

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

The word 'philosophy' is one of which the meaning is by no means fixed. Like the word 'religion', it has one sense when used to describe certain features of historical cultures, and another when used to denote a study or an attitude of mind which is considered desirable in the present day. Philosophy, as pursued in the universities of the Western democratic world, is, at least in intention, part of the pursuit of knowledge aiming at the same kind of detachment as is sought in science, and not required by the authorities to arrive at conclusions convenient to the government. Many teachers of philosophy would say that knowledge should be the sole purpose of university teaching; virtue should be left to parents, schoolmasters and the churches.

But philosophy, in the historically usual sense, has resulted from the attempt to produce a synthesis of science and religion. Philosophy was distinguished from religion by the fact that, nominally at least, it did not appeal to authority or tradition; it was distinguished from science by the fact that an essential part of its purpose was to tell men how to live. Sometimes ethical motives influenced the philosopher's views as to the nature of the universe, sometimes his views as to the universe led him to ethical conclusions. And with most philosophers, ethical opinions involved political consequences: some valued democracy, others oligarchy; some praised liberty, others discipline. Almost all types of philosophy were invented by the Greeks, and the controversies of our own day were already vigorous among the pre-Socratics.

The fundamental problem of ethics and politics is that of finding some way of reconciling the needs of social life with the urgency of individual desires. This has been achieved, in so far as it has been achieved, by means of various devices. When a government exists, the criminal law can be used to prevent anti-social action on the part of those who do not belong to the government, and law can be enforced by religion wherever religion teaches that disobedience is impiety. Where there is priesthood sufficiently influential to enforce its moral code on lay rulers, even the rulers become to some extent subject to law; of this there are abundant instances in the Old Testament and in medieval history.

Philosophers, when they have tackled the problem of preserving social coherence, have sought solutions less obviously dependent upon dogma than those offered by official religions. Most philosophy has been a reaction against scepticism; it has arisen in ages when authority no longer sufficed to produce the socially necessary minimum of belief, so that nominally rational arguments had to be invented to secure the same result. This motive has led to a deep insincerity infecting most philosophy, both ancient and modern.

1)

Which of the following has led to a deep insincerity infecting most philosophy?

- ☐ Most philosophy aims at weakening the popular force of tradition, and targets dogma.
- ☐ As a result of scepticism, philosophy is increasingly becoming politically conservative.
- ☒ Philosophers are forever trying to frame rational arguments to preserve social coherence. ✓
- ☐ There is an unconscious fear among philosophers that clear thinking would lead to anarchy.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Refer to the last paragraph. Most philosophy has been a reaction against scepticism whereby nominally rational arguments had to be invented to secure social coherence. This has led to deep insincerity infecting most philosophy. None of the other options can be inferred from the passage. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: **458 secs**Avg Time taken by all students: **250 secs**Your Attempt: **Correct**% Students got it correct: **65 %**

2)

According to the author, the historical origins of philosophy can be traced to:

- ☐ An attempt to reconcile religion and science.
- ☐ The effort to reconcile the needs of social life and the urgency of individual desires.
- ☐ A reaction against scepticism prevalent in contemporary society.
- ☒ The pure pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. ✗

Video Explanation: ▼

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

The word 'philosophy' is one of which the meaning is by no means fixed. Like the word 'religion', it has one sense when used to describe certain features of historical cultures, and another when used to denote a study or an attitude of mind which is considered desirable in the present day. Philosophy, as pursued in the universities of the Western democratic world, is, at least in intention, part of the pursuit of knowledge aiming at the same kind of detachment as is sought in science, and not required by the authorities to arrive at conclusions convenient to the government. Many teachers of philosophy would say that knowledge should be the sole purpose of university teaching; virtue should be left to parents, schoolmasters and the churches.

But philosophy, in the historically usual sense, has resulted from the attempt to produce a synthesis of science and religion. Philosophy was distinguished from religion by the fact that, nominally at least, it did not appeal to authority or tradition; it was distinguished from science by the fact that an essential part of its purpose was to tell men how to live. Sometimes ethical motives influenced the philosopher's views as to the nature of the universe, sometimes his views as to the universe led him to ethical conclusions. And with most philosophers, ethical opinions involved political consequences: some valued democracy, others oligarchy; some praised liberty, others discipline. Almost all types of philosophy were invented by the Greeks, and the controversies of our own day were already vigorous among the pre-Socratics.

The fundamental problem of ethics and politics is that of finding some way of reconciling the needs of social life with the urgency of individual desires. This has been achieved, in so far as it has been achieved, by means of various devices. When a government exists, the criminal law can be used to prevent anti-social action on the part of those who do not belong to the government, and law can be enforced by religion wherever religion teaches that disobedience is impiety. Where there is priesthood sufficiently influential to enforce its moral code on lay rulers, even the rulers become to some extent subject to law; of this there are abundant instances in the Old Testament and in medieval history.

Philosophers, when they have tackled the problem of preserving social coherence, have sought solutions less obviously dependent upon dogma than those offered by official religions. Most philosophy has been a reaction against scepticism; it has arisen in ages when authority no longer sufficed to produce the socially necessary minimum of belief, so that nominally rational arguments had to be invented to secure the same result. This motive has led to a deep insincerity infecting most philosophy, both ancient and modern.

Refer to the second paragraph: “But philosophy, in the historically usual sense, has resulted from the attempt to produce a synthesis of science and religion.” Option 2 is said in connection with ethics and politics. Option 3 is slightly tricky- last paragraph states that “philosophers, when they have tackled the problem of preserving social coherence, have sought solutions less obviously dependent upon dogma than those offered by official religions. Most philosophy has been a reaction against scepticism...” So, option 3 is true about certain or ‘most philosophy’. But, with the specific mention of philosophy in the “historically usual sense”, option 3 has to be rejected in favour of option 1, which provides a precise answer. Hence, [1].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **235 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **109 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

3)

**According to the passage, which of the following is true about philosophy?**

- ☐ Its ethical connotations have no political significance.
- ☐ Cosmological and ethical theories are closely connected.
- ☐ Philosophy is not a matter in which official authorities have an opinion.
- ☐ It taught mere scepticism and attacked existing dogmas.

**Video Explanation:**

**Explanation:**

Option [1] is in opposition to the central idea of the passage. Option [3] is not even stated by the author. Philosophy was largely sceptical of dogmas, but it didn't 'merely' concentrate on that. So, [4] is an exaggeration. Refer to paragraph 2: “sometimes ethical motives influenced the philosopher's views as to the nature of the universe, sometimes his views as to the universe led him to ethical conclusions.” Hence, [2].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **33 secs**

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

The word 'philosophy' is one of which the meaning is by no means fixed. Like the word 'religion', it has one sense when used to describe certain features of historical cultures, and another when used to denote a study or an attitude of mind which is considered desirable in the present day. Philosophy, as pursued in the universities of the Western democratic world, is, at least in intention, part of the pursuit of knowledge aiming at the same kind of detachment as is sought in science, and not required by the authorities to arrive at conclusions convenient to the government. Many teachers of philosophy would say that knowledge should be the sole purpose of university teaching; virtue should be left to parents, schoolmasters and the churches.

But philosophy, in the historically usual sense, has resulted from the attempt to produce a synthesis of science and religion. Philosophy was distinguished from religion by the fact that, nominally at least, it did not appeal to authority or tradition; it was distinguished from science by the fact that an essential part of its purpose was to tell men how to live. Sometimes ethical motives influenced the philosopher's views as to the nature of the universe, sometimes his views as to the universe led him to ethical conclusions. And with most philosophers, ethical opinions involved political consequences: some valued democracy, others oligarchy; some praised liberty, others discipline. Almost all types of philosophy were invented by the Greeks, and the controversies of our own day were already vigorous among the pre-Socratics.

The fundamental problem of ethics and politics is that of finding some way of reconciling the needs of social life with the urgency of individual desires. This has been achieved, in so far as it has been achieved, by means of various devices. When a government exists, the criminal law can be used to prevent anti-social action on the part of those who do not belong to the government, and law can be enforced by religion wherever religion teaches that disobedience is impiety. Where there is priesthood sufficiently influential to enforce its moral code on lay rulers, even the rulers become to some extent subject to law; of this there are abundant instances in the Old Testament and in medieval history.

Philosophers, when they have tackled the problem of preserving social coherence, have sought solutions less obviously dependent upon dogma than those offered by official religions. Most philosophy has been a reaction against scepticism; it has arisen in ages when authority no longer sufficed to produce the socially necessary minimum of belief, so that nominally rational arguments had to be invented to secure the same result. This motive has led to a deep insincerity infecting most philosophy, both ancient and modern.

% Students got it correct: 26 %

4) —

The author is LEAST likely to agree with which of the following statements?

- ☐ Knowledge is the sole purpose of university teaching.
- ☐ Most types of philosophy were invented by the Greeks.
- ☒ Philosophy is detached from politics.✔
- ☐ The word 'philosophy', like 'religion', is used in two senses.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Options [1] and [2] are categorically stated in the passage. Refer Paragraph 2. “.... Almost all types of philosophy were invented by the Greeks, and the controversies of our own day were already vigorous among the pre-Socratics”. Refer to the first two sentences of paragraph 1: option [4] too is clearly stated. Option [3] is contrary to the passage. Thus, the author is least likely to agree with [3]. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: 245 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 57 secs

Your Attempt: Correct

% Students got it correct: 61 %

Loading...

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

For years I spent my days, from before dawn until after dusk, following a troop of endangered red colobus monkeys around a small West African forest. ... While they are obviously not us, they are far more like us than many people would like to admit. Or as Darwin pronounced almost 150 years ago, “The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind.” The similarities were disturbingly obvious when it came to the uses and abuses of leadership; the distribution of power and resources; the movement of individuals seeking safety, security, better resources and perhaps just adventure; and the interactions between different social troops. As time passed, evident parallels emerged between their social, psychological and especially political journeys through the canopy with the journeys we humans make on the ground.

When a calm, confident, socially skilled, adaptable and benevolent, yet firm, leader with an amiable sidekick ruled, internal disputes were easily and quickly settled, the troop sailed through short-lived, homegrown crises, peace was maintained and morale blossomed. A good leader was also able to mobilize collective action during territorial skirmishes, lead a troop into battle against external threats and come out victorious.

In contrast, when a bully was in charge—particularly a bully with no accommodating wingman or cohesive hierarchy to give support—chaos could rule. Watching a bully take over and lead a troop was like watching a bloated, self-serving egotist create mayhem and confusion. With a leader that was often nasty, “off the rails,” full of malice and loaded with active schadenfreude, constantly indulging his dark side and unable or unwilling to curb those leanings, the troop appeared to run on fear, morale suffered, internal strife was an everyday occurrence, territorial disputes were lost, and necessary immigration slid downhill.

While colobus bullies push their troop mates around, human bully-boy leaders persecute or undermine

1)

According to Charles Darwin ...

- ☐ Genetic similarities between man and higher animals are a result of a series of random mutations or undirected evolution.
- ☒ Humans and higher animals derive from a common ancestor, and therefore share a common structural and behavioural stem.
- ☐ Evolution accounts for the independent generation of same patterns in different systems that are otherwise genetically unrelated.
- ☐ The mental capabilities of human beings have strong evolutionary continuity with those of higher animals.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Refer to paragraph 1: “The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind.” By stating that humans and higher animals possess the same kind of ‘mind’, Darwin points to their genetic relatedness. Therefore, option [3], which states the converse, is incorrect. Option [2] takes it for granted that humans and higher animals have a common ancestor though we have insufficient information to make such a conclusion. The statement doesn’t state or even imply the reason for the genetic similarities between humans and higher animals while option [1] claims it to be *a result of a series of random mutations or undirected evolution*. Option [4] rightly rephrases Darwin’s words that states that the mental capabilities (mind) of man and the higher animals is different only by degrees—or that they belong to the same kind: *strong evolutionary continuity in terms of mental abilities*. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer: ▼

Your Attempt: **Wrong**% Students got it correct: **59 %**

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

For years I spent my days, from before dawn until after dusk, following a troop of endangered red colobus monkeys around a small West African forest. ... While they are obviously not us, they are far more like us than many people would like to admit. Or as Darwin pronounced almost 150 years ago, “The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind.” The similarities were disturbingly obvious when it came to the uses and abuses of leadership; the distribution of power and resources; the movement of individuals seeking safety, security, better resources and perhaps just adventure; and the interactions between different social troops. As time passed, evident parallels emerged between their social, psychological and especially political journeys through the canopy with the journeys we humans make on the ground.

When a calm, confident, socially skilled, adaptable and benevolent, yet firm, leader with an amiable sidekick ruled, internal disputes were easily and quickly settled, the troop sailed through short-lived, homegrown crises, peace was maintained and morale blossomed. A good leader was also able to mobilize collective action during territorial skirmishes, lead a troop into battle against external threats and come out victorious.

In contrast, when a bully was in charge—particularly a bully with no accommodating wingman or cohesive hierarchy to give support—chaos could rule. Watching a bully take over and lead a troop was like watching a bloated, self-serving egotist create mayhem and confusion. With a leader that was often nasty, “off the rails,” full of malice and loaded with active schadenfreude, constantly indulging his dark side and unable or unwilling to curb those leanings, the troop appeared to run on fear, morale suffered, internal strife was an everyday occurrence, territorial disputes were lost, and necessary immigration slid downhill.

While colobus bullies push their troop mates around, human bully-boy leaders persecute or undermine

2)

**We can infer from the passage that bully-leader societies under a colobus or a human are similar in all the following ways EXCEPT:**

- ☐ A pervading sense of fear of persecution and the lack of motivation in individuals.
- ☐ A leader who enjoys the attention from sycophants and suffers from persecution complex.
- ☐ A society marked by xenophobia and a strong sense of group-identity.
- ☒ An ability to restore to normalcy immediately after a change to benign leadership. ✓

**Video Explanation:** ▼**Explanation:** ▼

From the third paragraph to the end of the passage, the author describes how colobus societies and human societies behave under leaders who are bullies. The third paragraph mentions fear and low morale in colobus societies and persecution and draconian rules in human societies. Hence 1 can be inferred. Option 2 is true according to the fifth paragraph. It states, that in any society, the bully appears to enjoy receiving false fawning ... and the leader proclaims ‘witch hunt’ in case of disagreement from individuals or institutions – hence applicable to both societies. ‘Immigration’ is mentioned with respect to both the societies – hence xenophobia is applicable to both. However, the last paragraph states that a quick return to normalcy is possible only in colobus societies and not in human societies. Hence option 4 is an exception. Hence, [4],

**Correct Answer:** ▼



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

For years I spent my days, from before dawn until after dusk, following a troop of endangered red colobus monkeys around a small West African forest. ... While they are obviously not us, they are far more like us than many people would like to admit. Or as Darwin pronounced almost 150 years ago, “The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind.” The similarities were disturbingly obvious when it came to the uses and abuses of leadership; the distribution of power and resources; the movement of individuals seeking safety, security, better resources and perhaps just adventure; and the interactions between different social troops. As time passed, evident parallels emerged between their social, psychological and especially political journeys through the canopy with the journeys we humans make on the ground.

When a calm, confident, socially skilled, adaptable and benevolent, yet firm, leader with an amiable sidekick ruled, internal disputes were easily and quickly settled, the troop sailed through short-lived, homegrown crises, peace was maintained and morale blossomed. A good leader was also able to mobilize collective action during territorial skirmishes, lead a troop into battle against external threats and come out victorious.

In contrast, when a bully was in charge—particularly a bully with no accommodating wingman or cohesive hierarchy to give support—chaos could rule. Watching a bully take over and lead a troop was like watching a bloated, self-serving egotist create mayhem and confusion. With a leader that was often nasty, “off the rails,” full of malice and loaded with active schadenfreude, constantly indulging his dark side and unable or unwilling to curb those leanings, the troop appeared to run on fear, morale suffered, internal strife was an everyday occurrence, territorial disputes were lost, and necessary immigration slid downhill.

While colobus bullies push their troop mates around, human bully-boy leaders persecute or undermine


Avg Time taken by all students: 93 secs

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: 78 %

3)

In the author’s opinion, which of the following can mitigate the adverse impact of a bully leader?

- ☒ A vigilant and courageous citizenry who stands up to bullies. 
- ☐ A fawning and sycophantic group of followers devoted to the leader.
- ☐ A deputy who is more resilient or a well-organized bureaucracy.
- ☐ Journalists, judges, political opponents, and institutions.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

The third paragraph states, “In contrast, when a bully was in charge—particularly a bully with no accommodating wingman or cohesive hierarchy to give support—chaos could rule.” Option 3 is thus supported. Option 1 arises from the remark of Barack Obama – but there is no suggestion that the bully’s impact will be impacted. Option 3 would implicitly aggravate the leader’s adverse impact. Option 4 is the class that is subjugated and persecuted by the bully-leader. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: 76 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 15 secs

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: 15 %

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

For years I spent my days, from before dawn until after dusk, following a troop of endangered red colobus monkeys around a small West African forest. ... While they are obviously not us, they are far more like us than many people would like to admit. Or as Darwin pronounced almost 150 years ago, “The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind.” The similarities were disturbingly obvious when it came to the uses and abuses of leadership; the distribution of power and resources; the movement of individuals seeking safety, security, better resources and perhaps just adventure; and the interactions between different social troops. As time passed, evident parallels emerged between their social, psychological and especially political journeys through the canopy with the journeys we humans make on the ground.

When a calm, confident, socially skilled, adaptable and benevolent, yet firm, leader with an amiable sidekick ruled, internal disputes were easily and quickly settled, the troop sailed through short-lived, homegrown crises, peace was maintained and morale blossomed. A good leader was also able to mobilize collective action during territorial skirmishes, lead a troop into battle against external threats and come out victorious.

In contrast, when a bully was in charge—particularly a bully with no accommodating wingman or cohesive hierarchy to give support—chaos could rule. Watching a bully take over and lead a troop was like watching a bloated, self-serving egotist create mayhem and confusion. With a leader that was often nasty, “off the rails,” full of malice and loaded with active schadenfreude, constantly indulging his dark side and unable or unwilling to curb those leanings, the troop appeared to run on fear, morale suffered, internal strife was an everyday occurrence, territorial disputes were lost, and necessary immigration slid downhill.

While colobus bullies push their troop mates around, human bully-boy leaders persecute or undermine

4)

What is the central idea of the passage?

- ☐ Though the differences between human and non-human primate societies are great, the similarity is disturbingly obvious when it comes to the abuse of leadership.
- ☐ In primate societies, whether human or nonhuman, a leader who's a bloated, self-serving egotist creates mayhem and confusion.
- ☐ The social, psychological, and political parallels between human and non-human primate societies become pronounced when it comes to the abuse of leadership.
- ☐ The similarities between human and non-human primate societies become pronounced politically as a domineering leader creates mayhem and confusion in both societies.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Option [1] is incorrect because it highlights only one similarity about abuse of leadership – the essay talks about social psychological and political parallels. Option [2] misses the parallels altogether. Option [4] is limiting and unspecific in ‘similarities ... become pronounced politically by excluding the general likeness. Option [3] appropriately phrases the central idea of the passage as it mentions the ‘social, psychological, and political parallels.’ and stresses the ‘abuse of leadership.’ Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: 0 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 53 secs

Your Attempt: Skipped

% Students got it correct: 50 %

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

For years I spent my days, from before dawn until after dusk, following a troop of endangered red colobus monkeys around a small West African forest. ... While they are obviously not us, they are far more like us than many people would like to admit. Or as Darwin pronounced almost 150 years ago, “The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind.” The similarities were disturbingly obvious when it came to the uses and abuses of leadership; the distribution of power and resources; the movement of individuals seeking safety, security, better resources and perhaps just adventure; and the interactions between different social troops. As time passed, evident parallels emerged between their social, psychological and especially political journeys through the canopy with the journeys we humans make on the ground.

When a calm, confident, socially skilled, adaptable and benevolent, yet firm, leader with an amiable sidekick ruled, internal disputes were easily and quickly settled, the troop sailed through short-lived, homegrown crises, peace was maintained and morale blossomed. A good leader was also able to mobilize collective action during territorial skirmishes, lead a troop into battle against external threats and come out victorious.

In contrast, when a bully was in charge—particularly a bully with no accommodating wingman or cohesive hierarchy to give support—chaos could rule. Watching a bully take over and lead a troop was like watching a bloated, self-serving egotist create mayhem and confusion. With a leader that was often nasty, “off the rails,” full of malice and loaded with active schadenfreude, constantly indulging his dark side and unable or unwilling to curb those leanings, the troop appeared to run on fear, morale suffered, internal strife was an everyday occurrence, territorial disputes were lost, and necessary immigration slid downhill.

While colobus bullies push their troop mates around, human bully-boy leaders persecute or undermine



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

The two basic classes of information systems can be described by models — the towel model and the jelly model. In the towel model a towel is laid out flat on to a table and a small bowl of ink is placed nearby. A spoonful of ink is taken from the bowl and poured on to the surface of the towel at a specified place. The ink represents the ‘information input’ which can be specified by reference to coordinates taken along the edge of the towel. The information input is recorded as an ink stain. A number of different inputs are made one after another so that the towel comes to bear a number of ink stains. The towel simply records what has happened to it, and since the ink is immediately absorbed by the towel there is, at the end, an accurate record of the inputs.

The towel system is the sort of accurate memory system which one uses in a computer. The incoming information is recorded without being altered in any way. A separate processor then uses this stored information according to its programmed instructions. It is the processor that changes the information around.

In the jelly model the towel is replaced by a large shallow dish of ordinary jelly or gelatine. This time the bowl of ink is heated. When a spoonful of hot ink is poured on to the jelly, it melts the jelly’s surface. However, as the ink cools, it stops melting the jelly. When the cooling ink and melted jelly are poured off a shallow depression is left which marks where the ink was placed, and this depression corresponds to the ink stain in the towel model, as a record of input.

If succeeding spoonfuls of ink are poured on to widely separated parts of the jelly surface, the final result is very much like the towel model, but if the spoonfuls overlap then something quite different happens. Instead of staying exactly where it has been placed, the incoming ink flows into an already existing depression and tends to make it deeper. At the end, instead of having a number of separate depressions, one has a sort of continuous channel which is sculpted into the surface of the jelly, much as a river is sculpted into the landscape.

The difference between the two types of recording system is considerable. With the towel model the ink stays where it is placed, so that, at the end, there is a good record of what has happened.

In the jelly model, however, the ink flows along the channels already formed in the surface.

The jelly model is, therefore, a bad recording system since it

**1) According to the passage, all of the following are true \_ except:**

- ☐ the towel model is best suited to describe how computers work.
- ☒ the towel model is a better recording system than the jelly model. ❌
- ☐ the towel model is not a ‘thinking system’.
- ☐ the jelly model is a pattern-making system.

**Video Explanation:** ▼

**Explanation:** ▼

Option [2] has been mentioned in paragraph 5. Option [3] can be determined from paragraph 7. Option [4] has been mentioned in paragraph 9. There is no information in the passage to tell us that the towel model is best suited to describe how computers work. There may be other models that can do a better job. Hence, [1].

**Correct Answer:** ▼

Time taken by you: **421 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **202 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **52 %**

**2) Which of the following, if true, would seriously undermine the author’s conclusion that the towel model is like an accurate memory system?** —

- ☐ The speed at which the ink spreads depends on the nature of material of the towel.
- ☐ Due to blotting, the ink stains do not stay in place, but actually spread and overlap.
- ☐ In certain cases, the jelly model and the towel model behave almost identically.
- ☒ Ink stains tend to blot and, therefore, spread only slightly. ❌

**Video Explanation:** ▼

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

The two basic classes of information systems can be described by models — the towel model and the jelly model. In the towel model a towel is laid out flat on to a table and a small bowl of ink is placed nearby. A spoonful of ink is taken from the bowl and poured on to the surface of the towel at a specified place. The ink represents the ‘information input’ which can be specified by reference to coordinates taken along the edge of the towel. The information input is recorded as an ink stain. A number of different inputs are made one after another so that the towel comes to bear a number of ink stains. The towel simply records what has happened to it, and since the ink is immediately absorbed by the towel there is, at the end, an accurate record of the inputs.

The towel system is the sort of accurate memory system which one uses in a computer. The incoming information is recorded without being altered in any way. A separate processor then uses this stored information according to its programmed instructions. It is the processor that changes the information around.

In the jelly model the towel is replaced by a large shallow dish of ordinary jelly or gelatine. This time the bowl of ink is heated. When a spoonful of hot ink is poured on to the jelly, it melts the jelly’s surface. However, as the ink cools, it stops melting the jelly. When the cooling ink and melted jelly are poured off a shallow depression is left which marks where the ink was placed, and this depression corresponds to the ink stain in the towel model, as a record of input.

If succeeding spoonfuls of ink are poured on to widely separated parts of the jelly surface, the final result is very much like the towel model, but if the spoonfuls overlap then something quite different happens. Instead of staying exactly where it has been placed, the incoming ink flows into an already existing depression and tends to make it deeper. At the end, instead of having a number of separate depressions, one has a sort of continuous channel which is sculpted into the surface of the jelly, much as a river is sculpted into the landscape.

The difference between the two types of recording system is considerable. With the towel model the ink stays where it is placed, so that, at the end, there is a good record of what has happened.

In the jelly model, however, the ink flows along the channels already formed in the surface.

The jelly model is, therefore, a bad recording system since it

The author says that the towel model is like an accurate memory system, in which information does not overlap. The speed at which the ink spreads does not make a difference to how accurately it can be recorded. So, option [1] is incorrect. Option [3] is incorrect as it considers only some cases-- this does not completely weaken the argument. Option [4] is incorrect as the fact that the ink stains spread slightly does not imply that information is not recorded accurately. However, if the stains overlap, they can’t be likened to an accurate memory system; therefore, option 2 seriously undermines the towel model. Hence, [2]

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: 112 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 61 secs

Your Attempt: Wrong

% Students got it correct: 78 %

3) Which one of the following statements cannot be inferred from the information given in the passage?

- ☐ The towel system can be used to collect raw data.
- ☐ In the towel system, all inputs are independent of each other.
- ☐ In the jelly model, new inputs react with the previous inputs to arrive at a final outcome.
- ☒ The jelly model is an accurate memory system. ✓

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

Option [1] can be inferred from the second line of the paragraph 2. Option [2] can be inferred from the last line of the passage. Option [3] can be inferred from the first line of paragraph 6. Option [4] is contrary to the passage. It is the towel model that is described to be an accurate memory system. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: 150 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 60 secs

% Students got it correct: **88 %**

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

The two basic classes of information systems can be described by models — the towel model and the jelly model. In the towel model a towel is laid out flat on to a table and a small bowl of ink is placed nearby. A spoonful of ink is taken from the bowl and poured on to the surface of the towel at a specified place. The ink represents the ‘information input’ which can be specified by reference to coordinates taken along the edge of the towel. The information input is recorded as an ink stain. A number of different inputs are made one after another so that the towel comes to bear a number of ink stains. The towel simply records what has happened to it, and since the ink is immediately absorbed by the towel there is, at the end, an accurate record of the inputs.

The towel system is the sort of accurate memory system which one uses in a computer. The incoming information is recorded without being altered in any way. A separate processor then uses this stored information according to its programmed instructions. It is the processor that changes the information around.

In the jelly model the towel is replaced by a large shallow dish of ordinary jelly or gelatine. This time the bowl of ink is heated. When a spoonful of hot ink is poured on to the jelly, it melts the jelly’s surface. However, as the ink cools, it stops melting the jelly. When the cooling ink and melted jelly are poured off a shallow depression is left which marks where the ink was placed, and this depression corresponds to the ink stain in the towel model, as a record of input.

If succeeding spoonfuls of ink are poured on to widely separated parts of the jelly surface, the final result is very much like the towel model, but if the spoonfuls overlap then something quite different happens. Instead of staying exactly where it has been placed, the incoming ink flows into an already existing depression and tends to make it deeper. At the end, instead of having a number of separate depressions, one has a sort of continuous channel which is sculpted into the surface of the jelly, much as a river is sculpted into the landscape.

The difference between the two types of recording system is considerable. With the towel model the ink stays where it is placed, so that, at the end, there is a good record of what has happened.

In the jelly model, however, the ink flows along the channels already formed in the surface.

The jelly model is, therefore, a bad recording system since it

**4) Which one of the following is not necessarily true regarding the pattern making system?**

- ☐ The pattern making system records and processes the information simultaneously.
- ☐ The pattern making system relies on the probability of events being determinable.
- ☒ The pattern making system is a widely used information system. ✓
- ☐ The pattern making system is a ‘thinking system’.

**Video Explanation:** ▼

**Explanation:** ▼

Option [1] has been explained in the last paragraph with the example of the jelly model. Option [2] can be determined from the definition of pattern given in paragraph 7. The jelly model that has been described as a “thinking system” in paragraph 6 is also a pattern making system, according to the information given in the last paragraph. Thus, option [4] is also correct. There is no information given in the passage regarding the popularity of the pattern making system. So, option [3] is not correct. Hence, [3].

**Correct Answer:** ▼

Time taken by you: **109 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **72 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

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

The two basic classes of information systems can be described by models — the towel model and the jelly model. In the towel model a towel is laid out flat on to a table and a small bowl of ink is placed nearby. A spoonful of ink is taken from the bowl and poured on to the surface of the towel at a specified place. The ink represents the ‘information input’ which can be specified by reference to coordinates taken along the edge of the towel. The information input is recorded as an ink stain. A number of different inputs are made one after another so that the towel comes to bear a number of ink stains. The towel simply records what has happened to it, and since the ink is immediately absorbed by the towel there is, at the end, an accurate record of the inputs.

The towel system is the sort of accurate memory system which one uses in a computer. The incoming information is recorded without being altered in any way. A separate processor then uses this stored information according to its programmed instructions. It is the processor that changes the information around.

In the jelly model the towel is replaced by a large shallow dish of ordinary jelly or gelatine. This time the bowl of ink is heated. When a spoonful of hot ink is poured on to the jelly, it melts the jelly’s surface. However, as the ink cools, it stops melting the jelly. When the cooling ink and melted jelly are poured off a shallow depression is left which marks where the ink was placed, and this depression corresponds to the ink stain in the towel model, as a record of input.

If succeeding spoonfuls of ink are poured on to widely separated parts of the jelly surface, the final result is very much like the towel model, but if the spoonfuls overlap then something quite different happens. Instead of staying exactly where it has been placed, the incoming ink flows into an already existing depression and tends to make it deeper. At the end, instead of having a number of separate depressions, one has a sort of continuous channel which is sculpted into the surface of the jelly, much as a river is sculpted into the landscape.

The difference between the two types of recording system is considerable. With the towel model the ink stays where it is placed, so that, at the end, there is a good record of what has happened.

In the jelly model, however, the ink flows along the channels already formed in the surface.

The jelly model is, therefore, a bad recording system since it

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

When you have a vague feeling that you have already experienced the present situation before, it is called déjà vu.

Various studies indicate that 50 to 90 percent of us can recall having had at least one such déjà vu incident in our lives. A few people sense the inverse of déjà vu, called jamais vu. When they encounter a familiar person or place, they nonetheless insist they have never seen the individual or scene before.

For much of the 20th century, psychiatrists espoused a Freudian-based explanation of déjà vu – that it is an attempt to recall suppressed memories. This ‘paramnesia’ theory suggests that the original event was somehow linked to distress and was being suppressed from conscious recognition, no longer accessible to memory. Therefore, a similar occurrence later could not elicit clear recall yet would somehow ‘remind’ the ego of the original event, creating an uneasy familiarity.

Many who have experienced déjà vu share the conviction that the phenomenon must arise from some mystical power or as a sign of a past life and reincarnation. They reason that because logical thought and clear perception reign immediately before and after an episode, some paranormal force must be the only plausible explanation.

Scientists, unsatisfied with such conjecture, have long sought clues about the physical causes behind déjà vu, but investigation has proved elusive, because déjà vu never announces itself in advance. Scientists have been forced to rely mostly on the recollections of test subjects. But enough accounts have been examined to allow experts to start defining what déjà vu is and why it arises.

Cognitive psychologists have paid special attention to the unconscious process which is responsible for so-called implicit, or nondeclarative, memories. These are artefacts that we have long forgotten and do not retrieve consciously, although they have not been erased from our neural networks. Consider seeing an old cupboard at a flea market, and suddenly it seems strangely familiar, as does the act of viewing it. What you may have forgotten – or, rather, cannot retrieve – is that when you were a young child, your grandparents had a cupboard just like this one in their home.

A related theory implies that we may perceive a person, place or event as familiar if at some earlier time in our lives we were exposed to just a partial aspect of the experience, even if it was within a different context. Perhaps, when you were young, your parents stopped at a flea market while on vacation and one vendor was selling old kitchen cupboards. Or perhaps you smell an odour that was also present at that flea market you attended as a child. A single element, only partially registered consciously, can trigger a feeling of familiarity by erroneously transferring itself to the present setting.

These assumptions, which are founded on the unconscious processing of information, ultimately place responsibility for déjà vu on gaps in our attention system. Let’s say you’re driving down a hectic street and are

1) According to the passage, which of the following experiences would definitely not count as déjà vu? —

- ☐ On meeting your new neighbour, you realize that she is an old school friend of yours, but you simply cannot recall her name.
- ☐ On meeting a new colleague, you think that you have seen him before; later on, you find out that you met him once when you were a very small child.
- ☐ While exploring a town you have never been to before, you see a building that you feel you have seen already, even though you know you have never been there till now.
- ☐ You see a painting which looks strangely familiar; later on, you realize that a small part of it used to be featured on the wrapper of a brand of chocolate you used to eat as a child.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Options [2], [3] and [4] qualify as déjà vu. [2] is a type of situation similar to the one mentioned in paragraph 6. [3] is a typical example of déjà vu, like the one described in paragraph 1. [4] is an example of the ‘partial aspect of the experience’ theory explained in paragraph 7. But [1] is not an example of déjà vu, as there is no ‘vague sense of having encountered a situation before’ – you have already recognized the woman, you have difficulty only in remembering her name. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: 0 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 252 secs

Your Attempt: Skipped

% Students got it correct: 73 %

2) Which of the following statements about déjà vu, is not true in the light of the passage? —

- ☒ The Freudian theory had negative emotions as its basis. ✖
- ☐ An alert memory when superimposed on a distracted one may cause the feeling of déjà vu.
- ☐ Implicit memories have not been erased from our neural networks.
- ☐ Scientists have discounted the physical causes underlying déjà vu.

Video Explanation: ▼



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

When you have a vague feeling that you have already experienced the present situation before, it is called déjà vu.

Various studies indicate that 50 to 90 percent of us can recall having had at least one such déjà vu incident in our lives. A few people sense the inverse of déjà vu, called jamais vu. When they encounter a familiar person or place, they nonetheless insist they have never seen the individual or scene before.

For much of the 20th century, psychiatrists espoused a Freudian-based explanation of déjà vu – that it is an attempt to recall suppressed memories. This ‘paramnesia’ theory suggests that the original event was somehow linked to distress and was being suppressed from conscious recognition, no longer accessible to memory. Therefore, a similar occurrence later could not elicit clear recall yet would somehow ‘remind’ the ego of the original event, creating an uneasy familiarity.

Many who have experienced déjà vu share the conviction that the phenomenon must arise from some mystical power or as a sign of a past life and reincarnation. They reason that because logical thought and clear perception reign immediately before and after an episode, some paranormal force must be the only plausible explanation.

Scientists, unsatisfied with such conjecture, have long sought clues about the physical causes behind déjà vu, but investigation has proved elusive, because déjà vu never announces itself in advance. Scientists have been forced to rely mostly on the recollections of test subjects. But enough accounts have been examined to allow experts to start defining what déjà vu is and why it arises.

Cognitive psychologists have paid special attention to the unconscious process which is responsible for so-called implicit, or nondeclarative, memories. These are artefacts that we have long forgotten and do not retrieve consciously, although they have not been erased from our neural networks. Consider seeing an old cupboard at a flea market, and suddenly it seems strangely familiar, as does the act of viewing it. What you may have forgotten – or, rather, cannot retrieve – is that when you were a young child, your grandparents had a cupboard just like this one in their home.

A related theory implies that we may perceive a person, place or event as familiar if at some earlier time in our lives we were exposed to just a partial aspect of the experience, even if it was within a different context. Perhaps, when you were young, your parents stopped at a flea market while on vacation and one vendor was selling old kitchen cupboards. Or perhaps you smell an odour that was also present at that flea market you attended as a child. A single element, only partially registered consciously, can trigger a feeling of familiarity by erroneously transferring itself to the present setting.

These assumptions, which are founded on the unconscious processing of information, ultimately place responsibility for déjà vu on gaps in our attention system. Let’s say you’re driving down a hectic street and are

Refer to paragraph 3 – since distress and suppression are the basis of the Freudian theory, option [1] is correct. Option [2] can be inferred from the last two sentences of the last paragraph. Refer to the sixth paragraph where option [3] is stated. But [4] is wrong – scientists have sought clues about the physical causes of déjà vu, but option [4] incorrectly suggests *dismissal* through using the word ‘discounted’. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: 44 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 77 secs

Your Attempt: Wrong

% Students got it correct: 60 %

3)

According to the passage, which of these conditions is necessary for an experience to be considered a déjà vu?

- ☐ The incident which seems familiar must be rooted in some disturbing memory.
- ☐ Your thoughts must remain clear and logical throughout the incident.
- ☒ Even while seeing a familiar object, you must feel that you have never seen it before.
- ☐ You know you’ve encountered a similar situation before, but not when.

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

The Freudian theory about déjà vu suggests that an incident which evokes a sensation must be rooted in a disturbing memory, but this has not been stated as a definite characteristic of déjà vu. So, [1] is wrong. Refer to paragraph 4: logical thought characterizes the period before and after a déjà vu episode, not during; this makes option 2 incorrect. Option [3] is not déjà vu at all, but an incident of jamais vu, as explained in paragraph 2. Option [4] is one of the defining characteristics of déjà vu: “We experience a vague sense of having encountered a situation before, identical in every detail, even though we can’t say when the first event took place.” Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: 61 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 51 secs

Your Attempt: Wrong

% Students got it correct: 60 %

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

When you have a vague feeling that you have already experienced the present situation before, it is called déjà vu.

Various studies indicate that 50 to 90 percent of us can recall having had at least one such déjà vu incident in our lives. A few people sense the inverse of déjà vu, called jamais vu. When they encounter a familiar person or place, they nonetheless insist they have never seen the individual or scene before.

For much of the 20th century, psychiatrists espoused a Freudian-based explanation of déjà vu – that it is an attempt to recall suppressed memories. This ‘paramnesia’ theory suggests that the original event was somehow linked to distress and was being suppressed from conscious recognition, no longer accessible to memory. Therefore, a similar occurrence later could not elicit clear recall yet would somehow ‘remind’ the ego of the original event, creating an uneasy familiarity.

Many who have experienced déjà vu share the conviction that the phenomenon must arise from some mystical power or as a sign of a past life and reincarnation. They reason that because logical thought and clear perception reign immediately before and after an episode, some paranormal force must be the only plausible explanation.

Scientists, unsatisfied with such conjecture, have long sought clues about the physical causes behind déjà vu, but investigation has proved elusive, because déjà vu never announces itself in advance. Scientists have been forced to rely mostly on the recollections of test subjects. But enough accounts have been examined to allow experts to start defining what déjà vu is and why it arises.

Cognitive psychologists have paid special attention to the unconscious process which is responsible for so-called implicit, or nondeclarative, memories. These are artefacts that we have long forgotten and do not retrieve consciously, although they have not been erased from our neural networks. Consider seeing an old cupboard at a flea market, and suddenly it seems strangely familiar, as does the act of viewing it. What you may have forgotten – or, rather, cannot retrieve – is that when you were a young child, your grandparents had a cupboard just like this one in their home.

A related theory implies that we may perceive a person, place or event as familiar if at some earlier time in our lives we were exposed to just a partial aspect of the experience, even if it was within a different context. Perhaps, when you were young, your parents stopped at a flea market while on vacation and one vendor was selling old kitchen cupboards. Or perhaps you smell an odour that was also present at that flea market you attended as a child. A single element, only partially registered consciously, can trigger a feeling of familiarity by erroneously transferring itself to the present setting.

These assumptions, which are founded on the unconscious processing of information, ultimately place responsibility for déjà vu on gaps in our attention system. Let’s say you’re driving down a hectic street and are

4) —

Which of the following, if true, would cast most doubt on the explanation given for the déjà vu experience in the last paragraph?

☐

Your first glance at the woman lasted no more than a fraction of a second.

☒

The time lapse between the two glances is too short to allow a long-term memory to form. ✗

☐

Your feeling of familiarity applies more to the woman’s gait than to her appearance.

☐

You were really young when you had the experience.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

The déjà vu experience in the last paragraph is explained thus: a first, fleeting glance, which does not produce a conscious impression, followed by a more detailed look, produce the déjà vu experience. So [1] would support, not contradict this explanation. According to the last line of the passage, the impression of a long-term memory here is a false one, so [2] is not really an issue. But [3] casts some doubt on the idea that the previous, unconscious look causes the feeling of familiarity, as the woman does not start walking until you stop at the traffic light (which is when you look at her for the second time). Option [4] is irrelevant, as one’s age has not been stated to be a factor affecting the experience either way. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: **357 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **39 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

Loading...

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

Decades before the rise of social media, polarization plagued discussions about language. By and large, it still does. Everyone who cares about the topic is officially required to take one of two stances. Either you smugly preen about the mistakes you find abhorrent – this makes you a so-called prescriptivist – or you show off your knowledge of language change, and poke holes in the prescriptivists' facts – this makes you a descriptivist. Group membership is mandatory, and the two are mutually exclusive.

Language changes all the time. Some changes really are chaotic, and disruptive. Take *decimate*, a prescriptivist shibboleth. It comes from the old Roman practice of punishing a mutinous legion by killing every 10th soldier (hence that deci- root). Now we don't often need a word for destroying exactly a 10th of something – this is the 'etymological fallacy', the idea that a word must mean exactly what its component roots indicate. But it is useful to have a word that means to destroy a sizeable proportion of something. Yet many people have extended the meaning of *decimate* until now it means something approaching 'to wipe out utterly'.

Descriptivists – that is, virtually all academic linguists – will point out that semantic creep is how languages work. It's just something words do: look up virtually any nontechnical word in the great historical Oxford English Dictionary (OED), which lists a word's senses in historical order. You'll see things such as the extension of *decimate* happening again and again and again. Words won't sit still. The prescriptivist position, offered one linguist, is like taking a snapshot of the surface of the ocean and insisting that's how ocean surfaces must look.

Be that as it may, retort prescriptivists, but that doesn't make it any less annoying. *Decimate* doesn't have a good synonym in its traditional meaning (to destroy a portion of), and it has lots of company in its new meaning: *destroy*, *annihilate*, *devastate* and so on. If *decimate* eventually settles on this latter meaning, we lose a unique word and gain nothing. People who use it the old way and people who use it the new way can also confuse each other.

1)

Which of the following is the central idea of the passage?

- ☐ Discussions about language change often center around the contextual origin of words.
- ☐ Prescriptivist and descriptivist linguists often differ in that the former insists on retaining words as they are while the latter keeps building words by adding new meanings and structures.
- ☐ The prescriptivist and descriptivist approaches often offer completely different and incompatible perspectives on the evolution of language.
- ☐ Although descriptivist and prescriptivist perspectives were at odds before the rise of the social media, they have now reconciled on the varied aspects of language change.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Option 1 is used by the author to substantiate the central premise of merely paragraph 2, which roughly outlines the evolution of the word '*decimate*', and is therefore not the correct option. Option 2 cannot be the central premise of the passage because there is no claim anywhere in the passage that descriptivists add new to words. Option 4 too is a choice that is contradicted in the first two sentences of paragraph 1. Central idea of the passage is incorporated in the first paragraph itself: "Decades before the rise of social media, polarisation plagued discussions about language. By and large, it still does." Paragraph 3 states that *descriptivists, (most academic linguists) accept that language is dynamic and that 'semantic creep' is how language works*. In other words, descriptivists accept the change in meaning that a word goes through over time. However, prescriptivists do not accept this point of view. It's stated in paragraph 4 that they find this evolution 'annoying'. Also, they decry the merging of the meaning of '*decimate*' with other that of words like '*destroy*', by which the language loses a word that can otherwise bring greater precision to communication. Thus, option 3 best expresses the central idea of the passage. Hence, [3].

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

Decades before the rise of social media, polarization plagued discussions about language. By and large, it still does. Everyone who cares about the topic is officially required to take one of two stances. Either you smugly preen about the mistakes you find abhorrent – this makes you a so-called prescriptivist – or you show off your knowledge of language change, and poke holes in the prescriptivists' facts – this makes you a descriptivist. Group membership is mandatory, and the two are mutually exclusive.

Language changes all the time. Some changes really are chaotic, and disruptive. Take *decimate*, a prescriptivist shibboleth. It comes from the old Roman practice of punishing a mutinous legion by killing every 10th soldier (hence that deci- root). Now we don't often need a word for destroying exactly a 10th of something – this is the 'etymological fallacy', the idea that a word must mean exactly what its component roots indicate. But it is useful to have a word that means to destroy a sizeable proportion of something. Yet many people have extended the meaning of *decimate* until now it means something approaching 'to wipe out utterly'.

Descriptivists – that is, virtually all academic linguists – will point out that semantic creep is how languages work. It's just something words do: look up virtually any nontechnical word in the great historical Oxford English Dictionary (OED), which lists a word's senses in historical order. You'll see things such as the extension of *decimate* happening again and again and again. Words won't sit still. The prescriptivist position, offered one linguist, is like taking a snapshot of the surface of the ocean and insisting that's how ocean surfaces must look.

Be that as it may, retort prescriptivists, but that doesn't make it any less annoying. *Decimate* doesn't have a good synonym in its traditional meaning (to destroy a portion of), and it has lots of company in its new meaning: *destroy*, *annihilate*, *devastate* and so on. If *decimate* eventually settles on this latter meaning, we lose a unique word and gain nothing. People who use it the old way and people who use it the new way can also confuse each other.

Time taken by you: 0 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 98 secs

Your Attempt: Skipped

% Students got it correct: 31 %

2) Based on the passage all of the following statements about the word *decimate* are true, EXCEPT:

- ☒ Obliterate is synonymous with the original meaning of *decimate*. ✓
- ☐ The word *decimate* has assumed different meanings over time.
- ☐ Part of the original meaning of *decimate* refers to the number ten.
- ☐ Its original meaning has limited relevance in contemporary usage.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Option 2 is not the right choice because most of paragraph 2 centers on the varying meanings of *decimate*. Option 3 is not the right choice either, because sentence 3 of paragraph 2 traces the word to its root "deci" and explains its meaning from its Roman origin. Option 4 is supported by sentence 4 in Para 2: "Now we don't often need a word for destroying exactly a 10th of something – this is the 'etymological fallacy', the idea that a word must mean exactly what its component roots indicate."

Hence, Option 1 is the exception. 2<sup>nd</sup> Sentence in paragraph 3 states that there isn't a good synonym for the original meaning of *decimate*. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: 467 secs

Avg Time taken by all students: 88 secs

% Students got it correct: 80 %

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

Decades before the rise of social media, polarization plagued discussions about language. By and large, it still does. Everyone who cares about the topic is officially required to take one of two stances. Either you smugly preen about the mistakes you find abhorrent – this makes you a so-called prescriptivist – or you show off your knowledge of language change, and poke holes in the prescriptivists' facts – this makes you a descriptivist. Group membership is mandatory, and the two are mutually exclusive.

Language changes all the time. Some changes really are chaotic, and disruptive. Take *decimate*, a prescriptivist shibboleth. It comes from the old Roman practice of punishing a mutinous legion by killing every 10th soldier (hence that deci- root). Now we don't often need a word for destroying exactly a 10th of something – this is the 'etymological fallacy', the idea that a word must mean exactly what its component roots indicate. But it is useful to have a word that means to destroy a sizeable proportion of something. Yet many people have extended the meaning of *decimate* until now it means something approaching 'to wipe out utterly'.

Descriptivists – that is, virtually all academic linguists – will point out that semantic creep is how languages work. It's just something words do: look up virtually any nontechnical word in the great historical Oxford English Dictionary (OED), which lists a word's senses in historical order. You'll see things such as the extension of *decimate* happening again and again and again. Words won't sit still. The prescriptivist position, offered one linguist, is like taking a snapshot of the surface of the ocean and insisting that's how ocean surfaces must look.

Be that as it may, retort prescriptivists, but that doesn't make it any less annoying. *Decimate* doesn't have a good synonym in its traditional meaning (to destroy a portion of), and it has lots of company in its new meaning: *destroy*, *annihilate*, *devastate* and so on. If *decimate* eventually settles on this latter meaning, we lose a unique word and gain nothing. People who use it the old way and people who use it the new way can also confuse each other.

3) Which of the following would refute what the author is saying about descriptivists?

- ☐ Descriptivists believe that the contemporary meaning or usage of a word may be radically different from the original form or meaning of a word.
- ☐ Descriptivists engage in understanding words diachronically i.e. how it changes or develops over time.
- ☐ Descriptivists agree that the component root of a word must be retained even as the word takes on newer meanings.
- ☐ Descriptivists flaunt their knowledge about how the connotations and usage of words has altered over time.

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

Options 1 and 2 rephrase what the author explains in paragraph 3 that talks about the descriptivists' position on semantic creep, and how the sense/meaning of words changes in historical order. Option 4 summarizes what the author says in Paragraph 1, sentence 4: "...or you show off your knowledge of language change...this makes you a descriptivist". Options 1, 2 and 4 are all in agreement with what the author states in the passage about descriptivists. However, option 3 refutes this; refer to paragraph 1: "Group membership is mandatory, and the two are mutually exclusive." Put simply, descriptivists do not agree on preserving the etymological root of a word. According to the author, prescriptivists like to hold on to the original root of language while descriptivists prefer to study how it changes. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: 0 secs



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

Decades before the rise of social media, polarization plagued discussions about language. By and large, it still does. Everyone who cares about the topic is officially required to take one of two stances. Either you smugly preen about the mistakes you find abhorrent – this makes you a so-called prescriptivist – or you show off your knowledge of language change, and poke holes in the prescriptivists' facts – this makes you a descriptivist. Group membership is mandatory, and the two are mutually exclusive.

Language changes all the time. Some changes really are chaotic, and disruptive. Take *decimate*, a prescriptivist shibboleth. It comes from the old Roman practice of punishing a mutinous legion by killing every 10th soldier (hence that deci- root). Now we don't often need a word for destroying exactly a 10th of something – this is the 'etymological fallacy', the idea that a word must mean exactly what its component roots indicate. But it is useful to have a word that means to destroy a sizeable proportion of something. Yet many people have extended the meaning of *decimate* until now it means something approaching 'to wipe out utterly'.

Descriptivists – that is, virtually all academic linguists – will point out that semantic creep is how languages work. It's just something words do: look up virtually any nontechnical word in the great historical Oxford English Dictionary (OED), which lists a word's senses in historical order. You'll see things such as the extension of *decimate* happening again and again and again. Words won't sit still. The prescriptivist position, offered one linguist, is like taking a snapshot of the surface of the ocean and insisting that's how ocean surfaces must look.

Be that as it may, retort prescriptivists, but that doesn't make it any less annoying. *Decimate* doesn't have a good synonym in its traditional meaning (to destroy a portion of), and it has lots of company in its new meaning: *destroy*, *annihilate*, *devastate* and so on. If *decimate* eventually settles on this latter meaning, we lose a unique word and gain nothing. People who use it the old way and people who use it the new way can also confuse each other.

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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

4) What does 'shibboleth' in the sentence, "Take *decimate*, a prescriptivist shibboleth" stand for?

- ☐ A word that has been overused by members of a particular group.
- ☐ A word known and used distinctively by a particular group of people.
- ☐ A word which is marked by chaotic and disruptive change.
- ☐ A word consciously coined by linguists based on historical practices.

Video Explanation: ▼

Explanation: ▼

Since the phrase "prescriptivist shibboleth" is used to describe the word *decimate*, it is best to understand the word vis-a-vis what the passage says about *decimate*- Option 1 is an incorrect choice because nowhere does the passage say that *decimate* is 'overused' by any particular group. Likewise, Options 3 and 4 are incorrect too-- neither is *decimate* marked by chaotic or disruptive changes, nor is it a word that was consciously coined by linguists. Only option 2 remains. The validity of it can further be confirmed from paragraph 2, which goes on to describe how prescriptivists use a certain word, i.e. *decimate* differently from the other linguistic group, the descriptivists. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer: ▼

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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

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

Decades before the rise of social media, polarization plagued discussions about language. By and large, it still does. Everyone who cares about the topic is officially required to take one of two stances. Either you smugly preen about the mistakes you find abhorrent – this makes you a so-called prescriptivist – or you show off your knowledge of language change, and poke holes in the prescriptivists' facts – this makes you a descriptivist. Group membership is mandatory, and the two are mutually exclusive.

Language changes all the time. Some changes really are chaotic, and disruptive. Take *decimate*, a prescriptivist shibboleth. It comes from the old Roman practice of punishing a mutinous legion by killing every 10th soldier (hence that deci- root). Now we don't often need a word for destroying exactly a 10th of something – this is the 'etymological fallacy', the idea that a word must mean exactly what its component roots indicate. But it is useful to have a word that means to destroy a sizeable proportion of something. Yet many people have extended the meaning of *decimate* until now it means something approaching 'to wipe out utterly'.

Descriptivists – that is, virtually all academic linguists – will point out that semantic creep is how languages work. It's just something words do: look up virtually any nontechnical word in the great historical Oxford English Dictionary (OED), which lists a word's senses in historical order. You'll see things such as the extension of *decimate* happening again and again and again. Words won't sit still. The prescriptivist position, offered one linguist, is like taking a snapshot of the surface of the ocean and insisting that's how ocean surfaces must look.

Be that as it may, retort prescriptivists, but that doesn't make it any less annoying. *Decimate* doesn't have a good synonym in its traditional meaning (to destroy a portion of), and it has lots of company in its new meaning: *destroy*, *annihilate*, *devastate* and so on. If *decimate* eventually settles on this latter meaning, we lose a unique word and gain nothing. People who use it the old way and people who use it the new way can also confuse each other.

**Answer the question based on the reasoning contained in the brief passage.**

Reading has always been different from writing. Writing prioritizes sound, as the spoken word must be transformed or deconstructed into representative sign(s). Reading, however, prioritizes meaning. The faculty of reading has, in fact, very little to do with the skill of writing.

Which of the following, if true, weakens the above argument the most?

- ☐ Meaning is not different from its representative sign.
- ☐ One cannot read anything that hasn't been written in the first place.
- ☐ It is not possible to write anything coherent without paying at least some attention to the meaning.
- ☐ In languages such as Chinese, the script is based on the meaning of the words, not their sound.

**Explanation:**

The given argument states that reading and writing are very different activities and not closely connected at all, with reading focused on meaning and writing focused on sound. Option [4] challenges this dichotomy, but only for specific languages like Chinese, not all languages. [3] makes a similar point, but a phrase like ‘at least some attention’ makes it rather vague and feeble. The argument claims that writing ‘prioritizes’ sound, not that it doesn’t pay any attention to meaning. In [2], it is not necessarily the same person who does both the reading and the writing, so it does not really affect the argument. But the opposite is true in [1] – a person who can write must, of necessity, also be able to read, so the two abilities are inextricably intertwined. This weakens the argument that the two have little to do with each other. Hence, [1].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **37 secs**

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

% Students got it correct: **24 %**





**Answer the question based on the reasoning contained in the brief passage.**

There is a theory of emotions, which came from Aristotle but was elaborated and made famous by Freud. It is catharsis – certain events initiate a psychological purging process, through which fear and anxiety and sadness are released, and we feel better, calmer and purified afterward. We suffer through the aversive experiences, then, because of the positive payoff at the end – for the release. Perhaps this happens sometimes – there are people who claim to feel better after a good cry – but catharsis is a poor theory of the emotions, one that has no scientific support. It is just not true that emotional experiences have a purging effect. To take a much-studied case, watching a violent movie doesn't put one in a relaxed and pacifistic state of mind – it arouses the viewer. People don't leave horror movies feeling mellow and safe; they don't walk out of tragedies feeling happy. The typical result of feeling bad is feeling worse, not feeling better. The pleasure of horror and tragedy, for example, can't be explained as some sort of blissful afterglow.

Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the author's case against catharsis as a theory of emotions?

- ☐ Studies have shown that people who regularly watch horror movies are less likely to be nervous or easily spooked.
- ☐ One's emotions are not as engaged while watching fiction, like violent or tragic movies, as they are while seeing violence or tragedy in real life.
- ☐ In the immediate aftermath of watching a violent movie, one may feel worse, but in the long term, the experience makes one more peaceable.
- ☐ The cathartic effect of watching horror or tragedy does not necessarily involve experiencing the exact opposite emotion, but rather experiencing some positive emotion.

**Explanation:**

Catharsis, as defined in the paragraph, involves the purging of negative emotions through watching or experiencing negative events. There is no such cause-effect relation mentioned in statement [1] – the two may be unrelated or the cause-effect relation may be the other way around, i.e. people who are not nervous by nature may be more inclined to watch horror movies. Statement [2] fails to state whether seeing violence or tragedy in real life does in fact result in catharsis, so it is irrelevant. While [4] does point out a possible loophole in the author's argument, it does not state whether people actually do experience some positive emotion after watching horror or tragedy. Only [3] directly weakens the argument, by showing that the cathartic effects of watching violence may not be obvious in the short term, but they do show up in the long term. Hence, [3].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **48 secs**

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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



**Answer the question based on the reasoning contained in the brief passage.**

Ramesh is clearly an incompetent Sales Manager. His team has met its monthly sales target only once in the last twelve months. Every other team in the company has met its monthly sales targets in at least six of the past twelve months.

Which one of the following, if true, most seriously weakens the argument above?

- ☐ The Sales Chief assigns Ramesh only the most difficult territories, ones in which others have failed to meet monthly targets even once.
- ☐ Before he became a Sales Manager, Ramesh was an insurance salesman and was highly regarded by the residents of the neighbourhoods he covered.
- ☐ Sales Managers of the company in which Ramesh serves are provided with extensive resources, including the use of a large computer database, to help them generate customer leads.
- ☐ Many of the salespersons in Ramesh's team have left in the last six months.

**Explanation:**

[2] is irrelevant to the argument presented, as it pertains to Ramesh's previous job, not his current one. [3] is neutral since all Sales Managers, including Ramesh, have access to the computer database. [4] may be a reason for Ramesh's team not meeting targets in the last six months, but fails to account for the six months prior to that. [1] gives the reason as to why Ramesh's team is apparently performing poorly as compared to other teams: the team has been given the most difficult territory. This weakens the argument that Ramesh is incompetent. Hence, [1].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **79 secs**

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

% Students got it correct: **78 %**





**Answer the question based on the reasoning contained in the brief passage.**

On March 15, 2019, school students across the rich world walked out of classrooms and took to the streets to call for action against climate change. They are inspired by 16-year-old Swedish activist Greta Thunberg, who blasts the media and political leaders for ignoring global warming and wants us to “panic.” Although the students’ passion is admirable, their focus is misguided. This is largely the fault of adults, who must take responsibility for frightening children unnecessarily about climate change. It is little wonder that kids are scared when grown-ups paint such a horrific picture of global warming.

Which of the following is an assumption underlying the author’s argument?

- ☐ The youth in poor countries are not climate-alarmists.
- ☐ Politicians and media have prioritized climate change.
- ☐ Global warming is nowhere near a catastrophe.
- ☐ Climate change is currently the lowest priority of adults.

**Explanation:**

The argument states that “this is largely the fault of adults ... frightening children *unnecessarily* about climate change”. It is little wonder that kids are scared when grown-ups paint *such a horrific picture of global warming*. The author tends to assume that the situation is not alarming. Hence, option 3 is sustainable. Options 1, 2 and 4 are data inadequate. Hence, [3].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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



**The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author's position. Key in your answer by using the virtual keyboard provided below.**

Stem cells from the umbilical cord blood are young and unexposed to the external environment. These stem cells are capable of differentiating and regenerating into different types of cells in the human body. They have the potential to treat life-threatening diseases including blood-related and oncological disorders. 3654 clinical trials are in progress across the world around the application of stem cells for the treatment of various diseases. In India there are 31 on-going clinical trials that delve into the usage of stem cell therapy for curing diseases. Cord blood stem cells are used in treating over 80 blood diseases including Sickle Cell Disease, Thalassemia and forms of cancers such as Leukaemia and Myeloma.

- 1 Cord blood stem cells, which regenerate into different types of cells, are used in treating life-threatening diseases including blood-related and oncological disorders.
2. In clinical trials across the world, embryonic stem cells have proved crucial in treating life-threatening blood-disorders and cancers.
3. Cord blood stem cells, which regenerate without differentiation, are used widely in stem cell therapy against life-threatening diseases including blood disorders and cancers.
4. Stem cells form the umbilical cord blood, which have the potential to treat life-threatening blood disorders and cancers, are widely used in clinical trials in India and across the world.

**Explanation:**

This is a fact based paragraph – hence, this is a straightforward summary question. The paragraph explains that Cord blood stem cells are young and unexposed, they regenerate into different types of cells; they have the potential to treat life-threatening diseases including blood disorder and cancer. They are used in treating these diseases. Option 1 best summarizes these ideas. Option 3 is incorrect in saying that they “regenerate without differentiation” - this is contrary to their ability to differentiate and regenerate. Option 2 is problematic due to the phrase, “embryonic stem cells”, in place of stems cells drawn from the umbilical cord blood. Option 4 limits itself to clinical trials alone, whereas the paragraph is also about ... and forms of cancers.” Hence, [1].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **64 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **40 secs**

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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





**The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author's position. Key in your answer by using the virtual keyboard provided below.**

The Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Zizek makes a striking observation about the difference between fascism and communism. In fascism — think of Adolf Hitler or Benito Mussolini — when the supreme leader finishes his speech, his body seeks to embody a theatrical gravitas. The leader stares into the crowds and his hands barely move as he soaks in the wave of applause. He never betrays the mask of virility that he carefully adorns. In contrast, under communism — think of Joseph Stalin, Xi Jinping, or Kim Jong Un — the supreme leader joins in the bonhomie. His hands applaud freely and his body seeks to project conviviality to further the claim that he too is merely a fellow party worker, never hinting at the vast authoritarian powers he oversees.

1. According to Slovoj Zizek while fascism expects complete subservience from people, communism pretends conviviality for promoting the authoritarian state.
2. While in communism the supreme leader may pretend to identify himself with the crowds to hide his authoritarian powers, in fascism he makes no such pretenses of camaraderie.
3. While a supreme communist leader never betrays the mask of virility that he adorns, fascist authoritarian leaders pretend conviviality to the fellow party worker.
4. The difference between fascism and communism is farcical as the supreme leaders project carefully cultivated, but contrary images to hide their authoritarian powers.

**Explanation:**

By implication, the author’s position is close to option 1; however, the author’s concern is not about how fascist or communist leaders promote the authoritarian state. It is about how they behave and how they may sustain themselves. Mention of Slavoj Zizek is not necessary in “author’s position” unlike in a normal précis. You may refer to CAT 2018 for similar summary questions. Option 3 interchanges fascism and communism – hence, it’s an incorrect summary. Option 4 only makes a general comment about ‘contrary images’ – there is no further mention of how they’re contrary. Hence, [2].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

% Students got it correct: **48 %**



In the following question, each sentence has a pair of words that are italicized and highlighted. From the italicized and highlighted words, identify the appropriate word (1 or 2) to form correct sentences. Enter the number corresponding to the correct option for each sentence in the correct order.

Use the virtual keyboard to enter your answer in the box provided below.

1. He is not a heavy eater generally, but he has a tendency to ***gouge (1) / gorge (2)*** on a fresh, seasonal fruits and vegetables.
2. The river narrowed at the bend and entered in a ***cascade (1) / cavalcade (2)*** of nearly 300 feet.
3. The WHO is working to stop the current outbreak of swine flu in several countries from becoming a/an ***epidemic (1) / pandemic (2)***.
4. In deserted villages a few houses stood among heaps of ***rabble (1) / rubble (2)***



Oops, you got it wrong!

**Explanation:**

‘To gorge’ means ‘to stuff with food’. ‘To gouge’ means ‘to scoop out or to swindle’. A ‘cascade’ is a waterfall descending over a steep surface. Its verb form indicates that something falls in or like a cascade. A ‘cavalcade’ is a procession. A disease that affects many more people than usual in a particular area or that spreads into regions in which it does not usually occur is said to be ‘epidemic’. An epidemic that spreads over a very wide area, such as a country or continent or the world is called a ‘pandemic’. Due to the presence of the word ‘global’ in the sentence, ‘pandemic’ is more appropriate. Broken bits and pieces of anything can be called ‘rubble’. ‘Rabble’ is a disorderly crowd or a mob. Thus BABB is the correct sequence. Hence, [2122].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **8 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **16 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **10 %**





In the following question, each sentence has a pair of words that are italicized and highlighted. From the italicized and highlighted words, identify the appropriate word (1 or 2) to form correct sentences. Enter the number corresponding to the correct option for each sentence in the correct order.

Use the virtual keyboard to enter your answer in the box provided below.

1. Her collar *chafed (1) / chuffed (2)* her neck.
2. The troops *quailed (1) / quelled (2)* the rebellion quickly.
3. If you boycotted the work of every heel, liar and *philatelist (1) / philanderer (2)*, you'd opt out of much of the creative output of human history.
4. Commencing salaries will be *commiserate (1) / commensurate (2)* with qualifications and experience.



Oops, you got it wrong!

**Explanation:**

‘To chafe’ means ‘to make sore by rubbing’. *Chuff* is the sound made by the exhaust of a steam engine, so ‘to chuff’ means to emit or proceed with chuffs. ‘To quail’ means ‘to shrink with fear’. ‘To quell’ means ‘to suppress or put an end to’. A ‘philatelist’ is a collector of stamps whereas a ‘philanderer’ is a flirt. The words ‘heel’ and ‘liar’ have a negative connotation and indicate the need for another negative word. ‘Commiserate’ means ‘to sympathize with’. ‘Commensurate’ means ‘proportionate or adequate’. Thus 1222 is the correct sequence. Hence, [1222].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **21 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **24 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **23 %**



**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. Its spreading array of fingers fits snugly around the contours of the bone's underside.
2. Eiving feels for gaps between the steel and smooth bone, then removes the saddle and walks to a blowtorch nearby.
3. Made of carbon steel, the support resembles a pair of cupped hands bound together at the wrists.
4. Ahead of us, a young, jewellery designer named Leslie Eiving is working on a saddle to hold one of the fossil's cervical vertebrae.



Oops, you got it wrong!

**Explanation:**

Sequence 4312. Statement 4 begins the series as it introduces the subjects – the designer and the saddle. 3 follows as it elaborates on the saddle’s make. 1 comes next and ‘its’ in 1 refers to the saddle mentioned in 4 and 3. Statement 2 adds on to the process of manufacture of the saddle. So, the correct sequence is 4312. Hence, [4312].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **45 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **61 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **47 %**





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. The cluster of thatched huts with tiled roofs set amidst hibiscus bushes also looks similar.
2. The boat voyage from Kuttanad to Alleppy is a voyage of discovery to urbanites like us.
3. A group of children in black and white, chasing a school of ducks in an open dinghy poled by themselves, add a spur of effervescence to this laid back serene landscape.
4. Village after village floats past, the water gently obliterating the boundaries.



Oops, you got it wrong!

**Explanation:**

Sequence 2413. 1 follows 4 as the 'also' in 1 refers to the similar view in 4. 'This laid back serene landscape' indicates that 3 should follow 1 and not vice-versa. Hence, [2413].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **12 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **36 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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



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. The finding is surprising, investigators say, because bladder cancer, which has long been linked to smoking, is more common among men.
2. When it comes to bladder cancer, two things have always seemed clear: smokers and men are at heightened risk.
3. In a study of more than 3,000 adults, with and without bladder cancer, researchers found that when smoking habits were comparable, women had a higher risk for the disease than men did.
4. But new research shows that, cigarette for cigarette, female smokers are more likely than males to get the disease.



Oops, you got it wrong!

**Explanation:**

Option 2431. Starting with 2, 4 is the next sentence as it connects to 2 by mentioning 'new research'. 3 describes the new research and 1 concludes the sequence by saying that it is surprising. So, the correct sequence is 2431. Hence, [2431].

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **19 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **45 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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





**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. Contemplation and, more alarmingly, our connections to the real persons, places and the world around us are substituted with virtual ones.
2. There is nothing as refreshing as closing the browser, stepping outside into the bright light of day, and noting the sensuously replete, fully dimensional, physical world.
3. There is an intimate relation between the images that form the basis of perception and the internal images of the imagination.
4. Fortunately, we need not be philosophers to occasionally find our way out of our technological confinement.
5. Among modernity's unintended effects is the new cult of images: endlessly distracting technological images that cultivate consumerism.



Oops, you got it wrong!

**Explanation:**

The passage is a narrative. It begins with sentence 5 setting the theme and the tone – that among the effects of modernity is the endlessly distracting technological images that cultivate consumerism. As a result of these endless images we have lost touch with reality. This is stated in sentence 1. Technological images in 5 are again referred to as ‘virtual ones’ in sentence 1. So, 5 and 1 are related. Sentence 4 continues that, ‘yet, in moments, we are above to find our way out from our technological confinement.’ Sentence 2 then tells us how refreshing it is to close the browser and look at the real world. So, sentences 5, 1, 4 and 2, in this order, form a coherent narrative about how modern life is controlled by images. Sentence 3, on the other hand, is contrary or irrelevant in this narrative. That there is an intimate relation between the images that form the basis of perception and the internal images of the imagination is unrelated and vague. Hence, 3.

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **18 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **32 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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



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. There has never been a company quite like Amazon.
2. But there's another picture: *The Everything Store: Jeff Bezos and the Age of Amazon* portrays Bezos as a ruthless tyrant.
3. Amazon has 225 million customers around the world; its goal is to sell everything to everyone.
4. Conceived as an online book seller, it has reinvented itself time and again, changing the way the world shops, reads and computes.
5. The brainchild of Jeff Bezos, Amazon prides itself on disrupting the traditional way of doing things.



Oops, you got it wrong!

**Explanation:**

Sentence 1 and sentence 2 are contrary in their references to Amazon. Sentences 3, 4 and 5 are facts about Amazon that support the thought expressed in sentence 1 – that there has never been a company like Amazon – it was conceived as an online book seller but it reinvented itself time and again and changed the way the world shopped etc. It has 225 million customers and it disrupts the traditional way of doing things. Sentence 2 is critical of Jeff Bezos, and refers to a book that calls him a tyrant. So, sentence 2 does not follow the theme of the other sentences. Hence, 2.

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **12 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **50 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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



**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. In the humanities, we value the ancient, the antique, the quaint, and the outmoded all in the interest of thickening and enriching our understanding of human life.
2. In the natural sciences, one often draws the conclusion that new knowledge is better than old knowledge.
3. History teaches us that the pursuit of knowledge is often a digressive process.
4. It is no wonder that young people often have a limited sense of the past, unable to place even watershed events or identify major historical time periods.
5. Unlike the natural sciences where knowledge and learning are generally linear and new insights and replace previous conclusions, humanistic knowledge proceeds haltingly.



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



**Explanation:**

Sentence 1 talks about humanities (Arts subjects – philosophy, language etc.) and sentence 2 is about natural sciences (pure science subjects). Sentence 5 also depicts a comparison between natural sciences and humanistic knowledge. So, sentences 1, 2 and 5 are related to the same theme. I.e., either sentence 3 or 4 has to be the odd one. Sentence 3 is related to sentence 5 as ‘digressive process’ of history in sentence 3 is compared with the linear process of pure sciences in sentence 5. So, sentences 3 and 5 are closely related. However, the young people being unable to place even watershed events i.e., their ignorance of history, is not related to the main idea of the paragraph. Through the example of history, the paragraph is highlighting the difference between humanities and natural sciences. Hence, 4.

**Correct Answer:**

Time taken by you: **21 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **67 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

