Astronomers have identified about two hundred asteroids with a diameter larger than a hundred kilometers, and about a thousand with diameters between thirty and a hundred kilometers. The majority are smaller.   Now, where do asteroids come from? No one really knows for sure. But many scientists think that asteroids are left over from the formation of the solar system, 4.6 billion years ago. One popular theory suggests that asteroids are the remains of giant planets that were destroyed in a massive collision millions - or perhaps billions - of years ago.  Now, as I said, most of the known asteroids can be found in the asteroid belt. As you might imagine, over billions of years, many of these asteroids have crashed into each other. When this happens, fragments break off and are sent drifting into space, and these asteroid fragments can eventually drift into Earth's orbit. These pieces, these fragments of asteroids, are called *meteoroids*. They are smaller than asteroids; some are only the size of a grain of sand. When a meteoroid enters Earth's orbit, it's pulled towards Earth by Earth's gravitational pull. As the meteoroid strikes our atmosphere, it's traveling at up to 72 kilometers per second. Friction causes this chunk of space matter to incinerate, to burn up, in a streak of light known as a *meteor*. If the meteor doesn't burn up completely, what's left of it strikes Earth's surface and is called a *meteorite*.   Make sure you understand this: meteoroids are asteroid fragments that strike our atmosphere; meteorites are the ones that strike the earth.  Much of our understanding about asteroids comes from examining meteorites - these pieces of space debris that have fallen to Earth's surface. Of all the meteorites examined, a little more than 92 percent are composed of silicate, or stone, and nearly 6 percent are composed of iron and nickel; the rest are a mixture of these three materials. Stony meteorites are by far the hardest to identify. This is because they look very much like terrestrial, or regular, rocks.   By studying meteorites, scientists hope to determine their history and origin. As it turns out, not all meteorites come from asteroids. Several meteorites found in Antarctica have been shown to have originated on the moon! We know this because their composition matches samples obtained from the moon by the Apollo missions. Another set are suspected to have come from Mars. These meteorites have trapped gasses that seem to match the atmosphere of Mars, which was measured by the Viking missions. But the majority of meteorites found so far are presumed to be fragments of asteroids.  I'm often asked if Earth has ever been hit by a large asteroid. The answer is "Yes, many times." To date, about 120 impact, or meteor, craters have been identified, most of them in North America, Europe, and Australia. Scientists believe that millions of years ago, an asteroid of between 10 and 20 kilometers in diameter hit the Yucatan Peninsula. This particular region is rich in sulfur compounds, and, some scientists say, billions of tons of sulfur and other materials were injected into the atmosphere by the impact. These compounds blocked sunlight from reaching Earth for about six months, which caused temperatures around the globe to drop to near freezing. This event is blamed for the massive extinction of the dinosaurs, and indeed the extinction of nearly half of all species that were then living. |
| Stem / Prompt | What is the main topic of this talk? |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | Classification of asteroids |
| Option 2 | Methods for studying asteroids |
| Option 3 | Current theories about asteroids |
| Option 4 | Formation and behavior of asteroids |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **30** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLIM2120** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2119 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LIM |
| Stem / Prompt | What does the professor imply about asteroids? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | Scientists have been studying them for many centuries. |
| Option 2 | They may be found in other solar systems. |
| Option 3 | How they are formed is not entirely understood. |
| Option 4 | They are important for understanding the origins of the solar system. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **31** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2121** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2119 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | What is the name for asteroid fragments that strike the earth's atmosphere, but do not reach the earth's surface? |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | Meteors |
| Option 2 | Meteoric |
| Option 3 | Meteoroids |
| Option 4 | Meteorites |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **32** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLII2122** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2119 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LII |
| Stem / Prompt | Which of the following are said to be characteristics of asteroids? |
| Correct Answer | 145 |
| Option 1 | They range widely in size. |
| Option 2 | They all contain trapped gases. |
| Option 3 | They all travel at roughly the same speed. |
| Option 4 | They are mostly found between Mars and Jupiter. |
| Option 5 | They are mainly composed of silicate. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **33** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLDE2123** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2119 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LDE |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the professor, which of the following are places from where meteorites may originate? |
| Correct Answer | 13 |
| Option 1 | Mars |
| Option 2 | Mercury |
| Option 3 | The moon |
| Option 4 | Venus |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **34** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TLRF2124** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TLMI2119 |
| Question Type | Listening Comprehension |
| SkillCode | LRF |
| Listening Stimulus | Listen to part of the talk again, and then answer the question.   **Professor:** To date, about a hundred and twenty impact, or meteor, craters have been identified, most of them in North America, Europe, and Australia. Scientists believe that millions of years ago, an asteroid of between 10 and 20 kilometers in diameter hit the Yucatan Peninsula. |
| Stem / Prompt | Why does the professor mention the Yucatan Peninsula? |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | Because scientists recently found a meteorite there |
| Option 2 | To cite an example of where and when an asteroid may have struck the earth |
| Option 3 | To describe where most current studies of asteroids are centered |
| Option 4 | Because it is a region that has been hit by over 120 meteorites |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **1** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRRF2257** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RRF |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   -->Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | In paragraph 2, why does the author mention the fact that Wright designed clothing?  An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 2. |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | To stress that Wright's talents went beyond the world of architecture |
| Option 2 | To suggest a reason why Wright's goals were sometimes misunderstood by his clients |
| Option 3 | To identify a possible but often overlooked element of Wright's architectural creativity |
| Option 4 | To emphasize the degree of control that Wright wanted to have over his creations |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **2** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2258** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | In the passage, the word *seamlessly* is closest in meaning to |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | repeatedly |
| Option 2 | harmoniously |
| Option 3 | carefully |
| Option 4 | reliably |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **3** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRIN2259** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RIN |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   -->Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | It can be inferred from paragraph 2 that Frank Lloyd Wright's attitude toward many of his clients was  An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 2. |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | discouraging |
| Option 2 | authoritarian |
| Option 3 | reverential |
| Option 4 | balanced |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **4** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRCO2260** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RCO |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. **~~+~~** Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. **~~+~~** At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. **~~+~~** The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. **~~+~~** Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | As for the clients, any concerns they may have had were put to rest in the wake of the incredible interest the house created. |
| Correct Answer | 4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **5** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2261** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | The word *revered* in the passage is closest in meaning to |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | described |
| Option 2 | honored |
| Option 3 | built |
| Option 4 | designed |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **6** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2262** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | Frank Lloyd Wright was known for his innovative use of |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | wood |
| Option 2 | water |
| Option 3 | concrete |
| Option 4 | steel |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **7** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRRE2263** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RRE |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   -->It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | In paragraph 4, *none* refers to  An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 4. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | structures |
| Option 2 | architects |
| Option 3 | designers |
| Option 4 | fans |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **8** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2264** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   -->Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | The word *exhaustive* in paragraph 2 is closest in meaning to   An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 2. |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | unique |
| Option 2 | surprising |
| Option 3 | controversial |
| Option 4 | thorough |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **9** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2265** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | The word *indifference* in the passage is closest in meaning to |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | concern |
| Option 2 | disregard |
| Option 3 | sympathy |
| Option 4 | neutrality |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **10** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2266** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the passage, the owners of Fallingwater intended to use it mainly as |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | a vacation home |
| Option 2 | a museum |
| Option 3 | an office complex |
| Option 4 | a park for tourists |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **11** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2267** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | Wright's designs are said to have been influenced by |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | furniture design |
| Option 2 | the Bauhaus movement |
| Option 3 | Asian architecture |
| Option 4 | colors found in nature |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **12** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRII2268** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRRF2257 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RII |
| Reading Passage | *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect and Legend*  Frank Lloyd Wright is arguably the most famous architect of the 20th century. In his lifetime he became known for his opposition to the International Style and the invention of his own signature creations. Even though he reacted against the Bauhaus movement, he consistently used flowing horizontal lines and seamlessly brought together interior and exterior spaces in nearly every structure he designed. His work took him around the world, especially to Japan, and to the countryside and cities throughout the United States. He was known for his dynamic use of decorative block and his ingenious use of concrete in a style of construction that was seen as an interpretation of Eastern architectural influences combined with his own ideas. An eccentric figure who wore a purple cape and reacted violently to any suggestion or idea of which he did not approve, Wright left an enduring legacy of his work in homes and commercial buildings all over the United States.   Wright was known not only for his breathtaking architectural concepts but also for the creative and exhaustive design of his furnishings. He commanded every space within the interiors of his architectural dreams. He was driven by his passion for order and balance and line, and clearly had his own sense of what would work and what would not work in all of the spaces he created. He would plan the complete interior space of the homes he designed and would argue vehemently with his clients about the placement of furniture and the degree of the lighting in his spaces. He even tried to design clothing to be worn in his architectural wonders. Frank Lloyd Wright was not known as an easy person to work with. He was demanding and temperamental and difficult. Although some would argue with him, most did not for fear of his withering condemnation if they did dare to disagree. More than one person described him as "impossible," even imperialistic. Nevertheless, Wright was revered and still is, as perhaps the greatest American architect of all time. Wright was without a doubt admired in spite of his well-known temperament, and some clients would give anything to have their homes created by the master.   Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright's best-known work, also sometimes labeled the most famous house in America, is Fallingwater, a home he designed in 1939 for a New York businessman and his family as their weekend retreat. Fallingwater was built literally on top of a waterfall. Originally the house was meant to be situated in such a way that those inside would have a view of the waterfall, but Wright became obsessed with the unheard of idea of building the house so that it actually straddled the waterfall. At first his clients resisted this unusual concept but eventually they too were captivated by Wright's vision and the house was indeed built where its designer intended it to be. Wright was known for his frequent indifference to engineering, an attitude that in this case caused considerable anxiety about the structural integrity of the house. The builders feared that it might not be structurally sound, but unbeknownst to Wright, his engineers had added ten times the amount of structural steel he had specified. Very quickly the house acquired the name by which it became known the world over. People from all over the world came to Fallingwater to admire its splendid horizontal profile and its captivating terraces overlooking the rushing stream below. Today the house is a public park and museum where visitors can still experience the genius of the work of Frank Lloyd Wright.   It is common in architecture to describe a structure as Wrightian. This rather indefinable, but clearly identifiable "look" is the favorite of many fans of modern architecture. For many decades, architects and designers have copied and interpreted and created heart-stopping structures with the stamp of Frank Lloyd Wright all over them. But none can match the incomparable art that the great man himself created. All over America today homes and workplaces designed by Frank Lloyd Wright are revered as monuments of beauty and design. In many cases these places have been lovingly and precisely restored. Perhaps if he were here today he would approve; or perhaps he would not! |
| Stem / Prompt | Frank Lloyd Wright is a legend in the history of American architecture. |
| Correct Answer | 134 |
| Option 1 | Although Wright's autocratic style caused him to be feared by many, he was widely respected and sought-after during his lifetime. |
| Option 2 | Wright's clients sometimes managed to convince him to change his designs to conform to their desires, while preserving his own artistic intentions. |
| Option 3 | Fallingwater, widely recognized as a visionary creation, was designed by Wright for his clients who were seeking a weekend retreat where they could enjoy the view of a nearby waterfall. |
| Option 4 | Wright designed a great number of buildings in America, which today are greatly admired and carefully maintained. |
| Option 5 | Wright's architectural career was driven mainly by his struggle against the Bauhaus movement and the International Style, which Wright believed to be too utilitarian. |
| Option 6 | Although Wright was not known in his day for the design of interior furnishings to complement his structures, these furnishings have left a strong imprint on modern furniture design. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **13** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2269** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  -->Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | The word *heretical* in paragraph 1 is closest in meaning to  An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 1. |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | innovative |
| Option 2 | noteworthy |
| Option 3 | unacceptable |
| Option 4 | impractical |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **14** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRIN2270** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RIN |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  -->Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | The author implies in paragraph 1 that a liberal arts degree   An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 1. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | is not regarded as financially rewarding |
| Option 2 | is still considered prestigious |
| Option 3 | was once considered very lucrative |
| Option 4 | should be obtained before choosing a profession |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **15** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRRE2271** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RRE |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   -->In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | The phrase *these principles* in paragraph 3 refers to   An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 3. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | the curriculum divisions of the ancient Greeks and Romans |
| Option 2 | grammar, logic, and rhetoric |
| Option 3 | arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music |
| Option 4 | the ideals of liberal arts education |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **16** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2272** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   -->Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | The phrase *looked to* in paragraph 4 is closest in meaning to  An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 4. |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | checked out |
| Option 2 | assessed |
| Option 3 | disregarded |
| Option 4 | relied upon |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **17** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRPA2273** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RPA |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | Choose the sentence below that most closely represents the information in the highlighted sentence in the passage.  Answer choices that are wrong do not contain all the information that is in the highlighted sentence or change the meaning in an important way. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | Critics claimed that liberal education perpetuated a privileged class and that it was impractical. |
| Option 2 | Critics argued that liberal education was too nurturing and failed to keep up with the modern world. |
| Option 3 | Opponents of liberal education believed it to be too expensive and utilitarian. |
| Option 4 | Advocates of liberal education wanted to make colleges more affordable and more devoted to classical subjects. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **18** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRCO2274** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RCO |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. **~~+~~** Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. **~~+~~** He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." **~~+~~** As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. **~~+~~** Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | These institutions attempted to resurrect the spirit and ideals of classical learning. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **19** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRKT2275** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RKT |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   -->In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | Based on the information in paragraph 3, which of the following is the best definition of the term *classical*?   An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 3. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | Belonging to a traditional style or set of ideas |
| Option 2 | Belonging to the study of ideas rather than practical uses of ideas |
| Option 3 | Relating to teaching methods or the practice of teaching |
| Option 4 | Relating to the skills a person needs for a particular job |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **20** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRRF2276** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RRF |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   -->Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | In paragraph 4, the author mentions Antioch in order to   An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 4. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | provide an example of an early challenge to traditional liberal education |
| Option 2 | argue that a liberal arts curriculum leads to higher academic achievement |
| Option 3 | give an example of a school that was resistant to educational reform |
| Option 4 | disprove the idea that liberal education was unpopular in the early 20th century |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **21** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2277** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the passage, Robert Hutchins |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | was one of the first to challenge liberal education |
| Option 2 | was a 20th century British philosopher |
| Option 3 | was a strong proponent of the liberal arts |
| Option 4 | was the author of 100 "great books" |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **22** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2278** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the passage, the major shift away from traditional liberal education occurred |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | at the end of the 19th century |
| Option 2 | in the early 1920s |
| Option 3 | in the mid-20th century |
| Option 4 | in the late 1960s |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **23** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRMI2279** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RMI |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the passage, a curriculum is considered to be centered on the liberal arts when it |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | emphasizes the teaching of general skills |
| Option 2 | prepares students for the workplace |
| Option 3 | emphasizes the teaching of European classics |
| Option 4 | promotes the idea of learning for its own sake |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **24** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2280** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the passage, all of the following subjects were a part of the ancient Greek system of education EXCEPT |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | math |
| Option 2 | physics |
| Option 3 | rhetoric |
| Option 4 | logic |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **25** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDM2281** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDM |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | Cardinal Newman's book *The Idea of a University* argued that liberal arts education |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | combined elements of vocational and classical education |
| Option 2 | emphasized the teaching of grammar, rhetoric, and logic |
| Option 3 | was solely concerned with the development of the mind |
| Option 4 | aimed to teach the fundamental truths of humankind |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **26** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRII2282** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRWM2269 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RII |
| Reading Passage | *American Liberal Arts and its Decline*  Today, many people equate an American liberal arts education with the study of subjects that, while interesting, have little or no professional value. But the liberal arts were once the foundation of the university curriculum in Europe and the United States. The idea of not teaching students subjects such as Greek philosophy and Latin was considered heretical. It would have been beyond comprehension to generations of educators. But while its legacy is still with us, traditional liberal education has, over the past 50 years, given way to an emphasis on professional training, and to a broader notion of what should be included in the American college curriculum.   The European tradition of liberal arts has its roots in ancient Greece and Rome, going back more than 2,000 years. The name itself derives from the Latin for the word *free*, referring to the position of those in Greek society privileged to seek an education, as opposed to the large mass of slaves. For early philosophers of education like Aristotle, it was only this class of freemen who could and would make use of complex philosophical and political ideas. In ancient Rome, the liberal arts were composed of seven disciplines. The paramount group of three, the trivium, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the art of persuasive communication. The other subjects were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, all of which were seen as related.   In the 18th century, these principles, along with the bulk of Greek philosophy, were reclaimed as the cornerstone for the new centers of learning - universities - spreading across Europe and, in time, to the Americas. Just as Aristotle conceived of education as something pursued for its own purpose, so did Cardinal Newman, the 19th-century British philosopher of education. He insisted in his famous work, *The Idea of a University*, that liberal education was the cultivation of the intellect and "nothing more." As such, it shared the classical disdain for vocational - job-related - training. Even through much of the 20th century, American colleges remained bastions of classical learning. Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1951, promoted a curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and Aristotelian metaphysics, going so far as to compile a list of 100 "great books," wherein lay the fundamental truths of humankind.   Not surprisingly, as colleges in the United States increasingly were looked to as means of social advancement and career preparation, the traditional curriculum began to be challenged. Critics charged that, as it had developed, liberal education helped create and foster an elite, and that it inadequately prepared students for modern careers. American colleges began to experiment with more practical curriculums. In the early 1920s, Antioch, an innovative college in Ohio, introduced a program of study that allowed students to alternate time in the classroom with experience on the job. It wasn't until after World War II, however, with the growth of colleges around the country, that American schools really began to change.   While the idea of the "Ivory Tower" - the university as a sanctuary for pure learning - was crumbling, most American institutions still maintained some allegiance to the ideal of a broad education. But no longer was the classical liberal arts curriculum regarded as sacrosanct. Latin and rhetoric began to make way for English and math and even electives - classes that students could choose to take. A 1945 report by Harvard, the nation's oldest and most venerable university, heralded the shift away from classical liberal arts toward an emphasis on something called "general education," which emphasized skills that would most likely be employed in the workplace.   Today there are American universities that champion a return to the ideals of liberal arts education. In many of these schools, the scope of the liberal arts has expanded to include subjects well outside of the classic Greek trivium. In particular, many modern liberal arts curriculums include the writings of women and people of color, alongside the classical "white men" of the classical European tradition. But as university students become increasingly concerned about gaining marketable skills, the future of the liberal arts in the United States remains unclear, as does the ideal it represents - learning for its own sake. |
| Stem / Prompt | The liberal arts once provided the foundation for university education in Europe and the United States. |
| Correct Answer | 236 |
| Option 1 | In the 1940s, Harvard University's report heralded a shift away from liberal arts toward general education. |
| Option 2 | Liberal arts traces its roots to ancient Greece, where general education was a luxury of a privileged class. |
| Option 3 | Liberal arts has reemerged in modern universities, but now includes subjects that were not considered part of the classical liberal arts curriculum. |
| Option 4 | In the 20th century, Latin and rhetoric began to give way to English, mathematics, and various electives. |
| Option 5 | The term trivium refers to any educational curriculum based on the teaching of facts. |
| Option 6 | In the United States, the classical liberal arts curriculum began to be challenged when universities began to teach work-related skills. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **27** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRKT2283** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RKT |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  -->The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | Based on the information in paragraph 1, which of the following is the best definition of the term *displacement*?   An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 1. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | When a group of people are forced to relocate |
| Option 2 | The transformation of a neighborhood from middle class to wealthy |
| Option 3 | When the value of property rises quickly |
| Option 4 | The deterioration and neglect of inner cities |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **28** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRRE2284** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RRE |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | The word *it* in the passage refers to |
| Correct Answer | 3 |
| Option 1 | character |
| Option 2 | transformation |
| Option 3 | gentrification |
| Option 4 | reflection |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **29** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2285** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   -->In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | The phrase *paved the way* in paragraph 4 is closest in meaning to   An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 4. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | made it easier |
| Option 2 | made it earlier |
| Option 3 | made it less profitable |
| Option 4 | made it less attractive |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **30** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRCO2286** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RCO |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. **~~+~~** Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. **~~+~~** In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. **~~+~~** By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. **~~+~~** In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | This left a population comprised mainly of the very poor - long-time residents who lacked the money to leave, as well as recent immigrants. |
| Correct Answer | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **31** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRPA2287** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RPA |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | Choose the sentence below that most closely represents the information in the highlighted sentence in the passage.  Answer choices that are wrong do not contain all the information that is in the highlighted sentence or change the meaning in an important way. |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | Similar to federal programs, community-based projects placed a high priority on maintaining and promoting historic buildings. |
| Option 2 | Defying the federal government's modernization campaign, community-based groups and individuals wanted to assess and improve the city's historic identity. |
| Option 3 | More radical community organizations opposed the federal government's indifference to the city's architectural and cultural heritage. |
| Option 4 | Unlike these bureaucratic bodies, groups at the community level took a greater interest in maintaining and improving the city's historic character. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **32** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRWM2288** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RWM |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   -->A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | The word *sleek* in paragraph 3 is closest in meaning to  An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 3. |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | secure |
| Option 2 | expensive |
| Option 3 | crowded |
| Option 4 | attractive |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **33** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRRF2289** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RRF |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   -->An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | SoHo is discussed in paragraph 5 in order to  An arrow [ ] marks paragraph 5. |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | provide an example of gentrification that was attempted but did not become fashionable |
| Option 2 | show how gentrification often follows a predictable sequence |
| Option 3 | argue that government-sponsored urban renewal projects have largely failed in Manhattan |
| Option 4 | illustrate the difference between urban and rural gentrification |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **34** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2290** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | Which of the following cities is mentioned in the passage as an example of a city that suffered from problems with crime? |
| Correct Answer | 1 |
| Option 1 | Detroit |
| Option 2 | Boston |
| Option 3 | San Francisco |
| Option 4 | New York |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **35** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2291** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | Opponents of gentrification would list all of the following as its negative consequences EXCEPT |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | unaffordable rent for the traditional residents |
| Option 2 | increased tax revenues for the city |
| Option 3 | lack of cultural diversity in neighborhoods |
| Option 4 | reduction in the availability of low-income housing |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **36** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRIN2292** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RIN |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | All of the following might be considered signs of gentrification in a neighborhood EXCEPT |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | expensive specialty shops |
| Option 2 | fancy restaurants |
| Option 3 | restored old buildings |
| Option 4 | empty grocery stores |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **37** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDE2293** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDE |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | According to the passage, all of the following have directly contributed to gentrification EXCEPT |
| Correct Answer | 2 |
| Option 1 | federal urban renewal programs designed to eliminate urban blight |
| Option 2 | the desire to maintain the traditional ethnic make-up of neighborhoods |
| Option 3 | changing family structures in urban areas |
| Option 4 | the rising popularity of urban living among young professionals |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **38** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRAO2294** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RAO |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | Which of the following most accurately expresses the author's attitude toward gentrification? |
| Correct Answer | 4 |
| Option 1 | Gentrification should be regulated by government authorities so that it will proceed in an orderly manner. |
| Option 2 | Gentrification is a problem that must be opposed at the community and local governmental level. |
| Option 3 | For good or bad, gentrification is an unavoidable process. |
| Option 4 | While it may present some economic benefits, gentrification raises serious social concerns. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **39** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TRDT2295** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TRKT2283 |
| Question Type | Reading Comprehension |
| SkillCode | RDT |
| Listening Stimulus | Before the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act\_3After the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act\_4 |
| Reading Passage | *Gentrification*  The changes in the old neighborhood are gradual but noticeable all the same. A popular, expensive café opens, followed by a few fancy salons; soon many of the parking spaces are filled with late-model, luxury cars. People who have lived in the neighborhood a long time begin to talk about the rising cost of rent and the possibility of moving away. *Gentrification* is the term that has been coined to describe the transformation of an urban area from poor or working-class to professional. Derived from the word *gentry* - an antiquated reference to the wealthy - the term has a negative connotation, implying the displacement of long-time and lower-income residents and the effacement of a neighborhood's deep-rooted character. But as much as it may be criticized today, gentrification can also be seen as a reflection of the remarkable transformation that American cities have undergone over the past four decades.   Starting in the 1950s and accelerating in the 1960s, urban areas experienced a steady withdrawal of both industry and residents, many of whom were middle-class families heading to new suburbs. Without sufficient revenue from tenants, building owners were unable or unwilling to keep up their properties, leading to what economists call disinvestment. In many cities buildings were, at best, minimally maintained and, at worst, allowed to fall into complete disrepair. By the 1970s, entire blocks of downtown Detroit, for example, consisted of abandoned buildings. In cities around the country, physical deterioration and neglect were accompanied by soaring crime rates - a condition characterized as "urban blight."   A range of federal programs, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, were initiated to try to breathe life into cities. Among the most important was the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, which over the years disbursed tens of billions of dollars in grants for urban development projects. At that time urban renewal was, for the most part, equated with modernization and large-scale development. Crumbling tenements were replaced by sleek office towers, shopping malls, hotels, and convention centers.   In contrast to these bureaucratic initiatives, grassroots - or community-based - efforts aimed to preserve and restore the city's architectural and cultural heritage. Beginning in the late 1960s, some intrepid young people went so far as to move into blighted urban areas, rehabilitating dilapidated buildings by themselves. Some urban researchers have suggested that this "advance guard" paved the way for more cautious - and more affluent - newcomers.   An illustration of this sequential transformation is provided by the Manhattan neighborhood of SoHo. Beginning in the early 1970s, artists began converting former factories and warehouses south of Houston Street (hence the name) into "lofts," large studios where they could live and work. Steadily, as the more risk-sensitive and wealthier were drawn to the "bohemian" neighborhood, SoHo evolved into one of the world's most renowned fine arts districts. What makes the neighborhood an emblem for gentrification, of course, is the skyward trajectory of its property value. Ironically, few artists can afford to live in SoHo today, unless they are exceptionally successful. In cities around the country, it would appear that developers are expediting the process of gentrification. New condominiums are marketed to professionals as "artist lofts," and neighborhoods are re-branded with hip SoHo-like names.   Underlying this phenomenon is a simple economic reality: in many U.S. cities, there is now a strong demand for urban residences. This can be traced in part to successful urban renewal policies of the past three decades. With the growth of the finance and technology sectors, cities like New York, San Francisco, and Boston have experienced large white-collar job growth. In surveys, newcomers to urban areas have consistently listed proximity to work as one of the strongest attractions. Changing demographics has also played a role. The past three decades have seen a rise in single-person households, the very people who have been increasingly drawn to the city. This also accounts for another prominent feature of gentrification: the division of buildings into separate purchasable units (condominiums), which vastly increases the earning potential of the property.   From a purely economic perspective, these developments can hardly be regarded as negative. They are certain to raise a city's property values and thus its tax revenues. The problem, critics charge, is that because housing is limited in urban areas, cities become economically segregated, with lower-income workers concentrated in chronically neglected, crime-ridden neighborhoods. Moreover, critics claim that while "revitalized" districts may gain a kind of superficial charm, they lose the diversity of people, businesses, and economic classes that make urban areas "vital" to begin with. |
| Stem / Prompt | Choose the phrases from the answer choices list and then match them to the period before or after the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act. You will NOT use TWO of the answer choices. ***This question is worth 4 points***. |
| Correct Answer | 1273569 |
| Option 1 | large numbers of middle-class families heading to the suburbs |
| Option 2 | urban disinvestment |
| Option 3 | the division of buildings into separate purchasable units |
| Option 4 | new banks designed to handle urban investment |
| Option 5 | federal grants for urban development projects |
| Option 6 | development of sleek, modern structures |
| Option 7 | decreased revenue from tenants |
| Option 8 | large number of factories being built |
| Option 9 | strong demand for urban residences |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **1** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TSFE1361** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TSFE1361 |
| Question Type | Speaking |
| SkillCode | SFE |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Number One. For this task, you will be asked to speak about a topic that is familiar to you. You will hear a question. You will then have 15 seconds to prepare your response and 45 seconds to speak. |
| Stem / Prompt | Describe a characteristic that you admire in a family member and explain why you think it is an admirable quality. Include details and examples to support your explanation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **2** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TSOP1344** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TSOP1344 |
| Question Type | Speaking |
| SkillCode | SOP |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Number Two. For this task, you will be asked to speak about a topic that is familiar to you. You will hear a question. You will then have 15 seconds to prepare your response and 45 seconds to speak. |
| Stem / Prompt | Some foreign-language classes are taught entirely in the language that the students are trying to learn. Others are taught partly in the foreign language and partly in the students' native language. Which approach do you think is better for learning a language, and why? Include details and examples in your explanation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **3** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TSSS1377** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TSSS1377 |
| Question Type | Speaking |
| SkillCode | SSS |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Now listen to two students as they discuss the announcement.   **Female student:** That's so unfair! What about the rest of us non-science majors?   **Male student:** I know what you mean, but you know that the majority of the students at this school are science majors. So I guess it makes sense to give them most of the resources.   **Female student:** Yeah, but the fall fundraising campaign was supposed to raise money to benefit the whole school. Why should the entire student body subsidize something that doesn’t benefit everybody? The extra money should have been used to build a bigger student center, or something we can all use.   **Male student:** I see your point, but I guess the science majors are more vocal and better organized than us Spanish majors. I mean, really, look at our Spanish Club - we only have, what, ten active members? The Physics Club has more than fifty!   **Female student:** Exactly. And that's why the non-science departments deserve more support. The science crowd has plenty of alumni they can depend on for donations. We're the ones that need the most help.   **Male student:** I agree. But you have to admit the decision was arrived at fairly. The committee seems like it was pretty representative. |
| Reading Passage | **Announcement from the Physics Club**  Thanks to the overwhelming response from alumni to the University's fall fundraising campaign, the University was able to raise more money than was anticipated. We are very pleased to announce that the University Finance Committee - composed of university administrators, student representatives, and faculty - has voted to authorize the use of the excess funds toward the construction of a new wing for the science laboratory and the purchase of new laboratory equipment. The much-needed renovations are expected to commence as early as next spring. The Physics Club applauds this decision and thanks the university community for its generous support. |
| Stem / Prompt | The woman expresses her opinion about the way university resources should be allocated. State her opinion and explain the reasons she gives for holding that opinion. |
| Option 1 | **Narrator:** Number Three. For this task, you will read a short text and then listen to a dialogue about the same topic. You will hear a question about what you have read and heard. You will then have 30 seconds to prepare your response and 60 seconds to speak.     **Narrator:** The University Finance Committee has made a decision about how to use extra funds. Read the announcement about its decision. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **4** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TSSS2137** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TSSS2137 |
| Question Type | Speaking |
| SkillCode | SSS |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Now listen to part of a talk on this topic in an ecology class.   **Professor (female):** In our last class, we discussed the role of light in the forest, the way light controls the natural distribution of plants. Now, as you might imagine, forests change over time. This change is called "succession."   Succession in forests usually begins after a major disturbance, like a fire or a wind storm, or even flooding. These events create gaps in the forest where new growth can occur. These gaps allow sunlight to reach the forest floor, which prompts so-called pioneer species to grow. These pioneer species are generally shade-intolerant, that is, they can't grow in shade. So when new patches of forest open up, these shade-intolerant species move in and begin to grow rapidly.   Now, these fast-growing shade-intolerant trees change the environment as they grow. As they grow taller, they begin to shade the forest floor, creating conditions that are ideal for other species of trees and plants, the so-called mid-tolerant species - species that require a mixture of sun and shade. Over time, a mixed forest will develop, and most of the species will be mid-tolerant species. As the forest reaches the later phases of succession, shade-tolerant species become dominant. These are known as the "climax" species; the climax species will dominate the site until disturbances launch the cycle of succession again. |
| Reading Passage | **Light and the Distribution of Plants**  Light is a major factor in determining how plants are distributed in forest environments. The amount of light available to plants depends to a large degree on their position in the forest. The top-most layer of a forest receives the maximum amount of sunlight; the shade this layer creates means less light is available to plants at the lower layers in the forest. In some very dense forests, trees cut off so much light that almost no shrubs or smaller plants are able to grow on the forest floor. In certain mid-latitude deciduous forests, smaller plants on the forest floor exhibit an intense and rapid growth cycle during the early spring, before the trees produce their leaves. By summer, the trees have produced a dense canopy of leaves, and these smaller early spring plants have almost entirely disappeared. Other plants in the same habitat require shade to grow and are inhibited by too much direct sunlight. These plants begin to appear later in the summer, when the leaf canopy darkens the forest floor. |
| Stem / Prompt | The professor describes the process of succession in forests. Explain the role of light in the development of forests. |
| Option 1 | **Narrator:** Number Four. For this task, you will read a short text and then hear a talk about the same topic. You will hear a question about what you have read and heard. After you hear the question, you will then have 30 seconds to prepare your response and 60 seconds to speak.     **Narrator:** Now read the passage about the distribution of plants in forests. You have 45 seconds to read the passage. Begin reading now. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **5** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TSSO2138** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TSSO2138 |
| Question Type | Speaking |
| SkillCode | SSO |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Number Five. For this task, you will listen to a dialogue. You will hear a question about it. You will then have 20 seconds to prepare your response and 60 seconds to speak.   **Narrator:** Now listen to a dialogue between a student and a professor.   **Female student:** Hello, Professor Taylor.   **Male professor:** Oh, hello, Susan. I suppose you're here to talk about that last test?   **Female student:** Um, yeah... I didn't do so well on it, did I?   **Male professor:** No, you didn't. And frankly I'm surprised. You're capable of much better work than that. Is something going on that's distracting you from studying?   **Female student:** It's not much of an excuse, but... my sister's getting married next month, and I've been helping out with the planning. It's a big wedding, and there's a lot of work to do. I guess in the excitement of it all, I've managed to fall behind on my studying.   **Male professor:** I understand - we all have lives outside of the classroom. But you do need to keep up if you hope to pass this class. And because you did so poorly on the last test, you're going to have to do even better on the next one to catch up.   **Female student:** I know, and that's what I wanted to talk to you about. Is there anything I can do to make up for the last test - any kind of extra credit project I could do?   **Male professor:** Yes... you could write a second term paper. If you did that, then I'd throw out your lowest test score and base your final grade on the other tests and the two papers.   **Female student:** A second term paper? That sounds like a lot of work!   **Male professor:** It is. Your only other option is to get an A on the final. If you do, I'll throw out your lowest test score when I compute your grade.   **Female student:** An A on the final! But your tests are so hard, Professor! Does anybody get an A on your finals?   **Male professor:** It happens occasionally.... But realistically, the only way you'd be able to do that is to work with a tutor. I can recommend a couple of good ones, if you'd like me to....   **Female student:** Hmm... So my only options are either write a second term paper or get an A on the final?   **Male professor:** I'm afraid so.   **Female student:** I'll need to think about this a little more....   **Male professor:** Of course. Just let me know by the end of the week whether you plan to write a second term paper. And if you want me to put you in contact with some tutors, I can do that. |
| Stem / Prompt | The professor offers the student two options to improve her grade in his class. Describe both options. Then state which of the two you prefer and explain why. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **6** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TSSI2139** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TSSI2139 |
| Question Type | Speaking |
| SkillCode | SSI |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Number six. For this task, you will hear a short academic talk. You will hear a question about it. You will then have 20 seconds to prepare your response and 60 seconds to speak.   **Narrator:** Now listen to part of a talk in a music history class.   **Professor (male):** In our last class we discussed the rhythm sections of early jazz groups, and how those were made up primarily of guitar, banjo, tuba, bass saxophone, string bass, piano, and drums. No bands had all these instruments playing together, of course, but most early jazz groups had some combination of these instruments.   Now, most early jazz bands had drummers, but when you listen to many of the early jazz recordings, you'll find that very few of them have drums. And for the recordings that do have drums, you almost can't hear them.   The reason there's so little drumming on the early jazz recordings - and I'm talking about those made in the early 1920s - is because the recording equipment available back then was rather primitive. A typical recording system of that era was basically a large cone-shaped horn connected to a cutting needle that cut grooves into a cylinder or a disc - the early forms of what came to be called *records*. The needles were very sensitive, and loud noises - like those from a drum being struck - could easily knock the cutting needle off the recording surface. So, as a result, most of the early jazz recordings represent the bands of the day, but without their drummers. On the recordings that do have drumming, the drums are muffled so much that you can't really hear it. On a few early recordings, you can hear a sort of clickety-click sound made by someone keeping time by hitting a small hollow wood block with a stick - not really what you would call "drumming." On some recordings you can also hear cowbells being struck, and cymbals or gongs, and some other small percussion instruments.   To get around the limitations of what could and couldn't be done in the early recording studios, drummers began experimenting with different techniques - trying to play softer, or using wire brushes instead of sticks. The wire brushes offer a softer, lighter sound, and give the drums a sustained sound when they're dragged slowly across a drum head or a cymbal. The use of wire brushes eventually became a staple, a sound heard in many styles of jazz drumming, even today. |
| Stem / Prompt | Using points and examples from the talk, explain why drumming is not commonly heard on very early jazz recordings, and how this lead to the use of wire brushes by jazz drummers. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **1** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TWSC2131** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TWSC2131 |
| Question Type | Writing |
| SkillCode | WSC |
| Listening Stimulus | **Narrator:** Now listen to part of a talk on the topic you just read about.  **Professor (male):** The common story of the Grand Canyon, that it was slowly carved out of the earth over millions of years, is no longer really accepted by most members of the scientific community. In fact, the age of the canyon appears to be much younger than was originally thought. How old? We're not entirely sure. And how, exactly, it was formed - this is still a bit of mystery, but we're doing some interesting research in this area.  The area I've been studying lies along a 14-mile stretch of the western Grand Canyon, downstream from Lava Falls Rapid. There's a huge concentration of volcanic deposits there-basalt boulders, for example - and we've been wondering what they're doing there. One of the ideas we're working with is that there was a volcanic flow - lava - that temporarily dammed up, blocked the Colorado River. And in fact, and this is what's exciting to me, we're starting to find evidence of a lake that may have existed a few hundred thousand years ago in this very spot!  So the idea we're working with, the idea is that this dam was suddenly breached, and the whole lake-full of water was released downstream at tremendous speeds, with enough force to carve out most of the canyon we see today. So rather than this slow erosion going on against a backdrop of rising geologic plates, the Grand Canyon may very well have been created in the blink of a geologic eye! And if it turns out to be true, that would place the age of the canyon at, get this, we're figuring between one-hundred fifty and two hundred thousand years! This would demand a whole new way of thinking about the Grand Canyon. |
| Reading Passage | The Grand Canyon owes its existence to the Colorado River and the rising of geologic plates. Of equal importance are the forces of erosion - from rain, snowmelt, and tributary streams - that continue to shape the canyon even today. Given millions of years to do the job, these forces cut a scar in the earth that today is almost a mile deep, 217 miles long, and ranges from 4 to 18 miles in width.  During the Cretaceous Era, Arizona stood barely above sea level, and through it ran the ancient Colorado River. Around 70 million years ago, the region started to rise into an immense plateau. But the ground rose so slowly that it did not change the course of the river; instead, the increasing elevation of the land gave speed and power to the water. Using silt, sand, gravel, and boulders as abrasives, the Colorado scoured its way through the rising landscape.  This gradual eroding of the canyon was aided by the region's climate. Even though the Grand Canyon's climate is classified as semi-arid, the rain it receives tends to come in violent storms, particularly in late summer. Because the soil in the Grand Canyon is baked by the sun, it is very hard, and cannot absorb the rainwater. The result is that there are frequent flash floods, powerful enough to move boulders and soil down to the Colorado River.  The power of erosion is therefore more evident at the Grand Canyon than in places that receive much more rain. In effect, the forces that took millions of years to carve the Grand Canyon continue to shape it even today. |
| Stem / Prompt | Summarize the points made in the talk you just heard, explaining how they cast doubt on the points made in the reading. |
| Sample Response | The reading and lecture discuss in different ways about how the Grand Canyon developed. The lecture takes a more unconventional theory about how the canyon was formed and seems to go against the grain of what is traditionally taught about the canyon and its development. The speaker talks about how the canyon was formed from a flood from a lake that was formed by the Colorado River becoming blocked by volcanic lava. The reading states the more conventional theory of the canyon's history by describing the shift in geological plates from the area that was at one time at sea level, and the effects of erosion from rain, snow and tributaries of the Colorado River. This has developed the canyon's appearance over millions of years. The evidence of the theory in the lecture is that scientists have found basalt boulders, the result of volcanic activity, on the western side of the canyon. To deduce how boulders got there, the speaker along with other researchers, have formulated a theory that a lake that was formed on the eastern end of the canyon and was released by a break in one of the sides formed by the lava. And with the great force and speed of the water, the canyon was carved out of the landscape quickly. If this is what actually happened with the canyon, then that would mean that the actual age of the canyon is about 200-300,000 years old. This differs greatly from the reading, which places the age of the canyon at about 70 million years ago. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **2** |
| **Kaplan QID** | **TWOP2132** |
| Passage ID (file name) | TWOP2132 |
| Question Type | Writing |
| SkillCode | WOP |
| Stem / Prompt | Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?  Modern technology has made people less creative than they used to be.  Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer. |
| Sample Response | I think that modern technology hasn't made people less creative. Advancements in technology are the result of other people’s creative influences to help advance a product or idea. I think that you have to understand the definition of creativity to get a better sense of how technology can help a person be creative.   Creativity is the ability to generate new ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing ideas. Modern technology can help accelerate these permutations or reapplications. An obvious example of a tool that does this for many people is the computer. To be able to accomplish basic tasks that would normally take a lot of time to complete allows someone the opportunity to creatively think ahead. An example of this is to think of any type of innovation in science or art. A computer can help create simulations of possible solutions and options for someone to pursue further or to discard and try another.   However, at this point in the discussion is where the original question of how modern technology has made people less creative becomes relevant. I think that there is a valid concern that some people choose to settle and become complacent with whatever the computer gives them as an option or a model and declares that their work is over. Evidence of this is so often found in popular music. The mechanical sounding structures that are prevalent in a lot of popular music is the result of someone being complacent with a computer reproduction and stopping the creative process at that point to accommodate a commercial deadline.   Ultimately, creativity comes down to someone trying to accomplish something new with whatever means he or she determines to be appropriate. As the old saying goes, "It's not the tools, it's the carpenter." |