The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Our world is losing biodiversity, and fast. According to a report by the United Nations, up to one million species could face extinction in the near future due to human influence on the natural world. Such a collapse in biodiversity would wreak havoc on the interconnected ecosystems of the planet, putting human communities at risk by compromising food sources, fouling clean water and air, and eroding natural defenses against extreme weather such as hurricanes and floods. In the sweeping UN-backed report, hundreds of scientists found that biodiversity loss poses a global threat on par with climate change. The report calls the rate of change in nature "unprecedented" and projects that species extinctions will become increasingly common in the coming decades, driven by factors such as land development, deforestation and overfishing.

As the global assessment confirms, human activity is a major driver of biodiversity decline among the millions of species on Earth. The report ranks some of the top causes of species loss as changes in land and sea use, direct exploitation of organisms, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species. The current global rate of species extinction is already "at least tens to hundreds of times higher than it has averaged over the past 10 million years," and it's expected to keep accelerating.

All in all, human action has "significantly altered" about 75 per cent of the world's land environment and 66 percent of its marine environment. Insect populations have plummeted in tropical forests, grasslands are increasingly drying out into deserts, and pollution along with ocean acidification is driving many coral reef ecosystems to the brink. The destruction of biodiversity at all levels, from genes to ecosystems, could pose significant threats to humankind. In addition to affecting human access to food resources, clean water and breathable air, a loss of species on a global scale could also clear a path for diseases and parasites to spread more quickly, says Emmett Duffy, a biodiversity expert who contributed to the report.

"Historically, a lot of us have thought about conservation and extinction in terms of charismatic animals like pandas and whales," Duffy says. "But there's a very strong utilitarian reason for saving species, because people depend on them. There's an environmental justice aspect."

The effects of biodiversity loss won't be distributed equally, either, the researchers found. The most devastating impacts would disproportionately affect some of the world's poorest communities, and the report concludes that the decline in biodiversity undermines global progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals, milestones set by the U.N. General Assembly in 2015 to reduce global inequality.

The situation is critical, but not hopeless, the authors of the report say. It is still possible to slow the destruction of the natural world, but it will require "transformative change" at the highest levels, Watson says. The report identifies "indirect drivers" of biodiversity loss—big-picture changes like population growth and unsustainable consumption—as well as "direct drivers" like land use and the spread of invasive species. Though the direct drivers are more visible in their effects on the environment, they can be considered symptoms of the massive global changes, says Josef Settele, one of the assessment's co-chairs.

Previous   Next   Exit Review

1) Which of the following best summarizes the U.N. Report on biodiversity? —

○ The threat posed by biodiversity loss due to human activity, though critical, is not hopeless if 'transformative' changes are initiated at the highest levels.   ✕

○ Biodiversity loss poses a global threat on par with climate change driving one million species to extinction and risking human populations around the world.

○ Biodiversity loss owing to human activity can cause the extinction of one million species in the near future and endanger human communities around the world.

○ Human induced decline in nature, species extinctions and the risk to people around the world, though critical, can be addressed by 'transformative change' at the highest levels.

Video Explanation: ﹀

Explanation: ﹀

The UN Report as described in the passage details the effects of human induced risks to biodiversity – potential extinction of one million species - which would wreak havoc on the interconnected ecosystems including human communities. The last paragraph states the conclusion of the report – that though critical the situation is not hopeless if transformative changes are initiated at the highest levels. Options 2 and 3 focus on just the opening part of the passage—they fail to bring in the idea that the situation can be tackled if proper steps are taken. Options 1 and 4 can be considered for the answer. Option 1, however, does not include the biodiversity loss, extinctions, and the risk to human communities and generalizes with the word 'threat'. Option 4 brings out the essential details of the report. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ﹀

Time taken by you: **287 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **141 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **39 %**

2) According to the passage, the marine environment: —

○ is less polluted than the land environment.

◉ has been considerably altered by pollution. ✔

○ has lost 66% of its biodiversity.

○ is less affected by human activities.

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Our world is losing biodiversity, and fast. According to a report by the United Nations, up to one million species could face extinction in the near future due to human influence on the natural world. Such a collapse in biodiversity would wreak havoc on the interconnected ecosystems of the planet, putting human communities at risk by compromising food sources, fouling clean water and air, and eroding natural defenses against extreme weather such as hurricanes and floods. In the sweeping UN-backed report, hundreds of scientists found that biodiversity loss poses a global threat on par with climate change. The report calls the rate of change in nature "unprecedented" and projects that species extinctions will become increasingly common in the coming decades, driven by factors such as land development, deforestation and overfishing.

As the global assessment confirms, human activity is a major driver of biodiversity decline among the millions of species on Earth. The report ranks some of the top causes of species loss as changes in land and sea use, direct exploitation of organisms, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species. The current global rate of species extinction is already "at least tens to hundreds of times higher than it has averaged over the past 10 million years," and it's expected to keep accelerating.

All in all, human action has "significantly altered" about 75 per cent of the world's land environment and 66 percent of its marine environment. Insect populations have plummeted in tropical forests, grasslands are increasingly drying out into deserts, and pollution along with ocean acidification is driving many coral reef ecosystems to the brink. The destruction of biodiversity at all levels, from genes to ecosystems, could pose significant threats to humankind. In addition to affecting human access to food resources, clean water and breathable air, a loss of species on a global scale could also clear a path for diseases and parasites to spread more quickly, says Emmett Duffy, a biodiversity expert who contributed to the report.

"Historically, a lot of us have thought about conservation and extinction in terms of charismatic animals like pandas and whales," Duffy says. "But there's a very strong utilitarian reason for saving species, because people depend on them. There's an environmental justice aspect."

The effects of biodiversity loss won't be distributed equally, either, the researchers found. The most devastating impacts would disproportionately affect some of the world's poorest communities, and the report concludes that the decline in biodiversity undermines global progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals, milestones set by the U.N. General Assembly in 2015 to reduce global inequality.

The situation is critical, but not hopeless, the authors of the report say. It is still possible to slow the destruction of the natural world, but it will require "transformative change" at the highest levels, Watson says. The report identifies "indirect drivers" of biodiversity loss—big-picture changes like population growth and unsustainable consumption—as well as "direct drivers" like land use and the spread of invasive species. Though the direct drivers are more visible in their effects on the environment, they can be considered symptoms of the massive global changes, says Josef Settele, one of the assessment's co-chairs.

Video Explanation:

Explanation: ⌄

Refer paragraph 3: "All in all, human action has "significantly altered" about 75 per cent of the world's land environment and 66 per cent of its marine environment. Insect populations have plummeted in tropical forests, grasslands are increasingly drying out into deserts, and pollution along with ocean acidification is driving many coral reef ecosystems to the brink." Option 2 is, thus, correct. Options, 1, 3 and 4 cannot be ascertained form the passage because of lack of information. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **25 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **71 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **58 %**

3) "Transformative change" would include all of the following EXCEPT: —

○ Sustainable consumption habits.

○ Measure to control population growth.

◉ Introduction of foreign species into the ecosystem. ✔

○ Conservation of wildlife habitats.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Refer the last paragraph. The report says that transformative change at the highest levels is needed to "slow the destruction of the natural world". "The report identifies "indirect drivers" of biodiversity loss—big-picture changes like population growth and unsustainable consumption—as well as "direct drivers" like land use and the spread of invasive species." One may infer that checking the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss is what transformative change would achieve. Introduction of new species into the ecosystem will be harmful to the environment as: invasive species" is stated as a direct driver of biodiversity degradation. Option 4 would enrich biodiversity. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **31 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **65 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

Change Section here ▼

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Our world is losing biodiversity, and fast. According to a report by the United Nations, up to one million species could face extinction in the near future due to human influence on the natural world. Such a collapse in biodiversity would wreak havoc on the interconnected ecosystems of the planet, putting human communities at risk by compromising food sources, fouling clean water and air, and eroding natural defenses against extreme weather such as hurricanes and floods. In the sweeping UN-backed report, hundreds of scientists found that biodiversity loss poses a global threat on par with climate change. The report calls the rate of change in nature "unprecedented" and projects that species extinctions will become increasingly common in the coming decades, driven by factors such as land development, deforestation and overfishing.

As the global assessment confirms, human activity is a major driver of biodiversity decline among the millions of species on Earth. The report ranks some of the top causes of species loss as changes in land and sea use, direct exploitation of organisms, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species. The current global rate of species extinction is already "at least tens to hundreds of times higher than it has averaged over the past 10 million years," and it's expected to keep accelerating.

All in all, human action has "significantly altered" about 75 per cent of the world's land environment and 66 percent of its marine environment. Insect populations have plummeted in tropical forests, grasslands are increasingly drying out into deserts, and pollution along with ocean acidification is driving many coral reef ecosystems to the brink. The destruction of biodiversity at all levels, from genes to ecosystems, could pose significant threats to humankind. In addition to affecting human access to food resources, clean water and breathable air, a loss of species on a global scale could also clear a path for diseases and parasites to spread more quickly, says Emmett Duffy, a biodiversity expert who contributed to the report.

"Historically, a lot of us have thought about conservation and extinction in terms of charismatic animals like pandas and whales," Duffy says. "But there's a very strong utilitarian reason for saving species, because people depend on them. There's an environmental justice aspect."

The effects of biodiversity loss won't be distributed equally, either, the researchers found. The most devastating impacts would disproportionately affect some of the world's poorest communities, and the report concludes that the decline in biodiversity undermines global progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals, milestones set by the U.N. General Assembly in 2015 to reduce global inequality.

The situation is critical, but not hopeless, the authors of the report say. It is still possible to slow the destruction of the natural world, but it will require "transformative change" at the highest levels, Watson says. The report identifies "indirect drivers" of biodiversity loss—big-picture changes like population growth and unsustainable consumption—as well as "direct drivers" like land use and the spread of invasive species. Though the direct drivers are more visible in their effects on the environment, they can be considered symptoms of the massive global changes, says Josef Settele, one of the assessment's co-chairs.

4) In the fourth paragraph, Emmett Duffy uses the term "environmental justice" to point out the need to save species because, according to him:

◉ Collapse in biodiversity destroys the planet's interconnected ecosystems. ✓

○ World's poorest will be the most affected from biodiversity loss.

○ Conservation of just charismatic animals like panda and whales is unjustifiable.

○ The UN Sustainable Development Goals consider humans and animals as equals.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Refer to the fourth paragraph: "Historically, a lot of us have thought about conservation and extinction in terms of charismatic animals like pandas and whales," Duffy says. "But there's a very strong utilitarian reason for saving species, because people depend on them. There's an environmental justice aspect.' People depend on them implies that the ecosystems are interconnected (as stated in the first paragraph) and destroying one species would affect another – this is also the 'utilitarian reason' for saving species. Hence, option 1 explains the implication of the term 'environmental justice. Option 2 is true but not related to 'environmental justice'. Option 3 is incorrect as Duffy does not imply what it states. Option 4 is a nonsensical option meant to distract – reference to inequality in the fourth paragraph is in relation to economic inequality. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **50 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **59 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **63 %**

5) The UN report mentions all of the following as reasons for biodiversity loss EXCEPT:

◉ Spread of diseases and parasites. ✓

○ Population growth and unsustainable consumption

○ Land use and spread of invasive alien species.

○ Direct exploitation of organisms and deforestation.

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Our world is losing biodiversity, and fast. According to a report by the United Nations, up to one million species could face extinction in the near future due to human influence on the natural world. Such a collapse in biodiversity would wreak havoc on the interconnected ecosystems of the planet, putting human communities at risk by compromising food sources, fouling clean water and air, and eroding natural defenses against extreme weather such as hurricanes and floods. In the sweeping UN-backed report, hundreds of scientists found that biodiversity loss poses a global threat on par with climate change. The report calls the rate of change in nature "unprecedented" and projects that species extinctions will become increasingly common in the coming decades, driven by factors such as land development, deforestation and overfishing.

As the global assessment confirms, human activity is a major driver of biodiversity decline among the millions of species on Earth. The report ranks some of the top causes of species loss as changes in land and sea use, direct exploitation of organisms, climate change, pollution and invasive alien species. The current global rate of species extinction is already "at least tens to hundreds of times higher than it has averaged over the past 10 million years," and it's expected to keep accelerating.

All in all, human action has "significantly altered" about 75 per cent of the world's land environment and 66 percent of its marine environment. Insect populations have plummeted in tropical forests, grasslands are increasingly drying out into deserts, and pollution along with ocean acidification is driving many coral reef ecosystems to the brink. The destruction of biodiversity at all levels, from genes to ecosystems, could pose significant threats to humankind. In addition to affecting human access to food resources, clean water and breathable air, a loss of species on a global scale could also clear a path for diseases and parasites to spread more quickly, says Emmett Duffy, a biodiversity expert who contributed to the report.

"Historically, a lot of us have thought about conservation and extinction in terms of charismatic animals like pandas and whales," Duffy says. "But there's a very strong utilitarian reason for saving species, because people depend on them. There's an environmental justice aspect."

The effects of biodiversity loss won't be distributed equally, either, the researchers found. The most devastating impacts would disproportionately affect some of the world's poorest communities, and the report concludes that the decline in biodiversity undermines global progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals, milestones set by the U.N. General Assembly in 2015 to reduce global inequality.

The situation is critical, but not hopeless, the authors of the report say. It is still possible to slow the destruction of the natural world, but it will require "transformative change" at the highest levels, Watson says. The report identifies "indirect drivers" of biodiversity loss—big-picture changes like population growth and unsustainable consumption—as well as "direct drivers" like land use and the spread of invasive species. Though the direct drivers are more visible in their effects on the environment, they can be considered symptoms of the massive global changes, says Josef Settele, one of the assessment's co-chairs.

Explanation: ⌄

Spread of diseases and parasites is mentioned as an effect of biodiversity loss and not the cause. The last paragraph mentions options 2 and 3 as direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss. Option 4 can be found in paragraph 2. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **35 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **66 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **87 %**

Loading...

Previous   Next   Exit Review

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Real freedom of speech is always limited to some degree. Outside of therapy, there are no social contexts in which adults can say whatever is on their minds without repercussions. But the fact that every culture polices language to some extent does not imply that all cultures do so to the same extent. The most interesting question about political correctness is not therefore whether it exists or whether it should exist — the answer to both questions is "yes" — but rather to what degree it should exist. How should we balance real freedom of speech against other goods?

The canonical treatment of the value of free expression remains that of John Stuart Mill, who argued that each of our ideas must be "fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed" on pain of being "held as a dead dogma, not as a living truth." To actively lead a life requires deciding what to believe and what to value. But you can know whether you really believe what you think you believe only if you genuinely consider what alternative beliefs have going for them. As Mill put it, people who have never "thrown themselves into the mental position of those who think differently … do not, in any proper sense of the word, know the doctrine which they themselves profess."

Mill's argument is often cited by today's free-speech warriors. But their opponents — the ones they call social-justice warriors — hardly ever cite the philosopher who I believe makes the strongest case for their view: Plato. In the Republic, Socrates argues that the only way to create a healthy society is to regulate the cultural environment with an eye to generating the right kind of ethos. If citizens are virtuous, then rules and regulations won't be necessary; if they are vicious, then rules and regulations won't work. An ethos comes about not only as a result of formal schooling but also through our daily interactions. The stories we tell, the jokes we make, the words we choose, the objects we produce, the models we imitate — each of those plays a part in constituting a cultural environment that transmits an understanding of what is right and good, and each must therefore be scrutinized accordingly.

What are we to make of the Platonic ideal of a society in which all cultural production, from the most elevated work of art to the most ordinary conversation, is ethically and politically salutary? We might be attracted by the underlying logic: If we're shaped by our culture, and our culture is generated by a complex web of individual actions, then progress will depend on the character of those actions — the personal is political. On the other hand, we might be repelled by the lack of playfulness and spontaneity in a society where art and sport, tragedy and comedy, furniture and embroidery must all answer to ethical and political demands. In the liberal-democratic version of Platonism, these demands would be imposed horizontally rather than vertically: citizen-to-citizen rather than ruler-to-subject. Yet that makes the social pressure only more intense, since even intimate spaces would offer no respite from citizenly obligation. Perhaps friends should let friends say inappropriate things? At any rate, a culture of thoroughgoing moralism tends also to be a culture of thoroughgoing hypocrisy.

---

1) In the first paragraph, the author's mention of 'political correctness' stands for:

○ unrestrained freedom of speech.

○ political regulation of unrestrained speech.

◉ carefully considered and restrained speech. ✓

○ freedom of speech during therapy.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Political correctness means 'the avoidance of forms of expression (or action) that are perceived to marginalize or insult groups of people who are socially disadvantaged or discriminated against'. Option 3 expresses this using a different set of words. The term has the same meaning in the context too. Options 1, 2 and 4 need not be 'politically correct'. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **327 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **137 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **54 %**

---

2) Which of the following is an aspect of the 'Platonic ideal of a society', which supports the argument of the 'social-justice warriors'?

○ Plato's view on freedom of speech.

○ Absolute liberty as a pre-requisite of good behaviour.

○ The uselessness of rules in a vicious society.

◉ The regulation of the cultural environment. ✓

Video Explanation: ⌄

Previous   Next   Exit Review

Explanation:

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Real freedom of speech is always limited to some degree. Outside of therapy, there are no social contexts in which adults can say whatever is on their minds without repercussions. But the fact that every culture polices language to some extent does not imply that all cultures do so to the same extent. The most interesting question about political correctness is not therefore whether it exists or whether it should exist — the answer to both questions is "yes" — but rather to what degree it should exist. How should we balance real freedom of speech against other goods?

The canonical treatment of the value of free expression remains that of John Stuart Mill, who argued that each of our ideas must be "fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed" on pain of being "held as a dead dogma, not as a living truth." To actively lead a life requires deciding what to believe and what to value. But you can know whether you really believe what you think you believe only if you genuinely consider what alternative beliefs have going for them. As Mill put it, people who have never "thrown themselves into the mental position of those who think differently … do not, in any proper sense of the word, know the doctrine which they themselves profess."

Mill's argument is often cited by today's free-speech warriors. But their opponents — the ones they call social-justice warriors — hardly ever cite the philosopher who I believe makes the strongest case for their view: Plato. In the Republic, Socrates argues that the only way to create a healthy society is to regulate the cultural environment with an eye to generating the right kind of ethos. If citizens are virtuous, then rules and regulations won't be necessary; if they are vicious, then rules and regulations won't work. An ethos comes about not only as a result of formal schooling but also through our daily interactions. The stories we tell, the jokes we make, the words we choose, the objects we produce, the models we imitate — each of those plays a part in constituting a cultural environment that transmits an understanding of what is right and good, and each must therefore be scrutinized accordingly.

What are we to make of the Platonic ideal of a society in which all cultural production, from the most elevated work of art to the most ordinary conversation, is ethically and politically salutary? We might be attracted by the underlying logic: If we're shaped by our culture, and our culture is generated by a complex web of individual actions, then progress will depend on the character of those actions — the personal is political. On the other hand, we might be repelled by the lack of playfulness and spontaneity in a society where art and sport, tragedy and comedy, furniture and embroidery must all answer to ethical and political demands. In the liberal-democratic version of Platonism, these demands would be imposed horizontally rather than vertically: citizen-to-citizen rather than ruler-to-subject. Yet that makes the social pressure only more intense, since even intimate spaces would offer no respite from citizenly obligation. Perhaps friends should let friends say inappropriate things? At any rate, a culture of thoroughgoing moralism tends also to be a culture of thoroughgoing hypocrisy.

Refer to the third paragraph: "In the Republic, Socrates argues that the only way to create a healthy society is to regulate the cultural environment with an eye to generating the right kind of ethos." The 'social justice warriors' are the opponents of the 'free-speech warriors' –they believe that speech must be regulated. Plato declared that the ideal state will have the healthiest of societies, which "comes about not only as a result of formal schooling but also through our daily interactions." Each element of the culture "must therefore be scrutinized accordingly." Option 4 states this idea. Option 1 is incorrect – Plato's view on freedom of speech is not spelt out in the passage. Plato did not claim 'absolute liberty' (option 2) as a pre-requisite; even if he did, it wouldn't support the argument of the 'social-justice warriors'. The uselessness of rules in a vicious society (option 3), though suggested by Plato, is at odds with social-justice warriors who believe in rules, in any kind of modern society. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **54 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **119 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **75 %**

3) In the last paragraph, the author's remark, "the personal is political" means: —

○ Individual life is controlled by the 'ruler-to-subject' principle.

○ Individual actions determine the character of the society as a whole.

⦿ Cultural environment becomes independent of individual actions. ✗

○ Ethical considerations become redundant in citizen-to-citizen interaction.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation:

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Real freedom of speech is always limited to some degree. Outside of therapy, there are no social contexts in which adults can say whatever is on their minds without repercussions. But the fact that every culture polices language to some extent does not imply that all cultures do so to the same extent. The most interesting question about political correctness is not therefore whether it exists or whether it should exist — the answer to both questions is "yes" — but rather to what degree it should exist. How should we balance real freedom of speech against other goods?

The canonical treatment of the value of free expression remains that of John Stuart Mill, who argued that each of our ideas must be "fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed" on pain of being "held as a dead dogma, not as a living truth." To actively lead a life requires deciding what to believe and what to value. But you can know whether you really believe what you think you believe only if you genuinely consider what alternative beliefs have going for them. As Mill put it, people who have never "thrown themselves into the mental position of those who think differently … do not, in any proper sense of the word, know the doctrine which they themselves profess."

Mill's argument is often cited by today's free-speech warriors. But their opponents — the ones they call social-justice warriors — hardly ever cite the philosopher who I believe makes the strongest case for their view: Plato. In the Republic, Socrates argues that the only way to create a healthy society is to regulate the cultural environment with an eye to generating the right kind of ethos. If citizens are virtuous, then rules and regulations won't be necessary; if they are vicious, then rules and regulations won't work. An ethos comes about not only as a result of formal schooling but also through our daily interactions. The stories we tell, the jokes we make, the words we choose, the objects we produce, the models we imitate — each of those plays a part in constituting a cultural environment that transmits an understanding of what is right and good, and each must therefore be scrutinized accordingly.

What are we to make of the Platonic ideal of a society in which all cultural production, from the most elevated work of art to the most ordinary conversation, is ethically and politically salutary? We might be attracted by the underlying logic: If we're shaped by our culture, and our culture is generated by a complex web of individual actions, then progress will depend on the character of those actions — the personal is political. On the other hand, we might be repelled by the lack of playfulness and spontaneity in a society where art and sport, tragedy and comedy, furniture and embroidery must all answer to ethical and political demands. In the liberal-democratic version of Platonism, these demands would be imposed horizontally rather than vertically: citizen-to-citizen rather than ruler-to-subject. Yet that makes the social pressure only more intense, since even intimate spaces would offer no respite from citizenly obligation. Perhaps friends should let friends say inappropriate things? At any rate, a culture of thoroughgoing moralism tends also to be a culture of thoroughgoing hypocrisy.

Refer to the last paragraph: "If we're shaped by our culture, and our culture is generated by a complex web of individual actions, then progress will depend on the character of those actions — the personal is political." This is stated as an elaboration to the 'platonic ideal of a society'. The same idea is restated in option 2. In simpler words, individual (personal) character determines the character of the state (political). Option 1 is irrelevant to the question—it is used to draw a contrast with the Platonic version of liberal democracies where the 'demands would be imposed horizontally rather than vertically'. Option 3 contradicts what the author actually means by the remark. 'Ethical consideration' (Option 4) is an aspect of the 'personal becoming political' — each individual action needs to be 'ethically and politically salutary'. Therefore, it doesn't become redundant, but relevant in a society aspired by Plato. Option 4 can be rejected. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **52 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **81 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **87 %**

4) Which of the following assumptions underlie Stuart Mill's treatment of the value of free expression? —

○ Discussions happen as an exchange of reason.

○ Emotions play a large role in the formation of beliefs.

○ Discussions can shut out perspectives and create prejudices.

○ Hate speech can incite mobs and bring about violence.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Stuart Mill's argument is that ideas should be "fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed…" Mill suggests that "…you can know whether you really believe what you think you believe only if you genuinely consider alternative beliefs…" and the idea that wins over becomes the one "to believe and … to value." If this reasoning is true, option 1 is the only option that supports it. In all others, discussion or 'free expression' will have a counter effect, contradicting Mill's idea. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **2 secs**

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Real freedom of speech is always limited to some degree. Outside of therapy, there are no social contexts in which adults can say whatever is on their minds without repercussions. But the fact that every culture polices language to some extent does not imply that all cultures do so to the same extent. The most interesting question about political correctness is not therefore whether it exists or whether it should exist — the answer to both questions is "yes" — but rather to what degree it should exist. How should we balance real freedom of speech against other goods?

The canonical treatment of the value of free expression remains that of John Stuart Mill, who argued that each of our ideas must be "fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed" on pain of being "held as a dead dogma, not as a living truth." To actively lead a life requires deciding what to believe and what to value. But you can know whether you really believe what you think you believe only if you genuinely consider what alternative beliefs have going for them. As Mill put it, people who have never "thrown themselves into the mental position of those who think differently … do not, in any proper sense of the word, know the doctrine which they themselves profess."

Mill's argument is often cited by today's free-speech warriors. But their opponents — the ones they call social-justice warriors — hardly ever cite the philosopher who I believe makes the strongest case for their view: Plato. In the Republic, Socrates argues that the only way to create a healthy society is to regulate the cultural environment with an eye to generating the right kind of ethos. If citizens are virtuous, then rules and regulations won't be necessary; if they are vicious, then rules and regulations won't work. An ethos comes about not only as a result of formal schooling but also through our daily interactions. The stories we tell, the jokes we make, the words we choose, the objects we produce, the models we imitate — each of those plays a part in constituting a cultural environment that transmits an understanding of what is right and good, and each must therefore be scrutinized accordingly.

What are we to make of the Platonic ideal of a society in which all cultural production, from the most elevated work of art to the most ordinary conversation, is ethically and politically salutary? We might be attracted by the underlying logic: If we're shaped by our culture, and our culture is generated by a complex web of individual actions, then progress will depend on the character of those actions — the personal is political. On the other hand, we might be repelled by the lack of playfulness and spontaneity in a society where art and sport, tragedy and comedy, furniture and embroidery must all answer to ethical and political demands. In the liberal-democratic version of Platonism, these demands would be imposed horizontally rather than vertically: citizen-to-citizen rather than ruler-to-subject. Yet that makes the social pressure only more intense, since even intimate spaces would offer no respite from citizenly obligation. Perhaps friends should let friends say inappropriate things? At any rate, a culture of thoroughgoing moralism tends also to be a culture of thoroughgoing hypocrisy.

5) The author would prefer which of the following?   —

○   A full, frequent, and fearless discussion of each of our ideas.

○   A culture of moralism that answers to all ethical and political demands.

◉   Political correctness without hypocrisy. ✔

○   A society which encourages spontaneity and playfulness.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

The author's point of view is expressed directly in the first paragraph, and then indirectly in the last paragraph: "The most interesting question about political correctness is not therefore whether it exists or whether it should exist — the answer to both questions is "yes"— but rather to what degree it should exist. How should we balance real freedom of speech against other goods?" Hence the author would support balanced 'political correctness' rather than Stuart Mill's or Plato's extreme positions—(explained in the rest of the passage) i.e., 'no control versus complete control.' The last two sentences of the passage also reveal the author's point of view. "Perhaps friends should let friends say inappropriate things? At any rate, a culture of thoroughgoing moralism tends also to be a culture of thoroughgoing hypocrisy." The author would thus avoid either of the extremes and prefer the middle ground – political correctness with a degree of freedom to be 'spontaneous and playful'. According to him, extreme political correctness is not different from thoroughgoing moralism which the author considers hypocrisy. Option 3 implicitly suggests the middle ground that the author would prefer. Options 1 and 2 are the extreme ends, and hence get eliminated. Option 4 is incorrect – society that "encourages spontaneity and playfulness" may end up becoming the 'no-control' society, which the author would not prefer. Hence, [3]

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **114 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **38 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **45 %**

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Loading...

Real freedom of speech is always limited to some degree. Outside of therapy, there are no social contexts in which adults can say whatever is on their minds without repercussions. But the fact that every culture polices language to some extent does not imply that all cultures do so to the same extent. The most interesting question about political correctness is not therefore whether it exists or whether it should exist — the answer to both questions is "yes" — but rather to what degree it should exist. How should we balance real freedom of speech against other goods?

The canonical treatment of the value of free expression remains that of John Stuart Mill, who argued that each of our ideas must be "fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed" on pain of being "held as a dead dogma, not as a living truth." To actively lead a life requires deciding what to believe and what to value. But you can know whether you really believe what you think you believe only if you genuinely consider what alternative beliefs have going for them. As Mill put it, people who have never "thrown themselves into the mental position of those who think differently … do not, in any proper sense of the word, know the doctrine which they themselves profess."

Mill's argument is often cited by today's free-speech warriors. But their opponents — the ones they call social-justice warriors — hardly ever cite the philosopher who I believe makes the strongest case for their view: Plato. In the Republic, Socrates argues that the only way to create a healthy society is to regulate the cultural environment with an eye to generating the right kind of ethos. If citizens are virtuous, then rules and regulations won't be necessary; if they are vicious, then rules and regulations won't work. An ethos comes about not only as a result of formal schooling but also through our daily interactions. The stories we tell, the jokes we make, the words we choose, the objects we produce, the models we imitate — each of those plays a part in constituting a cultural environment that transmits an understanding of what is right and good, and each must therefore be scrutinized accordingly.

What are we to make of the Platonic ideal of a society in which all cultural production, from the most elevated work of art to the most ordinary conversation, is ethically and politically salutary? We might be attracted by the underlying logic: If we're shaped by our culture, and our culture is generated by a complex web of individual actions, then progress will depend on the character of those actions — the personal is political. On the other hand, we might be repelled by the lack of playfulness and spontaneity in a society where art and sport, tragedy and comedy, furniture and embroidery must all answer to ethical and political demands. In the liberal-democratic version of Platonism, these demands would be imposed horizontally rather than vertically: citizen-to-citizen rather than ruler-to-subject. Yet that makes the social pressure only more intense, since even intimate spaces would offer no respite from citizenly obligation. Perhaps friends should let friends say inappropriate things? At any rate, a culture of thoroughgoing moralism tends also to be a culture of thoroughgoing hypocrisy.

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In 2002, the psychologists Frank Keil and Leonid Rozenblit asked people to rate their own understanding of how zips work. The respondents answered very confidently – after all, they used zips all the time. But when asked to explain how a zip works, they failed dismally. Similar results have been obtained with respect to flush toilets, piano keys, helicopters and bicycles. It doesn't just apply to physical objects: people have been found to overestimate their understanding of climate change, the tax system and foreign policy. Cognitive scientists call this "the illusion of explanatory depth", and sometimes just "the knowledge illusion". Collectively, we know an awful lot, but each individual's knowledge of the world is much sketchier and more superficial than he or she imagines. Only when pushed to explain what we think we know in detail do we briefly apprehend the epistemological abyss gaping beneath our beliefs.

This tells us something about what's gone wrong with our politics. Among our political leaders it is almost unheard of to concede ignorance or even to accept that reality is complicated. The disease of politics today is not populism, so much, as simplism. Politicians have always distilled intricate issues into soundbites and slogans – that's part of the job. But Brexit has revealed something new: a refusal even to accept that there is a more complex reality behind the slogans.

Brexit is by far the most complicated, technical, multi-layered policy problem this country has encountered. Details are dismissed as unimportant, expertise as irrelevant. People who complicate things – which might be a good definition of an expert – are viewed with suspicion. Even as they fail and fail again, the politicians chant incantations to keep complexity at bay: Leave means Leave, no deal is better than a bad deal, believe in Britain. The slogans are eating us alive.

It is not a coincidence that politicians have developed this ardently simplist sensibility at a time when complexity is growing. Voters are simplists too. We live in an increasingly globalised, diverse, interdependent, technology-led society, but most of us don't like to think about it. The number of voters, who truly understand the immigration system, or how schools are funded, is tiny. But that doesn't stop us from having strong opinions on them. Simplist solutions are seized upon because we don't like to feel that we don't understand things.

A zip, by the way, consists two tracks with dozens of teeth, each of which has a hook and a hollow; the trick is to latch every hook on one side into a hollow on the other. For that to happen, each tooth must be exactly the same size and shape and perfectly positioned on the track. Everything depends on everything else. Details matter. It's a pity nobody in politics believes in them. Simplism is driving us into the sea.

1) Frank Keil and Leonid Rozenblit showed that ...   −

○ People have no understanding of complex problems.

◉ People know a lot less than they think they do. ✔

○ People overestimate their knowledge of physical objects.

○ People cannot explain how simple things work.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Both options 1 and 4 are incorrect as the psychologists were not specific about the level of complexity of problems (or processes). What they showed is that "each individual's knowledge of the world is much sketchier and more superficial than he or she imagines." [Paragraph 1] For this, they asked people to explain how zips work. Though people were confident that they knew how zips worked, they failed when asked to explain. Option 3 is incorrect as the option refers to just physical objects, but the passage also refers to climate change and the like. People's failure to explain even the simplest of things despite their confidence in their own knowledge points at the validity of option 2. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **273 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **209 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **85 %**

2) The 'epistemological abyss' in Paragraph 1 refers to: −

◉ the gap between reality and our understanding of it. ✔

○ the gap between collective and individual knowledge.

○ our unwillingness to concede our ignorance of reality.

○ our unwillingness to accept that reality is complicated.

Video Explanation: ⌄

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In 2002, the psychologists Frank Keil and Leonid Rozenblit asked people to rate their own understanding of how zips work. The respondents answered very confidently – after all, they used zips all the time. But when asked to explain how a zip works, they failed dismally. Similar results have been obtained with respect to flush toilets, piano keys, helicopters and bicycles. It doesn't just apply to physical objects: people have been found to overestimate their understanding of climate change, the tax system and foreign policy. Cognitive scientists call this "the illusion of explanatory depth", and sometimes just "the knowledge illusion". Collectively, we know an awful lot, but each individual's knowledge of the world is much sketchier and more superficial than he or she imagines. Only when pushed to explain what we think we know in detail do we briefly apprehend the epistemological abyss gaping beneath our beliefs.

This tells us something about what's gone wrong with our politics. Among our political leaders it is almost unheard of to concede ignorance or even to accept that reality is complicated. The disease of politics today is not populism, so much, as simplism. Politicians have always distilled intricate issues into soundbites and slogans – that's part of the job. But Brexit has revealed something new: a refusal even to accept that there is a more complex reality behind the slogans.

Brexit is by far the most complicated, technical, multi-layered policy problem this country has encountered. Details are dismissed as unimportant, expertise as irrelevant. People who complicate things – which might be a good definition of an expert – are viewed with suspicion. Even as they fail and fail again, the politicians chant incantations to keep complexity at bay: Leave means Leave, no deal is better than a bad deal, believe in Britain. The slogans are eating us alive.

It is not a coincidence that politicians have developed this ardently simplist sensibility at a time when complexity is growing. Voters are simplists too. We live in an increasingly globalised, diverse, interdependent, technology-led society, but most of us don't like to think about it. The number of voters, who truly understand the immigration system, or how schools are funded, is tiny. But that doesn't stop us from having strong opinions on them. Simplist solutions are seized upon because we don't like to feel that we don't understand things.

A zip, by the way, consists of two tracks with dozens of teeth, each of which has a hook and a hollow; the trick is to latch every hook on one side into a hollow on the other. For that to happen, each tooth must be exactly the same size and shape and perfectly positioned on the track. Everything depends on everything else. Details matter. It's a pity nobody in politics believes in them. Simplism is driving us into the sea.

Refer to the first paragraph: "Cognitive scientists call this "the illusion of explanatory depth"… "the knowledge illusion" … Only when pushed to explain what we think we know in detail do we briefly apprehend the epistemological abyss gaping beneath our beliefs." *Epistemological abyss*, then, is the gap between what we think we know and what actually it is. Option 1 corresponds to this idea. Option 2 is incorrect because the gap between collective knowledge and individual knowledge is not examined. Options 3 and 4 are wrong because our unwillingness to concede our ignorance and to accept reality is implied in respect of Brexit and other political realities, which are mentioned as examples of epistemological abyss. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **33 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **63 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **68 %**

3) "Simplism" [2ⁿᵈ Paragraph] most likely means: —

○ offering solutions that appeal to the masses.

◉ reducing political issues into slogans. ❌

○ oversimplification of complex problems.

○ being suspicious of experts and expertise.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Refer to the second paragraph: "Among our political leaders it is almost unheard of to concede ignorance or even to accept that reality is complicated… Politicians have always distilled intricate issues into sound bites and slogans." Option 3 corresponds most closely to the idea of 'simplism.' Option 1 describes populism. Option 2 is mentions what politicians do; it misses the 'complexity' aspect. Option 4 is mentioned as a consequence of 'simplism', i.e. the reluctance to accept that problems are complex. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **96 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **62 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **80 %**

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In 2002, the psychologists Frank Keil and Leonid Rozenblit asked people to rate their own understanding of how zips work. The respondents answered very confidently – after all, they used zips all the time. But when asked to explain how a zip works, they failed dismally. Similar results have been obtained with respect to flush toilets, piano keys, helicopters and bicycles. It doesn't just apply to physical objects: people have been found to overestimate their understanding of climate change, the tax system and foreign policy. Cognitive scientists call this "the illusion of explanatory depth", and sometimes just "the knowledge illusion". Collectively, we know an awful lot, but each individual's knowledge of the world is much sketchier and more superficial than he or she imagines. Only when pushed to explain what we think we know in detail do we briefly apprehend the epistemological abyss gaping beneath our beliefs.

This tells us something about what's gone wrong with our politics. Among our political leaders it is almost unheard of to concede ignorance or even to accept that reality is complicated. The disease of politics today is not populism, so much, as simplism. Politicians have always distilled intricate issues into soundbites and slogans – that's part of the job. But Brexit has revealed something new: a refusal even to accept that there is a more complex reality behind the slogans.

Brexit is by far the most complicated, technical, multi-layered policy problem this country has encountered. Details are dismissed as unimportant, expertise as irrelevant. People who complicate things – which might be a good definition of an expert – are viewed with suspicion. Even as they fail and fail again, the politicians chant incantations to keep complexity at bay: Leave means Leave, no deal is better than a bad deal, believe in Britain. The slogans are eating us alive.

It is not a coincidence that politicians have developed this ardently simplist sensibility at a time when complexity is growing. Voters are simplists too. We live in an increasingly globalised, diverse, interdependent, technology-led society, but most of us don't like to think about it. The number of voters, who truly understand the immigration system, or how schools are funded, is tiny. But that doesn't stop us from having strong opinions on them. Simplist solutions are seized upon because we don't like to feel that we don't understand things.

A zip, by the way, consists of two tracks with dozens of teeth, each of which has a hook and a hollow; the trick is to latch every hook on one side into a hollow on the other. For that to happen, each tooth must be exactly the same size and shape and perfectly positioned on the track. Everything depends on everything else. Details matter. It's a pity nobody in politics believes in them. Simplism is driving us into the sea.

4) **According to the author, 'voters are simplists' mainly because:** −

○ they do not understand that they are living in a complex world.

○ they don't understand the immigration system, or how schools are funded.

○ they hold strong opinions on issues.

◉ they do not acknowledge that they don't understand issues. ✓

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Options 1, 2 and 3 are partially correct, but each one in itself is not sufficient to justify the author in calling voters 'simplists'. *Simplism* means 'oversimplifying complex issues and ignoring their complexity'. Option 1 fails to signify their refusal to acknowledge their ignorance. Refer to paragraph 4: "Voters are simplists too. We live in an increasingly globalised, diverse, interdependent, technology-led society, but most of us don't like to think about it." Option 2 contains only specific examples of what a voter may in fact be unaware of, contrary to common notion. Option 3 in itself is not 'simplism' unless it is in combination with ignorance. Option 4 is sufficient to suit the description of a 'simplist voter'. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **24 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **69 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **82 %**

5) **What is the central idea of the passage?** −

○ People feel they understand complex phenomena with far greater precision than they really do; they are subject to 'an illusion of explanatory depth.'

◉ From how a zip works to Brexit, people often pretend that they understand complex problems; they are victims of 'the knowledge illusion.' ✗

○ People do not really know as much as they think they know, which explains the appeal of "simplism" that is muddling our politics.

○ Politicians and their voters do not acknowledge their overconfidence in their knowledge and ability to solve problems, and this is ruining our politics.

Video Explanation: ⌄

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In 2002, the psychologists Frank Keil and Leonid Rozenblit asked people to rate their own understanding of how zips work. The respondents answered very confidently – after all, they used zips all the time. But when asked to explain how a zip works, they failed dismally. Similar results have been obtained with respect to flush toilets, piano keys, helicopters and bicycles. It doesn't just apply to physical objects: people have been found to overestimate their understanding of climate change, the tax system and foreign policy. Cognitive scientists call this "the illusion of explanatory depth", and sometimes just "the knowledge illusion". Collectively, we know an awful lot, but each individual's knowledge of the world is much sketchier and more superficial than he or she imagines. Only when pushed to explain what we think we know in detail do we briefly apprehend the epistemological abyss gaping beneath our beliefs.

This tells us something about what's gone wrong with our politics. Among our political leaders it is almost unheard of to concede ignorance or even to accept that reality is complicated. The disease of politics today is not populism, so much, as simplism. Politicians have always distilled intricate issues into soundbites and slogans – that's part of the job. But Brexit has revealed something new: a refusal even to accept that there is a more complex reality behind the slogans.

Brexit is by far the most complicated, technical, multi-layered policy problem this country has encountered. Details are dismissed as unimportant, expertise as irrelevant. People who complicate things – which might be a good definition of an expert – are viewed with suspicion. Even as they fail and fail again, the politicians chant incantations to keep complexity at bay: Leave means Leave, no deal is better than a bad deal, believe in Britain. The slogans are eating us alive.

It is not a coincidence that politicians have developed this ardently simplist sensibility at a time when complexity is growing. Voters are simplists too. We live in an increasingly globalised, diverse, interdependent, technology-led society, but most of us don't like to think about it. The number of voters, who truly understand the immigration system, or how schools are funded, is tiny. But that doesn't stop us from having strong opinions on them. Simplist solutions are seized upon because we don't like to feel that we don't understand things.

A zip, by the way, consists of two tracks with dozens of teeth, each of which has a hook and a hollow; the trick is to latch every hook on one side into a hollow on the other. For that to happen, each tooth must be exactly the same size and shape and perfectly positioned on the track. Everything depends on everything else. Details matter. It's a pity nobody in politics believes in them. Simplism is driving us into the sea.

Loading...

The first part of the passage explains "the knowledge of illusion" – the second paragraph begins with "This tells us something about what's gone wrong with our politics." The rest of the passage is about how 'simplism' rules our politics – politicians and voters alike. The 'politics' part is specifically about "Brexit". The passage ends with the sentence "Simplism is driving us into the sea." The option that most closely captures this central idea is option 3. The trigger for this article is "Brexit" and the politics surrounding it. But, options 1 and 2 have no reference to politics. Option 4 is incomplete without the psychological references-- 'the knowledge of illusion' and simplism—made in the passage. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **23 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **55 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **62 %**

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 4 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Every minute of the day and night we feel thousands of sensations that might trigger a positive emotion such as happiness, or a negative emotion such as sadness, or no emotion at all: a trace of perfume, a light touch, a fleeting shadow, a strain of music. And there are thousands of physiological responses, such as palpitations or sweating, that can equally accompany positive emotions such as love, or negative emotions such as fear, or can happen without any emotional tinge at all. What makes these sensory inputs and physiological outputs emotions is the charge that gets added to them somehow, somewhere in our brains. Emotions in their fullest sense comprise all of these components. Each can lead into the black box and produce an emotional experience, or something in the black box can lead out to an emotional response that seems to come from nowhere.

Memory, it turns out, is one of the major factors mediating the dialogue between sensation and emotional experience. Our memories of past experience become encoded into triggers that act as switchers on the rail of psycho-emotional response, directing the incoming train of present experience in the direction of one emotional destination or another. The same sensory input can trigger a negative emotion or a positive one, depending on the memories associated with it.

This is where stress comes in — much like memory, a complex set of biological and psychological factors determine how we respond to stress. Some types of stress can be stimulating and invigorating, mobilizing us into action and creative potency; others can be draining and incapacitating, leaving us frustrated and hopeless. This dichotomy of good vs. bad stress is determined by the biology undergirding our feelings — by the dose and duration of the stress hormones secreted by the body in response to the stressful stimulus.

As soon as the stressful event occurs, it triggers the release of the cascade of hypothalamic, pituitary, and adrenal hormones — the brain's stress response. It also triggers the adrenal glands to release epinephrine, or adrenaline, and the sympathetic nerves to squirt out the adrenaline-like chemical norepinephrine all over the body: nerves that wire the heart, and gut, and skin. So, the heart is driven to beat faster, the fine hairs of your skin stand up, you sweat, you may feel nausea or the urge to defecate. But your attention is focused, your vision becomes crystal clear, a surge of power helps you run — these same chemicals released from nerves make blood flow to your muscles, preparing you to sprint.

All this occurs quickly. If you were to measure the stress hormones in your blood or saliva, they would already be increased within three minutes of the event. In experimental psychology tests, playing a fast-paced video game will make salivary cortisol increase and norepinephrine spill over into venous blood almost as soon as the virtual battle begins. But if you prolong the stress, by being unable to control it or by making it too potent or long-lived, and these hormones and chemicals still continue to pump out from nerves and glands, then the same molecules that mobilized you for the short haul now debilitate you.

Previous   Next   Exit Review

---

1) **"Each can lead into the black box and produce an emotional experience…" By 'black box', the author most likely means:**   —

○ somewhere in the brain where experiences are encoded as memories.

○ memories that mediate the process between sensory input and emotional experience.

◉ somewhere in the brain where sensory inputs and physiological outputs combine with a charge.   ✓

○ the innumerable sensory responses that accompany positive or negative emotions.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Refer to paragraph 1; sentencespreceding the quoted part explain how an emotional experience is created: "What makes these sensory inputs and physiological outputs emotions is the charge that gets added to them somehow, somewhere in our brains … Each can lead into the black box and produce an emotional experience…" Hence, the black box refers to the part of the brain where a charge gets added to a sensory input (or a physiological output). Options 1 and 2 refer to 'memory', which acts as a catalyst: '…one of the major factors mediating the dialogue between sensation and emotional experience…' 'Sensory response' [Option 4] too does not correspond to the black box; it is the output brought forth by the Black Box. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **247 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **167 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **59 %**

---

2) Which of the following is the gist of the second paragraph?   —

◉ Memory of past experiences becomes a trigger for one's present emotions.   ✗

○ Sensory inputs determine a person's psycho emotional response in the present.

○ Memory acts as an intermediary between sensory inputs and emotional responses.

○ Past experiences encoded as memories form the basis of one's present feelings.

Video Explanation: ⌄

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 4 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Every minute of the day and night we feel thousands of sensations that might trigger a positive emotion such as happiness, or a negative emotion such as sadness, or no emotion at all: a trace of perfume, a light touch, a fleeting shadow, a strain of music. And there are thousands of physiological responses, such as palpitations or sweating, that can equally accompany positive emotions such as love, or negative emotions such as fear, or can happen without any emotional tinge at all. What makes these sensory inputs and physiological outputs emotions is the charge that gets added to them somehow, somewhere in our brains. Emotions in their fullest sense comprise all of these components. Each can lead into the black box and produce an emotional experience, or something in the black box can lead out to an emotional response that seems to come from nowhere.

Memory, it turns out, is one of the major factors mediating the dialogue between sensation and emotional experience. Our memories of past experience become encoded into triggers that act as switchers on the rail of psycho-emotional response, directing the incoming train of present experience in the direction of one emotional destination or another. The same sensory input can trigger a negative emotion or a positive one, depending on the memories associated with it.

This is where stress comes in — much like memory, a complex set of biological and psychological factors determine how we respond to stress. Some types of stress can be stimulating and invigorating, mobilizing us into action and creative potency; others can be draining and incapacitating, leaving us frustrated and hopeless. This dichotomy of good vs. bad stress is determined by the biology undergirding our feelings — by the dose and duration of the stress hormones secreted by the body in response to the stressful stimulus.

As soon as the stressful event occurs, it triggers the release of the cascade of hypothalamic, pituitary, and adrenal hormones — the brain's stress response. It also triggers the adrenal glands to release epinephrine, or adrenaline, and the sympathetic nerves to squirt out the adrenaline-like chemical norepinephrine all over the body: nerves that wire the heart, and gut, and skin. So, the heart is driven to beat faster, the fine hairs of your skin stand up, you sweat, you may feel nausea or the urge to defecate. But your attention is focused, your vision becomes crystal clear, a surge of power helps you run — these same chemicals released from nerves make blood flow to your muscles, preparing you to sprint.

All this occurs quickly. If you were to measure the stress hormones in your blood or saliva, they would already be increased within three minutes of the event. In experimental psychology tests, playing a fast-paced video game will make salivary cortisol increase and norepinephrine spill over into venous blood almost as soon as the virtual battle begins. But if you prolong the stress, by being unable to control it or by making it too potent or long-lived, and these hormones and chemicals still continue to pump out from nerves and glands, then the same molecules that mobilized you for the short haul now debilitate you.

Explanation:

Change Section here ▼

The gist of the second paragraph is in the last line of the paragraph: "… (A) sensory input can trigger … emotions … depending on the memories associated with it." The paragraph explains that when one receives a sensory input, the memory (of past experiences) associated with it directs the emotional response that has been triggered by the input. Option 3 summarizes this idea. Options 1 and 4 do not mention sensory inputs. Option 2 is incorrect because the same sensory input can trigger a negative or positive reaction depending on the memories associated with it; it also does not mention the role of 'memory'. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **127 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **47 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **38 %**

3) What is the relation between memories and stress that makes the author remark, "much like memory" in the 3rd Paragraph?

◉ As memory mediates our response to sensory inputs, specific physical and mental factors mediate our response to a stressful ✓ stimulus.

○ As memories trigger emotional reactions, past experiences determine an individual's susceptibility to stress.

○ Like the same memory can trigger different emotional responses, the same stimuli can trigger different levels of stress.

○ Similar to memories, stress may be stimulating and invigorating or frustrating and disappointing.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation:

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 4 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Every minute of the day and night we feel thousands of sensations that might trigger a positive emotion such as happiness, or a negative emotion such as sadness, or no emotion at all: a trace of perfume, a light touch, a fleeting shadow, a strain of music. And there are thousands of physiological responses, such as palpitations or sweating, that can equally accompany positive emotions such as love, or negative emotions such as fear, or can happen without any emotional tinge at all. What makes these sensory inputs and physiological outputs emotions is the charge that gets added to them somehow, somewhere in our brains. Emotions in their fullest sense comprise all of these components. Each can lead into the black box and produce an emotional experience, or something in the black box can lead out to an emotional response that seems to come from nowhere.

Memory, it turns out, is one of the major factors mediating the dialogue between sensation and emotional experience. Our memories of past experience become encoded into triggers that act as switchers on the rail of psycho-emotional response, directing the incoming train of present experience in the direction of one emotional destination or another. The same sensory input can trigger a negative emotion or a positive one, depending on the memories associated with it.

This is where stress comes in — much like memory, a complex set of biological and psychological factors determine how we respond to stress. Some types of stress can be stimulating and invigorating, mobilizing us into action and creative potency; others can be draining and incapacitating, leaving us frustrated and hopeless. This dichotomy of good vs. bad stress is determined by the biology undergirding our feelings — by the dose and duration of the stress hormones secreted by the body in response to the stressful stimulus.

As soon as the stressful event occurs, it triggers the release of the cascade of hypothalamic, pituitary, and adrenal hormones — the brain's stress response. It also triggers the adrenal glands to release epinephrine, or adrenaline, and the sympathetic nerves to squirt out the adrenaline-like chemical norepinephrine all over the body: nerves that wire the heart, and gut, and skin. So, the heart is driven to beat faster, the fine hairs of your skin stand up, you sweat, you may feel nausea or the urge to defecate. But your attention is focused, your vision becomes crystal clear, a surge of power helps you run — these same chemicals released from nerves make blood flow to your muscles, preparing you to sprint.

All this occurs quickly. If you were to measure the stress hormones in your blood or saliva, they would already be increased within three minutes of the event. In experimental psychology tests, playing a fast-paced video game will make salivary cortisol increase and norepinephrine spill over into venous blood almost as soon as the virtual battle begins. But if you prolong the stress, by being unable to control it or by making it too potent or long-lived, and these hormones and chemicals still continue to pump out from nerves and glands, then the same molecules that mobilized you for the short haul now debilitate you.

Memory is a mediator between sensory input and emotional response. Similarly, "…a complex set of biological and psychological factors determine how we respond to stress [or a stressful stimulus] …" And, just as an emotional response can be positive or negative, stress can also trigger a positive or negative output. Option 1 expresses this idea. Option 2 is incorrect as 'susceptibility to stress' is out of scope of the passage; besides, the passage is not explicit about 'past experiences' being a determinant for stress stimuli as well [as it's for emotional responses]. Option 3 mentions the 'different levels of stresses', which is not referred to in the passage. Option 4 may be true about emotional responses, but not about 'memories' because memories are what induce reactions, as per the passage. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **71 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **65 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **50 %**

4) In paragraphs 4 and 5, the author gives the examples of various stress hormones and their effects in order to…

○ elucidate the biological and psychological factors behind stress.

○ emphasize that stress can be positive or negative.

◉ show that the dichotomy of stress is determined by biology. ✓

○ show that prolonged stress can be counterproductive.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation:

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 4 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

Every minute of the day and night we feel thousands of sensations that might trigger a positive emotion such as happiness, or a negative emotion such as sadness, or no emotion at all: a trace of perfume, a light touch, a fleeting shadow, a strain of music. And there are thousands of physiological responses, such as palpitations or sweating, that can equally accompany positive emotions such as love, or negative emotions such as fear, or can happen without any emotional tinge at all. What makes these sensory inputs and physiological outputs emotions is the charge that gets added to them somehow, somewhere in our brains. Emotions in their fullest sense comprise all of these components. Each can lead into the black box and produce an emotional experience, or something in the black box can lead out to an emotional response that seems to come from nowhere.

Memory, it turns out, is one of the major factors mediating the dialogue between sensation and emotional experience. Our memories of past experience become encoded into triggers that act as switchers on the rail of psycho-emotional response, directing the incoming train of present experience in the direction of one emotional destination or another. The same sensory input can trigger a negative emotion or a positive one, depending on the memories associated with it.

This is where stress comes in — much like memory, a complex set of biological and psychological factors determine how we respond to stress. Some types of stress can be stimulating and invigorating, mobilizing us into action and creative potency; others can be draining and incapacitating, leaving us frustrated and hopeless. This dichotomy of good vs. bad stress is determined by the biology undergirding our feelings — by the dose and duration of the stress hormones secreted by the body in response to the stressful stimulus.

As soon as the stressful event occurs, it triggers the release of the cascade of hypothalamic, pituitary, and adrenal hormones — the brain's stress response. It also triggers the adrenal glands to release epinephrine, or adrenaline, and the sympathetic nerves to squirt out the adrenaline-like chemical norepinephrine all over the body: nerves that wire the heart, and gut, and skin. So, the heart is driven to beat faster, the fine hairs of your skin stand up, you sweat, you may feel nausea or the urge to defecate. But your attention is focused, your vision becomes crystal clear, a surge of power helps you run — these same chemicals released from nerves make blood flow to your muscles, preparing you to sprint.

All this occurs quickly. If you were to measure the stress hormones in your blood or saliva, they would already be increased within three minutes of the event. In experimental psychology tests, playing a fast-paced video game will make salivary cortisol increase and norepinephrine spill over into venous blood almost as soon as the virtual battle begins. But if you prolong the stress, by being unable to control it or by making it too potent or long-lived, and these hormones and chemicals still continue to pump out from nerves and glands, then the same molecules that mobilized you for the short haul now debilitate you.

As preface to what paragraphs 4 and 5 talk about, paragraph 3 states that "…much like memory, a complex set of biological and psychological factors determine how we respond to stress." Then, the author mentions the types of stress, i.e. the stimulating and frustrating ones. He ends paragraph 3 with: "This dichotomy of good vs. bad stress is determined by the biology undergirding our feelings — by the dose and duration of the stress hormones secreted by the body in response to the stressful stimulus." The fourth paragraph talks about the 'good' type while paragraph 5 does, about the 'bad', explaining the biological processes all along. Options 2 and 4 are factually correct, but do not adequately explain the purpose of the paragraphs. Options 1 and 3 can be considered for the answer. However, while option 1 only restates the introduction to the paragraphs, option 3 explains the purpose of these paragraphs. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: **60 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **35 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **32 %**

Loading...

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In *Capitalism and Freedom*, Milton Friedman accused corporate social responsibility of being a 'fundamentally subversive doctrine'. In Friedman's view, the business of business is business, not political causes, and certainly not progressive ones. However, the view that businesses fulfil a larger social purpose than filling the pockets of shareholders has recently grown more popular than ever.

Entrepreneurs, CEOs and business management writers have talked about 'creative capitalism' (Bill Gates), 'creating shared value' (Michael E Porter), 'conscious capitalism' (John Mackey), or 'inclusive capitalism' (C K Prahalad). The common underlying idea is that not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate. For them, 'stakeholders' – not just shareholders – should be taken seriously by the corporation. The invocation of responsibility towards stakeholders is one way of claiming the social legitimacy of business corporations, whose social legitimacy and authority historically has been questioned again and again …

But many companies often find ways to brand themselves and to market their commitments to social purposes. Today, international organizations including the United Nations have taken over a view of corporations as being institutions that can be channelled in the direction of social purposes. With the launch of the UN Millennium Development Goals in 2000 and subsequently in the Sustainable Development Goals of 2015, the role of business as a key partner in achieving these goals was given much weight. In response to an economic globalisation with weak political international integration, the idea was that businesses should play a vital role for development and poverty-reduction.

A more progressive spirit in the world of business wouldn't be a bad thing. Most people wouldn't rather live in a world where entrepreneurs couldn't care less about human welfare. However, it's unlikely that more substantial and lasting progressive social change will come from a new corporate ethic. While proponents of progressive business often proclaim to be the vanguard of a new 'revolution' wherein the role of business in society as we know it will change, it is worth noting that progressive business is by no means a new idea.

For example, the book *The American Business Creed* came out in 1956. Written by a distinguished team of three economists and one sociologist, it was the most comprehensive account of US business ideology ever written. The book laid bare a conceptual tension between two kinds of business ideologies: 'the classical business creed' and 'the managerial business creed'. While the former saw profit-maximisation as the central goal of corporations, the latter saw social responsibility as the key goal.

The 'classical' view held sway in the 60's through the 80's but 'managerialism' with its ethic of business as being socially responsible to multiple stakeholders, remained alive, and since the 1990s, the spirit of progressive business has resurfaced. However, todays' proponents of progressive business exist in an environment of historic inequality, broken labour unions and a crisis of social democracy.

Previous   Next   Exit Review

1) The main idea of the passage is: —

○ The ideologies of 'managerial business creed' and the 'classical business creed' alternately hold sway in economics.

○ Poverty and inequality arising out of globalization without political integration can be addressed only by progressive capitalism.

○ The idea of progressive business, which has gained popularity of late, may not be bad; but, the new corporate ethic is unlikely to bring about real social change.

◉ The idea that 'business of business is business' no longer holds true as businesses have a role to play in progressive social   ✖ change.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

The passage begins with Friedman's criticism of social responsibility as a business doctrine. It proceeds to talk about the growing reference to the idea of 'social responsibility to stakeholders' [as much as to shareholders], and the efforts by companies to claim commitment to this doctrine. Though the author believes that 'a more progressive spirit in the world of business wouldn't be a bad thing', he asserts in paragraph 4 that "…it's unlikely that more substantial and lasting progressive social change will come from a new corporate ethic."
The paragraph then goes on to discuss why progressive business as an ideology is not really a 'revolution' as it is an old idea. It ends by stating: "However, todays' proponents of progressive business exist in an environment of historic inequality, broken labour unions and a crisis of social democracy." Thus, the passage is sceptical on the efficacy of the doctrine as it sees a strictly limited role for the same in the current set-up. Only option 3 sums up the passage accurately. Other options only highlight parts of the passage. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **372 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **186 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **67 %**

2) As per the passage, the 'managerial business creed' would argue that:

○   not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate.

○   businesses are responsible to shareholders.

◉   the profit motive is an outdated concept. ✖

○   business of business is business.

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In *Capitalism and Freedom*, Milton Friedman accused corporate social responsibility of being a 'fundamentally subversive doctrine'. In Friedman's view, the business of business is business, not political causes, and certainly not progressive ones. However, the view that businesses fulfil a larger social purpose than filling the pockets of shareholders has recently grown more popular than ever.

Entrepreneurs, CEOs and business management writers have talked about 'creative capitalism' (Bill Gates), 'creating shared value' (Michael E Porter), 'conscious capitalism' (John Mackey), or 'inclusive capitalism' (C K Prahalad). The common underlying idea is that not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate. For them, 'stakeholders' – not just shareholders – should be taken seriously by the corporation. The invocation of responsibility towards stakeholders is one way of claiming the social legitimacy of business corporations, whose social legitimacy and authority historically has been questioned again and again ...

But many companies often find ways to brand themselves and to market their commitments to social purposes. Today, international organizations including the United Nations have taken over a view of corporations as being institutions that can be channelled in the direction of social purposes. With the launch of the UN Millennium Development Goals in 2000 and subsequently in the Sustainable Development Goals of 2015, the role of business as a key partner in achieving these goals was given much weight. In response to an economic globalisation with weak political international integration, the idea was that businesses should play a vital role for development and poverty-reduction.

A more progressive spirit in the world of business wouldn't be a bad thing. Most people wouldn't rather live in a world where entrepreneurs couldn't care less about human welfare. However, it's unlikely that more substantial and lasting progressive social change will come from a new corporate ethic. While proponents of progressive business often proclaim to be the vanguard of a new 'revolution' wherein the role of business in society as we know it will change, it is worth noting that progressive business is by no means a new idea.

For example, the book *The American Business Creed* came out in 1956. Written by a distinguished team of three economists and one sociologist, it was the most comprehensive account of US business ideology ever written. The book laid bare a conceptual tension between two kinds of business ideologies: 'the classical business creed' and 'the managerial business creed'. While the former saw profit-maximisation as the central goal of corporations, the latter saw social responsibility as the key goal.

The 'classical' view held sway in the 60's through the 80's but 'managerialism' with its ethic of business as being socially responsible to multiple stakeholders, remained alive, and since the 1990s, the spirit of progressive business has resurfaced. However, todays' proponents of progressive business exist in an environment of historic inequality, broken labour unions and a crisis of social democracy.

Video Explanation:

Explanation: ▼

Refer to the penultimate paragraph: "Where the former [the classical business creed] saw profit-maximization as the central goal of corporations, the latter [the managerial business creed] saw social responsibility as the key goal." Thus, social responsibility as opposed to profits is the goal of the 'managerial creed of business'. The managerial creed relates to the doctrine of progressive business; as paragraph 2 states: "The common underlying idea is that not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate". Options 2 and 4 would apply to the 'classical business creed'. Option 3 is incorrect as it is not an outdated concept – many businesses continue to exist with 'managerial' ideology. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: **48 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **53 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **41 %**

---

3) Entrepreneurs, CEOs and writers invoked 'stakeholders' instead of shareholders because:

○ reference to shareholders made the business corporations illegitimate.

○ corporate social responsibility was a 'fundamentally subversive doctrine.'

◉ businesses have been historically censured for their commitment to social purposes.   ✗

○ businesses have been historically questioned for their lack of corporate social responsibility.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation:

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In *Capitalism and Freedom*, Milton Friedman accused corporate social responsibility of being a 'fundamentally subversive doctrine'. In Friedman's view, the business of business is business, not political causes, and certainly not progressive ones. However, the view that businesses fulfil a larger social purpose than filling the pockets of shareholders has recently grown more popular than ever.

Entrepreneurs, CEOs and business management writers have talked about 'creative capitalism' (Bill Gates), 'creating shared value' (Michael E Porter), 'conscious capitalism' (John Mackey), or 'inclusive capitalism' (C K Prahalad). The common underlying idea is that not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate. For them, 'stakeholders' – not just shareholders – should be taken seriously by the corporation. The invocation of responsibility towards stakeholders is one way of claiming the social legitimacy of business corporations, whose social legitimacy and authority historically has been questioned again and again …

But many companies often find ways to brand themselves and to market their commitments to social purposes. Today, international organizations including the United Nations have taken over a view of corporations as being institutions that can be channelled in the direction of social purposes. With the launch of the UN Millennium Development Goals in 2000 and subsequently in the Sustainable Development Goals of 2015, the role of business as a key partner in achieving these goals was given much weight. In response to an economic globalisation with weak political international integration, the idea was that businesses should play a vital role for development and poverty-reduction.

A more progressive spirit in the world of business wouldn't be a bad thing. Most people wouldn't rather live in a world where entrepreneurs couldn't care less about human welfare. However, it's unlikely that more substantial and lasting progressive social change will come from a new corporate ethic. While proponents of progressive business often proclaim to be the vanguard of a new 'revolution' wherein the role of business in society as we know it will change, it is worth noting that progressive business is by no means a new idea.

For example, the book *The American Business Creed* came out in 1956. Written by a distinguished team of three economists and one sociologist, it was the most comprehensive account of US business ideology ever written. The book laid bare a conceptual tension between two kinds of business ideologies: 'the classical business creed' and 'the managerial business creed'. While the former saw profit-maximisation as the central goal of corporations, the latter saw social responsibility as the key goal.

The 'classical' view held sway in the 60's through the 80's but 'managerialism' with its ethic of business as being socially responsible to multiple stakeholders, remained alive, and since the 1990s, the spirit of progressive business has resurfaced. However, todays' proponents of progressive business exist in an environment of historic inequality, broken labour unions and a crisis of social democracy.

Refer paragraph 2: "The common underlying idea is that not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate. For them, 'stakeholders' – not just shareholders – should be taken seriously by the corporation. The invocation of responsibility towards stakeholders is one way of claiming the social legitimacy of business corporations, whose social legitimacy and authority has been historically questioned again and again." Thus, being responsible to stakeholders would help impart social legitimacy to businesses. Option 1 is incorrect as it uses the term 'illegitimate'—the passage only says that their social legitimacy was questioned. Option 2 rephrases Friedman's view and not that of entrepreneurs, CEOs, writers etc… Option 3 is false because the companies were criticized for its reverse—i.e. lack of commitment to social purposes. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **46 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **75 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **70 %**

4) **According to the passage, the book, *The American Business Creed*:**   ▬

○ helped resolve the tension between two conflicting business ideologies in America.

○ helped establish the managerial business creed as the American business ideology.

○ is at variance with Milton Friedman's view that 'the business of business is business.'

◉ presented a systematic account of the American business ideology and goals.   ✓

Video Explanation: ⌄

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In *Capitalism and Freedom*, Milton Friedman accused corporate social responsibility of being a 'fundamentally subversive doctrine'. In Friedman's view, the business of business is business, not political causes, and certainly not progressive ones. However, the view that businesses fulfil a larger social purpose than filling the pockets of shareholders has recently grown more popular than ever.

Entrepreneurs, CEOs and business management writers have talked about 'creative capitalism' (Bill Gates), 'creating shared value' (Michael E Porter), 'conscious capitalism' (John Mackey), or 'inclusive capitalism' (C K Prahalad). The common underlying idea is that not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate. For them, 'stakeholders' – not just shareholders – should be taken seriously by the corporation. The invocation of responsibility towards stakeholders is one way of claiming the social legitimacy of business corporations, whose social legitimacy and authority historically has been questioned again and again ...

But many companies often find ways to brand themselves and to market their commitments to social purposes. Today, international organizations including the United Nations have taken over a view of corporations as being institutions that can be channelled in the direction of social purposes. With the launch of the UN Millennium Development Goals in 2000 and subsequently in the Sustainable Development Goals of 2015, the role of business as a key partner in achieving these goals was given much weight. In response to an economic globalisation with weak political international integration, the idea was that businesses should play a vital role for development and poverty-reduction.

A more progressive spirit in the world of business wouldn't be a bad thing. Most people wouldn't rather live in a world where entrepreneurs couldn't care less about human welfare. However, it's unlikely that more substantial and lasting progressive social change will come from a new corporate ethic. While proponents of progressive business often proclaim to be the vanguard of a new 'revolution' wherein the role of business in society as we know it will change, it is worth noting that progressive business is by no means a new idea.

For example, the book *The American Business Creed* came out in 1956. Written by a distinguished team of three economists and one sociologist, it was the most comprehensive account of US business ideology ever written. The book laid bare a conceptual tension between two kinds of business ideologies: 'the classical business creed' and 'the managerial business creed'. While the former saw profit-maximisation as the central goal of corporations, the latter saw social responsibility as the key goal.

The 'classical' view held sway in the 60's through the 80's but 'managerialism' with its ethic of business as being socially responsible to multiple stakeholders, remained alive, and since the 1990s, the spirit of progressive business has resurfaced. However, todays' proponents of progressive business exist in an environment of historic inequality, broken labour unions and a crisis of social democracy.

Refer the penultimate paragraph: "The book laid bare a conceptual tension between two kinds of business ideologies: 'the classical business creed' and 'the managerial business creed'." The book is said to be an early exploration of American business ideologies, and is said to make a distinction between the classical business creed, which is based on profit, and the managerial business creed, which is derived from social responsibility. Thus, option 4 is correct. None of the other options can be inferred from the passage--option 1 is incorrect because the book did not help resolve the tension as its claims; option 2 is incorrect as it did not help establish any belief system in America; option 3 is incorrect as the passage does not say that the American Business Creed presented a view point, or that the view point was contrary to Friedman's. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **50 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **59 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **73 %**

5) **The author refers to 'inequality, broken trade unions, and a crisis of social democracy' in order to suggest that:** ▬

○ a progressive spirit in the world of business is the need of the hour.

○ they are the consequences of 'managerialism' in business since the 1990s.

○ the proponents of progressive business are unlikely to succeed.

○ the 'classical business creed' is superior to the 'managerial business creed'.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation:

The passage below is accompanied by a set of 5 questions. Choose the best answer for each question.

In *Capitalism and Freedom*, Milton Friedman accused corporate social responsibility of being a 'fundamentally subversive doctrine'. In Friedman's view, the business of business is business, not political causes, and certainly not progressive ones. However, the view that businesses fulfil a larger social purpose than filling the pockets of shareholders has recently grown more popular than ever.

Entrepreneurs, CEOs and business management writers have talked about 'creative capitalism' (Bill Gates), 'creating shared value' (Michael E Porter), 'conscious capitalism' (John Mackey), or 'inclusive capitalism' (C K Prahalad). The common underlying idea is that not all kinds of profit are equally legitimate. For them, 'stakeholders' – not just shareholders – should be taken seriously by the corporation. The invocation of responsibility towards stakeholders is one way of claiming the social legitimacy of business corporations, whose social legitimacy and authority historically has been questioned again and again …

But many companies often find ways to brand themselves and to market their commitments to social purposes. Today, international organizations including the United Nations have taken over a view of corporations as being institutions that can be channelled in the direction of social purposes. With the launch of the UN Millennium Development Goals in 2000 and subsequently in the Sustainable Development Goals of 2015, the role of business as a key partner in achieving these goals was given much weight. In response to an economic globalisation with weak political international integration, the idea was that businesses should play a vital role for development and poverty-reduction.

A more progressive spirit in the world of business wouldn't be a bad thing. Most people wouldn't rather live in a world where entrepreneurs couldn't care less about human welfare. However, it's unlikely that more substantial and lasting progressive social change will come from a new corporate ethic. While proponents of progressive business often proclaim to be the vanguard of a new 'revolution' wherein the role of business in society as we know it will change, it is worth noting that progressive business is by no means a new idea.

For example, the book *The American Business Creed* came out in 1956. Written by a distinguished team of three economists and one sociologist, it was the most comprehensive account of US business ideology ever written. The book laid bare a conceptual tension between two kinds of business ideologies: 'the classical business creed' and 'the managerial business creed'. While the former saw profit-maximisation as the central goal of corporations, the latter saw social responsibility as the key goal.

The 'classical' view held sway in the 60's through the 80's but 'managerialism' with its ethic of business as being socially responsible to multiple stakeholders, remained alive, and since the 1990s, the spirit of progressive business has resurfaced. However, todays' proponents of progressive business exist in an environment of historic inequality, broken labour unions and a crisis of social democracy.

In the third paragraph, the author expresses the view that "… it's unlikely that more substantial and lasting progressive social change will come from a new corporate ethic. While proponents of progressive business often proclaim to be the vanguard of a new 'revolution' wherein the role of business in society as we know it will change, it is worth noting that progressive business is by no means a new idea." By suggesting that it's an old idea, the author undermines the "revolutionary" aspect. He also implies that it has never been able to get ahead of the 'classical ideology'; use of the word 'resurfaced' in the last paragraph also points to this. The reference to the changed scenario with greater challenges of "inequality, broken trade unions etc.," suggests that author indicates that the idea is unlikely to succeed. Hence, option 3 is correct. Option 1 is not stated or implied by the writer. Option 2 is incorrect as the author does not attribute these to 'managerialism.' Option 4 is incorrect as the two ideologies are not compared. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **252 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **43 secs**

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

% Students got it correct: **56 %**

Loading...

The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author's position.

Finance is the language of business, the lifeblood of the economy, and increasingly a dominant force in capitalism. But, finance can be intimidating, and many business executives don't even try to get their arms around it. People who want to have advanced roles in enterprise confront financial questions more and more, and they have to be more fluent in the financial consequences of their decisions. They have to know how to communicate results and interact with shareholders. The problem is that people perceive finance to be this difficult building block. Executives ought to be more comfortable with it and realize it's not rocket science. It's really important for them to know that anyone can access these ideas.

○ Executives who are intimidated by finance and avoid learning it must realize that finance is not rocket science and that anyone can access its ideas.

○ Finance is important not just to business and economy, but to capitalism itself; hence, executives must become more comfortable with it and realize it's not rocket science.

○ Finance is intimidating to many executives; but, they ought to realize that finance is the language of business, and be more fluent in the financial consequences of their decisions.

◉ Executives who want to have advanced roles in business ought to become more comfortable in finance without being afraid of it, as it is the language of business. ✓

🙂 Congratulations, you got it correct!

Change Section here   ▼

Explanation: ⌄

The passage can be summarized this way: *finance is the language of business; but, since it appears to be intimidating many business executives do not try to learn it; however, they must realize the importance of finance and become more comfortable with it.* Primarily, the author's purpose is to tell the executives who are aiming for larger roles in business to give up the fear and to become more comfortable with finance. This idea is best captured in option 4. The difference between options 1 and 4 is that option 1 does not contain the following aspects: 'finance as the language of business' and 'requirement of its knowledge for advanced roles'. Option 2 does not mention the 'fear' factor. Option 3 does not mention the need to become more comfortable with the subject. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ❯

Time taken by you: **171 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **54 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **28 %**

Previous   Next   Exit Review

The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author's position.

The history of beauty is broken into two parts. For the ancients through the medievals, beauty was an empirical and objective concept. The belief, put forth first by Plato, was that beauty was a fundamental property of a person or an object; beauty was inherent and had been "created." But in 1757 David Hume undermined all this forever, setting forth the notion that beauty is actually about perception, that the way the mind thinks about an object or person has little to do with the object or person itself. According to Hume, beauty is no quality in things themselves, it exists merely in the mind which contemplates them; and each mind perceives a different beauty.

○ While the ancients and the medievals believed that beauty was an objective concept, the idea that it is subjective has gained currency since 1757.

○ By proving that beauty existed in the perceiving mind, David Hume in 1757 undermined the belief long-held by the ancients and the medievals that beauty existed in the object.

○ While the ancients and the medievals believed that an object in itself had beauty, David Hume changed it forever in 1757.

◉ The history of beauty is in two parts: the ancient and medieval notion that beauty is objective and David Hume's (1757) notion that beauty is all about perception.   ✓

Congratulations, you solved the question correctly and took less than average time!

Explanation: ⌄

Option 1 is incorrect. "…gained currency since 1757…" is not suggested by the passage. 'David Hume undermined it forever' is not the same as 'gaining currency'. Option 2 is incorrect in stating that Hume 'proved' the existence of beauty. Option 3 is incorrect as it does not include David Hum'e concept of beauty. The author's position about the concept of beauty is historical, and not judgmental or inferential. Option 4 correctly states the author's position. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ❯

Time taken by you: **71 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **90 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **67 %**

Previous   Next   Exit Review

The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author's position.

A new survey from Deloitte interviewed 13,416 millennials (defined as those born between January 1983 and December 1994) across 42 countries. The survey found that climate change was their biggest worry, with 29% concerned about the issue; followed by income equality at 21% (respondents were asked to pick three issues from a list of 20). Millennials seem to have turned very pessimistic about the global economy, with only 26% expecting the situation to improve in the next 12 months; that compares with 45% last year. Just over half expect their personal finances to deteriorate. Only 22% expect the social and political climate in their countries to improve, down from 33% in 2018.

○ A new Deloitte survey found that millennials across the globe are as much worried about the environment as about global economy.

◉ A survey of 13, 416 millennials across 42 countries showed that climate change and deteriorating economy are the   ✗
    most worrying problems in the world.

○ Young people all over the world are pessimistic about the economy, environment, and their own progress.

○ Compared to previous year, more millennials are now concerned about the future of the planet and the global economy.

😔 Oops, you got it wrong!

Section : Verbal Ability & Reading Comprehension

Explanation: ⌄

The author's position is that millennials are worried about mostly climate change and global economy, and that they do not expect any improvement in the social and political climate in their countries. They also expect their personal finances to deteriorate. Option 3 summarizes these ideas and communicates what the author wants to convey. The summary does not mention the survey does not matter in an author's position question. Option 1 is incorrect as the comparison between their concern for environment and economy is unwarranted—this is not the author's position. Option 2 fails to convey the millennials' concern about their own lives. Option 4 is factually correct; however, the comparison between this year and the previous year is not the main point the paragraph wants to convey. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⟩

Time taken by you: **188 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **31 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **22 %**

Previous   Next   Exit Review

The four sentences labelled (1, 2, 3, 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Each sentence is labelled with a number. Decide on the proper sequence of order of the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. Scaled up appropriately, the technology could be used to rewrite the planetary rules.
2. They plan to use a high-altitude balloon to place reflective particles into the stratosphere above the arid landscapes of the US Southwest.
3. A research team from Harvard University will conduct the first ever field test of geo-engineering the climate.
4. They will examine how effectively the particles beat back incoming solar energy.

3421

😞 Oops, you got it wrong!

01:54

Explanation: ⌄

Sentence 3 is the starter sentence of the sequence as it introduces the first ever field test of geo engineering by Harvard University. Sentences 2 and 4 follow, in that order, as 'they' in 2 refers to the research team mentioned in sentence 3 and "the particles" in 4 refers to the 'reflective particles' of sentence 2. Sentence 1 refers to 'the technology' outlined in sentences 2 and 4, and provides an appropriate end-sentence to the sequence. Hence, 3241.

Correct Answer: ›

Time taken by you: **29 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **56 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **60 %**

Previous   Next   Exit Review

The four sentences labelled (1, 2, 3, 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Each sentence is labelled with a number. Decide on the proper sequence of order of the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. It can approximate its answers with a specified and steadily increasing degree of certainty, reaching levels of accuracy that surpass human specialists.
2. Machine learning – a kind of sub-field of artificial intelligence – is a means of training algorithms to discern empirical relationships within immense reams of data.
3. Using analytical protocols modelled on the neurons of the human brain, in an iterative process of trial and error, the algorithm figures out how to discriminate between cancers and freckles.
4. Run a purpose-built algorithm by a pile of images of moles that might or might not be cancerous and then show it images of diagnosed melanoma.

2431

Congratulations, you got it correct!

02:04

Explanation: ⌄

2 is an easily identifiable starter sentence. It provides a definition for machine learning. 4-3 is a mandatory pair because 'the algorithm' in 3 refers to 'a purpose built algorithm' in 4. One can see that the pronoun 'it' in 1 refers again to this algorithm. So, 4-3-1 makes an appropriate sequence. Hence, [2431].

Correct Answer: ❯

Time taken by you: **93 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **34 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **26 %**

The four sentences labelled (1, 2, 3, 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Each sentence is labelled with a number. Decide on the proper sequence of order of the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. Transported around the globe by fierce atmospheric winds, relentless ocean currents, and the capacious cargo-holds of millions of fossil-fuel-powered vehicles, nowhere on Earth is free from humanity's imprint.
2. One fact about our time is becoming increasingly well-known.
3. The chemical and biological signatures of our species can be found everywhere.
4. There is no place on earth that remains free from the traces of human activity, no matter how far you travel, no matter in which direction you point.

2413

🥴 Oops, you got it wrong!

The four sentences labelled (1, 2, 3, 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Each sentence is labelled with a number. Decide on the proper sequence of order of the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. Transported around the globe by fierce atmospheric winds, relentless ocean currents, and the capacious cargo-holds of millions of fossil-fuel-powered vehicles, nowhere on Earth is free from humanity's imprint.
2. One fact about our time is becoming increasingly well-known.
3. The chemical and biological signatures of our species can be found everywhere.
4. There is no place on earth that remains free from the traces of human activity, no matter how far you travel, no matter in which direction you point.

Previous   Next   Exit Review

02:57

Explanation: ⌄

Sentence 2 begins the paragraph. The 'fact about our time' is articulated next in sentence 4 which asserts that every corner of the Earth has traces of human activity. Sentences 3 and 1 are linked to each other as sentence 1 talks about the 'transport' of 'chemical and biological signatures' mentioned in sentence 3. Arranging the sequences 24 and 31, we get the sequence 2431.

Correct Answer: ❯

Time taken by you: **69 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **29 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **27 %**

Previous   Next   Exit Review

The four sentences labelled (1, 2, 3, 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Each sentence is labelled with a number. Decide on the proper sequence of order of the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. Most people habitually eat between three to six small meals per day.
2. Additionally, eating meals during the day leaves many people feeling sluggish and exhausted due to uncontrolled hormonal and neurotransmitter changes.
3. On the other hand, when you practice the Warlock Diet, you can manipulate your hormones and neurotransmitters to work for you.
4. Unfortunately many are not satisfied with these small meals.

1423

🤗 Congratulations, you solved the question correctly and took less than average time!

02:38

Explanation: ⌄

'These small meals' in sentence 4 refers to the 'small meals' mentioned in sentence 1. The 1-4 pair also begins the paragraph. Sentence 2 follows 4 as 'additionally' adds to the list of problems with the small meals. Sentence 3 ends the sequence – it follows 2 as it states the reverse of what is stated in 2 with the phrase "on the other hand".Hence, 1423.

Correct Answer: ›

Time taken by you: **63 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **65 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **75 %**

Five sentences related to a topic are given below. Four of them can be put together to form a meaningful and coherent short paragraph. Identify the odd one out. Choose its number as your answer and key it in.

1. Women wait an average of 65 minutes in the Emergency Room, compared to men's 49 minutes.
2. Studies show that gender and race affect how the same pain is treated.
3. Subjectivity is a problem because people rank the same pain differently, which results in different medical care.
4. Bias based on gender is a widely acknowledged problem in which women's pain is not taken as seriously as men's.
5. Women are also more likely to be prescribed sedatives, whereas men are more likely to be prescribed painkillers.

5

🙄 Oops, you got it wrong!

03:10

Explanation: ⌄

Sentence 2 introduces the theme:Gender and race influence how medical practitioners treat the same pain. Sentences 4, 5, and 1 involve this theme of 'gender bias in the way a pain is treated' – sentence 4 explicitly calls it the "…bias based on gender.…" Sentence 3, on the other hand, talks about subjectivity in the way people rank/report the same pain; it means that the sustaining power differs from person to person. This is different from what the rest of the paragraph talks about [subjectivity vs. bias]. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ❯

Time taken by you: **80 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **29 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **34 %**

Previous   Next   Exit Review

Five sentences related to a topic are given below. Four of them can be put together to form a meaningful and coherent short paragraph. Identify the odd one out. Choose its number as your answer and key it in.

1. Routine gives a structure to life, and it is this structure that ensures life makes sense to you.
2. Yet another morning could see me thinking and planning frenetically for an official project that has me excited.
3. I have mostly been an admirer of spontaneity, and found excitement in walking into my day looking forward to surprises.
4. One day upon waking I could reach for a book to read, while another morning I may be mooning around, reflecting and dreaming.
5. So my mornings are not necessarily well structured.

1

Congratulations, you got it correct!

Explanation: ⌄

Sentence 3 begins the narrative; it is a first person account of how the author is an admirer of spontaneity, and how she beginsa day awaiting surprises. Sentences 2 and 4 describe possible ways the author spends her mornings usually– reading or mooning around, reflecting, dreaming or planning for an official project. Sentence 5 concludes the paragraph smoothly, with the author asserting that her mornings do not involve organized activities. Sentence 1 is a general statement about how routine/ organized life ensures structure and meaning to life. This is contrary to the theme in other sentences. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ❯

Time taken by you: **73 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **55 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **69 %**

Five sentences related to a topic are given below. Four of them can be put together to form a meaningful and coherent short paragraph. Identify the odd one out. Choose its number as your answer and key it in.

1. For example, when you are driving a car, the area just behind your shoulders is often a blind spot.
2. Every time you hit a blind spot, you are confronted with the whole gamut of negative emotions.
3. The dictionary defines a 'blind spot' as that area in your range of vision which you cannot see properly.
4. It is a place where they are `emotionally stuck' and refuse to see or even allow another perspective.
5. Likewise, every person has a few 'blind spots', especially concerning themselves, that they are not able to see clearly and properly.

4

😔 Oops, you got it wrong!

Explanation: ⌄

Sentences 2 and 3 are standalones, and both are on the same topic, i.e. 'blind spot.'Either of them can be the starter. However, sentence 2 will be an abrupt beginning. Besides, sentence 3 defines 'blind spot', and hence is a better starter. Sentence 1 gives us an example for 'blind spot'; this should logically follow the definition. So, 3-1 is a mandatory pair. Sentence 5 follows the 3-1 pair--definition (sentence 3) and example (sentence 1) leading to a more abstract aspect on the same. Sentence 4 explains the figurative sense in which the term, 'blind spot' has been used in sentence 5. Hence, 3-1-5-4 makes up a logical paragraph. *A person hitting a blind spot and being confronted by negative emotions* is out of place in this paragraph – the author isn't discussing the effects of a blind spot. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer: ❯

Time taken by you: **64 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **43 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **37 %**

Previous   Next   Exit Review