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

What is life? Science cannot tell us. Since the time of Aristotle, philosophers and scientists have struggled and failed to produce a precise, universally accepted definition of life. To compensate, modern textbooks point to characteristics that supposedly distinguish the living from the inanimate, the most important of which are organization, growth, reproduction and evolution. But there are numerous exceptions…. Crystals, for example, are highly organized; they grow; and they faithfully replicate their structures, but we do not think of them as alive. … Conversely, some organisms — such as gummy bear-shaped microanimals called tardigrades and brine shrimp (whose eggs are sealed up in little packets like baker's yeast under the brand name Sea Monkeys) — can enter a period of extreme dormancy during which they stop eating, growing and changing in any way for years at a time, yet are still regarded as living organisms.

In the 1990s, a group of scientists tasked with helping NASA find life on other planets devised a working definition of life: a self-sustaining system capable of Darwinian evolution. Even this phrase does not satisfactorily identify the fundamental difference between living things and nonliving things. Consider a virus: a bit of DNA or RNA encased in protein that hijacks a cell to make copies of itself. Viruses are incredibly efficient reproducers and they certainly evolve — much faster than most creatures. Yet biologists have disagreed for centuries about whether viruses belong among the ranks of the living, the inanimate or in some kind of purgatory. Gerald Joyce, one of the scientists who helped devise NASA's working definition of life, says that viruses do not satisfy the definition because they can only evolve in the context of the cells they infect.

The same is true, though, of many larger parasites that everyone agrees are alive. Bloodthirsty intestinal worms, vines that suck the sap from other plants, fungi that extrude filamentous antlers of flame orange through the shells of spiders they have killed — all are just as dependent on their hosts to reproduce and evolve as is a virus.

About 10 years after serving on the NASA panel, Mr. Joyce embarked on experiments that further deflated the agency's working definition of life. In the lab, he and his colleagues coaxed into existence two rather unique molecules of RNA that can indefinitely make copies of one another by stitching together sequences of nucleotides, their building blocks. Four billion years ago, in Earth's primordial soup, similar self-replicating RNAs may have spontaneously formed from linkages of free-floating nucleotides. As naked pieces of RNA, they are even simpler than viruses and, because they can reproduce and evolve, Mr. Joyce admits that they, too, meet the working definition of life. Yet he hesitates to say they are alive.

Why so much ambivalence? Why is it so difficult for scientists to cleanly separate the living and nonliving and make a final decision about ambiguously animate viruses? Because they have been trying to define something that never existed in the first place. Here is my conclusion: Life is a concept, not a reality…. It's not there. We must accept that the concept of life sometimes has its pragmatic value for our particular human purposes, but it does not reflect the reality of the universe outside the mind.

1) What main point does the author want to convey through the examples of crystals and tardigrades?

- There are things that exhibit features of the inanimate and things that exhibit features of the living.
- Conventional definition of life classifies crystals as inanimate and tardigrades as living things.
- ✓ There are inanimate things that have properties of the living, and living things that lack features of life.
- Organization, growth, reproduction, and evolution adequately address the distinction between living and inanimate things.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

The examples occur in the first paragraph: "…modern textbooks point to characteristics that supposedly distinguish the living from the inanimate… organization, growth, reproduction and evolution. But there are numerous exceptions… Crystals… we do not think of them as alive… Conversely, some organisms— such as tardigrades… stop eating, growing and changing in any way for years at a time, yet are still regarded as living organisms." Option 3 summarizes this. Options 1 and 2 are in effect the same idea— that there are numerous examples for living as well as non-living things. They do not explain the main point. Option 4 is contrary to the reason for citing the examples. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **262 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **248 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **83 %**

2) Which of the following is the probable reason for why "biologists have disagreed for centuries about whether viruses belong among the ranks of the living…"?

- They are nothing more than a bit of DNA and RNA.
- Viruses do not reproduce in the conventional sense.
- ✓ Viruses are not self-sustaining systems.
- Viruses are not capable of Darwinian evolution.

Video Explanation: ⌄

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

What is life? Science cannot tell us. Since the time of Aristotle, philosophers and scientists have struggled and failed to produce a precise, universally accepted definition of life. To compensate, modern textbooks point to characteristics that supposedly distinguish the living from the inanimate, the most important of which are organization, growth, reproduction and evolution. But there are numerous exceptions…. Crystals, for example, are highly organized; they grow; and they faithfully replicate their structures, but we do not think of them as alive. … Conversely, some organisms — such as gummy bear-shaped microanimals called tardigrades and brine shrimp (whose eggs are sealed up in little packets like baker's yeast under the brand name Sea Monkeys) — can enter a period of extreme dormancy during which they stop eating, growing and changing in any way for years at a time, yet are still regarded as living organisms.

In the 1990s, a group of scientists tasked with helping NASA find life on other planets devised a working definition of life: a self-sustaining system capable of Darwinian evolution. Even this phrase does not satisfactorily identify the fundamental difference between living things and nonliving things. Consider a virus: a bit of DNA or RNA encased in protein that hijacks a cell to make copies of itself. Viruses are incredibly efficient reproducers and they certainly evolve — much faster than most creatures. Yet biologists have disagreed for centuries about whether viruses belong among the ranks of the living, the inanimate or in some kind of purgatory. Gerald Joyce, one of the scientists who helped devise NASA's working definition of life, says that viruses do not satisfy the definition because they can only evolve in the context of the cells they infect.

The same is true, though, of many larger parasites that everyone agrees are alive. Bloodthirsty intestinal worms, vines that suck the sap from other plants, fungi that extrude filamentous antlers of flame orange through the shells of spiders they have killed — all are just as dependent on their hosts to reproduce and evolve as is a virus.

About 10 years after serving on the NASA panel, Mr. Joyce embarked on experiments that further deflated the agency's working definition of life. In the lab, he and his colleagues coaxed into existence two rather unique molecules of RNA that can indefinitely make copies of one another by stitching together sequences of nucleotides, their building blocks. Four billion years ago, in Earth's primordial soup, similar self-replicating RNAs may have spontaneously formed from linkages of free-floating nucleotides. As naked pieces of RNA, they are even simpler than viruses and, because they can reproduce and evolve, Mr. Joyce admits that they, too, meet the working definition of life. Yet he hesitates to say they are alive.

Why so much ambivalence? Why is it so difficult for scientists to cleanly separate the living and nonliving and make a final decision about ambiguously animate viruses? Because they have been trying to define something that never existed in the first place. Here is my conclusion: Life is a concept, not a reality…. It's not there. We must accept that the concept of life sometimes has its pragmatic value for our particular human purposes, but it does not reflect the reality of the universe outside the mind.

Explanation:

Change Section here

According to the definition of NASA a living organism is "a self-sustaining system capable of Darwinian evolution." [Paragraph 2] … "Consider a virus: a bit of DNA or RNA encased in protein that hijacks a cell to make copies of itself. Viruses are incredibly efficient reproducers and they certainly evolve — much faster than most creatures. Yet biologists have disagreed for centuries about whether viruses belong among the ranks of the living…" the explanation comes in the next sentence "NASA's working definition of life, says that viruses do not satisfy the definition because they can only evolve in the context of the cells they infect. In other words, they are not self-sustaining. Options 1, 2 and 4 are incorrect—option 1 doesn't concern NASA's definition of a living organism; option 2 is inconclusive as the passage doesn't say what 'the conventional sense' of reproduction is; option 4 too is inconclusive as we are not provided with a definition of 'Darwinian Evolution'. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **14 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

3) According to the author, Mr. Joyce's experiment [in paragraph 4] shows that …

- the origin of life is not a mystery any more.
- the dividing line between life and non-life is imaginary.
- reality of the universe is unmistakably outside the mind.
- bits of RNA can reproduce and evolve. ✖

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

The experiment "coaxed into existence two rather unique molecules of RNA that can indefinitely make copies of one another…" It is comparable to the very origin of life on earth four billion years ago, and what it engendered met the working definition of life. According to the author, the experiment proves that division between life and non-life is not possible because life is merely a concept. It is not reality. Option 2 thus rephrases the author's conclusion. Option 1 is categorical; it's only a possibility as per the passage-- "…may have spontaneously formed…" [Paragraph 4] Option 3 is contrary to the author's conclusion. Option 4 is already stated about viruses – hence, is not related to the experiment. Hence, [2].

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

What is life? Science cannot tell us. Since the time of Aristotle, philosophers and scientists have struggled and failed to produce a precise, universally accepted definition of life. To compensate, modern textbooks point to characteristics that supposedly distinguish the living from the inanimate, the most important of which are organization, growth, reproduction and evolution. But there are numerous exceptions…. Crystals, for example, are highly organized; they grow; and they faithfully replicate their structures, but we do not think of them as alive. … Conversely, some organisms — such as gummy bear-shaped microanimals called tardigrades and brine shrimp (whose eggs are sealed up in little packets like baker's yeast under the brand name Sea Monkeys) — can enter a period of extreme dormancy during which they stop eating, growing and changing in any way for years at a time, yet are still regarded as living organisms.

In the 1990s, a group of scientists tasked with helping NASA find life on other planets devised a working definition of life: a self-sustaining system capable of Darwinian evolution. Even this phrase does not satisfactorily identify the fundamental difference between living things and nonliving things. Consider a virus: a bit of DNA or RNA encased in protein that hijacks a cell to make copies of itself. Viruses are incredibly efficient reproducers and they certainly evolve — much faster than most creatures. Yet biologists have disagreed for centuries about whether viruses belong among the ranks of the living, the inanimate or in some kind of purgatory. Gerald Joyce, one of the scientists who helped devise NASA's working definition of life, says that viruses do not satisfy the definition because they can only evolve in the context of the cells they infect.

The same is true, though, of many larger parasites that everyone agrees are alive. Bloodthirsty intestinal worms, vines that suck the sap from other plants, fungi that extrude filamentous antlers of flame orange through the shells of spiders they have killed — all are just as dependent on their hosts to reproduce and evolve as is a virus.

About 10 years after serving on the NASA panel, Mr. Joyce embarked on experiments that further deflated the agency's working definition of life. In the lab, he and his colleagues coaxed into existence two rather unique molecules of RNA that can indefinitely make copies of one another by stitching together sequences of nucleotides, their building blocks. Four billion years ago, in Earth's primordial soup, similar self-replicating RNAs may have spontaneously formed from linkages of free-floating nucleotides. As naked pieces of RNA, they are even simpler than viruses and, because they can reproduce and evolve, Mr. Joyce admits that they, too, meet the working definition of life. Yet he hesitates to say they are alive.

Why so much ambivalence? Why is it so difficult for scientists to cleanly separate the living and nonliving and make a final decision about ambiguously animate viruses? Because they have been trying to define something that never existed in the first place. Here is my conclusion: Life is a concept, not a reality…. It's not there. We must accept that the concept of life sometimes has its pragmatic value for our particular human purposes, but it does not reflect the reality of the universe outside the mind.

Time taken by you: **49 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **44 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

4) The passage makes all of the following claims EXCEPT:

- Organization, growth, reproduction and evolution are not necessarily signs of life.
- Organisms that do not eat, grow or change are lifeless. ✓
- There is no such thing as 'life' in the world outside the mind.
- Biology has no precise unfailing definition of what is life.

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

Option 1 is not an exception. In the first paragraph, the author, after stating organization, growth etc. as signs of life, mentions that there are numerous exceptions – hence, option 1 is true. Option 2 is contrary to what the passage implies: "… some organisms — such as gummy bear-shapedmicroanimals called tardigrades and brine shrimp — can enter a period of extreme dormancy during which they stop eating, growing and changing in any way for years at a time, yet are still regarded as living organisms." *Dormant* need not mean lifeless. Option 3 is stated in the last paragraph, and option 4 is implied in the first, second, and fourth paragraph. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **62 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

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

What is life? Science cannot tell us. Since the time of Aristotle, philosophers and scientists have struggled and failed to produce a precise, universally accepted definition of life. To compensate, modern textbooks point to characteristics that supposedly distinguish the living from the inanimate, the most important of which are organization, growth, reproduction and evolution. But there are numerous exceptions…. Crystals, for example, are highly organized; they grow; and they faithfully replicate their structures, but we do not think of them as alive. … Conversely, some organisms — such as gummy bear-shaped microanimals called tardigrades and brine shrimp (whose eggs are sealed up in little packets like baker's yeast under the brand name Sea Monkeys) — can enter a period of extreme dormancy during which they stop eating, growing and changing in any way for years at a time, yet are still regarded as living organisms.

In the 1990s, a group of scientists tasked with helping NASA find life on other planets devised a working definition of life: a self-sustaining system capable of Darwinian evolution. Even this phrase does not satisfactorily identify the fundamental difference between living things and nonliving things. Consider a virus: a bit of DNA or RNA encased in protein that hijacks a cell to make copies of itself. Viruses are incredibly efficient reproducers and they certainly evolve — much faster than most creatures. Yet biologists have disagreed for centuries about whether viruses belong among the ranks of the living, the inanimate or in some kind of purgatory. Gerald Joyce, one of the scientists who helped devise NASA's working definition of life, says that viruses do not satisfy the definition because they can only evolve in the context of the cells they infect.

The same is true, though, of many larger parasites that everyone agrees are alive. Bloodthirsty intestinal worms, vines that suck the sap from other plants, fungi that extrude filamentous antlers of flame orange through the shells of spiders they have killed — all are just as dependent on their hosts to reproduce and evolve as is a virus.

About 10 years after serving on the NASA panel, Mr. Joyce embarked on experiments that further deflated the agency's working definition of life. In the lab, he and his colleagues coaxed into existence two rather unique molecules of RNA that can indefinitely make copies of one another by stitching together sequences of nucleotides, their building blocks. Four billion years ago, in Earth's primordial soup, similar self-replicating RNAs may have spontaneously formed from linkages of free-floating nucleotides. As naked pieces of RNA, they are even simpler than viruses and, because they can reproduce and evolve, Mr. Joyce admits that they, too, meet the working definition of life. Yet he hesitates to say they are alive.

Why so much ambivalence? Why is it so difficult for scientists to cleanly separate the living and nonliving and make a final decision about ambiguously animate viruses? Because they have been trying to define something that never existed in the first place. Here is my conclusion: Life is a concept, not a reality…. It's not there. We must accept that the concept of life sometimes has its pragmatic value for our particular human purposes, but it does not reflect the reality of the universe outside the mind.

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

Successful human societies are the focus of "Blueprint: The Evolutionary Origins of a Good Society", by Nicholas Christakis, a social scientist at Yale. What sorts of behaviour make societies work, and where do they originate? He begins with shipwrecks.

In 1864 two ships, the *Invercauld* and the *Grafton*, were wrecked on opposite sides of Auckland Island, which lies almost 300 miles (480km) south of New Zealand. Survivors from both crews were on the island at the same time, but were unaware of each other's presence. Over the year after their stranding, the 19 survivors of the *Invercauld* splintered in to groups, often left the weakest to die and even resorted to cannibalism. Only three crew members lived long enough to be rescued. In contrast, all five survivors of the *Grafton* eventually made it off the island. Shipwrecks, writes Mr Christakis, are good natural experiments in society-building: "survivor camps", he says, "provide fascinating data…about how and why social order might vary, and about what arrangements are the most conducive to peace and survival."

The crew of the *Invercauld* were led by a selfish captain who instilled an attitude that every man should look out for himself. The men of the *Grafton*, however, stuck and worked together on everything from repairing boats to sharing their resources equally, even organising a kind of adult-education programme to swap skills. This "social suite" of behaviour, as Mr Christakis puts it, helped them survive.

He argues that this social suite is not just learned from others; it is underpinned by thousands of genes that have evolved to nudge biochemistry and behaviour in such a way that people tend towards a good society. True, there are still appalling wars and horrific murders, but that is not the sum of who humans are. Look at the progress visible all around you, Mr Christakis urges, despite all the well-known episodes of death and destruction.

He ranges across sociology, anthropology, philosophy, genetics and economics, between jungles and laboratories and back again, at what sometimes feels like breakneck speed. But amid the whiplash, Mr Christakis's deep optimism (and considerable evidence) about the arc of human society bending towards good is uplifting. Along the way he delves fascinatingly into human cultures and customs, exploring, for instance, why monogamy and marriage have become so common (though not universal), and what friendship really means, from an evolutionary perspective.

1) According to Mr. Christakis, the 'social suite' is:

- (●) norms of behaviour acquired from a social group. ✗
- ( ) patterns of behaviour derived from social expectations.
- ( ) genetically influenced cooperative behaviour.
- ( ) behaviour that is triggered by environmental factors.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Refer paragraph 3: "The men of the *Grafton*, however, stuck and worked together on everything from repairing boats to sharing their resources equally, even organising a kind of adult-education programme to swap skills. This "social suite" of behaviour, as Mr Christakis puts it, helped them survive." In the next paragraph he states that the social suite is "not just learned from others; *it is underpinned by thousands of genes* that have evolved to nudge biochemistry and behaviour in such a way that people tend towards a good society." Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **418 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **197 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

2) According to the reviewer, Mr Christakis's writing …

- ( ) contains references to a range of subjects.
- ( ) obtains its flavour from his ideas as a social scientist.
- ( ) reflects his knowledge and his university background.
- (●) benefits from his extreme optimism. ✗

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Refer paragraph 5: "He ranges across sociology, anthropology, philosophy, genetics and economics, between jungles and laboratories and back again, at what sometimes feels like breakneck speed." Therefore, [1] is correct. Options 2 and 3 cannot be derived from the passage and option 4 is incorrect as the author does not find Christakis's optimism 'extreme'. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ⌄

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

Successful human societies are the focus of "Blueprint: The Evolutionary Origins of a Good Society", by Nicholas Christakis, a social scientist at Yale. What sorts of behaviour make societies work, and where do they originate? He begins with shipwrecks.

In 1864 two ships, the *Invercauld* and the *Grafton*, were wrecked on opposite sides of Auckland Island, which lies almost 300 miles (480km) south of New Zealand. Survivors from both crews were on the island at the same time, but were unaware of each other's presence. Over the year after their stranding, the 19 survivors of the *Invercauld* splintered in to groups, often left the weakest to die and even resorted to cannibalism. Only three crew members lived long enough to be rescued. In contrast, all five survivors of the *Grafton* eventually made it off the island. Shipwrecks, writes Mr Christakis, are good natural experiments in society-building: "survivor camps", he says, "provide fascinating data…about how and why social order might vary, and about what arrangements are the most conducive to peace and survival."

The crew of the *Invercauld* were led by a selfish captain who instilled an attitude that every man should look out for himself. The men of the *Grafton*, however, stuck and worked together on everything from repairing boats to sharing their resources equally, even organising a kind of adult-education programme to swap skills. This "social suite" of behaviour, as Mr Christakis puts it, helped them survive.

He argues that this social suite is not just learned from others; it is underpinned by thousands of genes that have evolved to nudge biochemistry and behaviour in such a way that people tend towards a good society. True, there are still appalling wars and horrific murders, but that is not the sum of who humans are. Look at the progress visible all around you, Mr Christakis urges, despite all the well-known episodes of death and destruction.

He ranges across sociology, anthropology, philosophy, genetics and economics, between jungles and laboratories and back again, at what sometimes feels like breakneck speed. But amid the whiplash, Mr Christakis's deep optimism (and considerable evidence) about the arc of human society bending towards good is uplifting. Along the way he delves fascinatingly into human cultures and customs, exploring, for instance, why monogamy and marriage have become so common (though not universal), and what friendship really means, from an evolutionary perspective.

Avg Time taken by all students: **52 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **53 %**

3) According to the passage, the men of the *Grafton* survived because:

- they were led by a capable leader.
- they possessed the social suite of behaviour. ✔
- they were on the more liveable part of Auckland island.
- they lived for many more years than the survivors of the Invercauld .

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

Refer the second and third paragraphs. "This "social suite" of behaviour, as Mr Christakis puts it, helped them survive." The survivors of The *Grafton* are said to have displayed the kind of behaviours that comprise the "social suite" advocated by Mr Christakis. Therefore, option 2 is the correct answer. None of the other options can be inferred from the passage. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **82 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **97 %**

4) Which of the following best introduces the passage?

- The example of two shipwrecks the Invercauld and the Grafton in 1864 sheds light on the origins of human behaviour that makes societies work.
- Even amidst the appalling wars, the 'social suite' of behaviour defines who humans are as they tend towards a good society.
- In "Blueprint", the social scientist Nicholas Christakis explores the evolutionary origins of human cooperative behaviour.
- The social scientist Nicholas Christakis ranges across various disciplines to trace the origins of cooperation among human societies.

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

Change Section here

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

Successful human societies are the focus of "Blueprint: The Evolutionary Origins of a Good Society", by Nicholas Christakis, a social scientist at Yale. What sorts of behaviour make societies work, and where do they originate? He begins with shipwrecks.

In 1864 two ships, the *Invercauld* and the *Grafton*, were wrecked on opposite sides of Auckland Island, which lies almost 300 miles (480km) south of New Zealand. Survivors from both crews were on the island at the same time, but were unaware of each other's presence. Over the year after their stranding, the 19 survivors of the *Invercauld* splintered in to groups, often left the weakest to die and even resorted to cannibalism. Only three crew members lived long enough to be rescued. In contrast, all five survivors of the *Grafton* eventually made it off the island. Shipwrecks, writes Mr Christakis, are good natural experiments in society-building: "survivor camps", he says, "provide fascinating data…about how and why social order might vary, and about what arrangements are the most conducive to peace and survival."

The crew of the *Invercauld* were led by a selfish captain who instilled an attitude that every man should look out for himself. The men of the *Grafton*, however, stuck and worked together on everything from repairing boats to sharing their resources equally, even organising a kind of adult-education programme to swap skills. This "social suite" of behaviour, as Mr Christakis puts it, helped them survive.

He argues that this social suite is not just learned from others; it is underpinned by thousands of genes that have evolved to nudge biochemistry and behaviour in such a way that people tend towards a good society. True, there are still appalling wars and horrific murders, but that is not the sum of who humans are. Look at the progress visible all around you, Mr Christakis urges, despite all the well-known episodes of death and destruction.

He ranges across sociology, anthropology, philosophy, genetics and economics, between jungles and laboratories and back again, at what sometimes feels like breakneck speed. But amid the whiplash, Mr Christakis's deep optimism (and considerable evidence) about the arc of human society bending towards good is uplifting. Along the way he delves fascinatingly into human cultures and customs, exploring, for instance, why monogamy and marriage have become so common (though not universal), and what friendship really means, from an evolutionary perspective.

The passage is a book review. The book "Blueprint" by Nicholas Christakis is reviewed. Hence, the best introduction–summary/title/preliminary text before the passage – gives a brief comment on the passage. Option 3 is the most appropriate comment introducing what the passage is about. Option 4 misses the name of the book, and hence cannot introduce the passage. Options 1 and 2 are ideas in the book that the reviewer makes reference to. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **28 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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

5) The reviewer considers Nicholas Christakis' book:

- learned and inspiring. ✓
- philosophical and pensive.
- bleak and cynical.
- sincere and encouraging.

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

The last paragraph has the writer's personal assessment of the book: "He ranges across sociology, anthropology, philosophy, genetics and economics, between jungles and laboratories and back again, at what sometimes feels like breakneck speed. But amid the whiplash, MrChristakis's deep optimism (and considerable evidence) about the arc of human society bending towards good is uplifting." This is summarised in option 1. 'Pensive' in option 2 and both 'bleak' and 'cynical' in option 3 makes them incorrect choices, and option 4 is not relevant to the reviewer's assessment of the book. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **63 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **49 %**

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

Successful human societies are the focus of “Blueprint: The Evolutionary Origins of a Good Society”, by Nicholas Christakis, a social scientist at Yale. What sorts of behaviour make societies work, and where do they originate? He begins with shipwrecks.

Loading...

In 1864 two ships, the *Invercauld* and the *Grafton*, were wrecked on opposite sides of Auckland Island, which lies almost 300 miles (480km) south of New Zealand. Survivors from both crews were on the island at the same time, but were unaware of each other’s presence. Over the year after their stranding, the 19 survivors of the *Invercauld* splintered in to groups, often left the weakest to die and even resorted to cannibalism. Only three crew members lived long enough to be rescued. In contrast, all five survivors of the *Grafton* eventually made it off the island. Shipwrecks, writes Mr Christakis, are good natural experiments in society-building: “survivor camps”, he says, “provide fascinating data…about how and why social order might vary, and about what arrangements are the most conducive to peace and survival.”

The crew of the *Invercauld* were led by a selfish captain who instilled an attitude that every man should look out for himself. The men of the *Grafton*, however, stuck and worked together on everything from repairing boats to sharing their resources equally, even organising a kind of adult-education programme to swap skills. This “social suite” of behaviour, as Mr Christakis puts it, helped them survive.

He argues that this social suite is not just learned from others; it is underpinned by thousands of genes that have evolved to nudge biochemistry and behaviour in such a way that people tend towards a good society. True, there are still appalling wars and horrific murders, but that is not the sum of who humans are. Look at the progress visible all around you, Mr Christakis urges, despite all the well-known episodes of death and destruction.

He ranges across sociology, anthropology, philosophy, genetics and economics, between jungles and laboratories and back again, at what sometimes feels like breakneck speed. But amid the whiplash, Mr Christakis’s deep optimism (and considerable evidence) about the arc of human society bending towards good is uplifting. Along the way he delves fascinatingly into human cultures and customs, exploring, for instance, why monogamy and marriage have become so common (though not universal), and what friendship really means, from an evolutionary perspective.

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

Artificial intelligence (AI) might have the potential to change how we approach tasks, and what we value. If we are using AI to do our thinking for us, employing AI might atrophy our thinking skills. The AI we have at the moment is narrow AI – it can perform only selected, specific tasks. And even when an AI can perform as well as, or better than, humans at certain tasks, it does not necessarily achieve these results in the same way that humans do. One thing that AI is very good at is sifting through masses of data at great speed.

But because AI might 'think' differently to how humans think, and because of the general tendency to get swept up in its allure, its use could well change how we approach tasks and make decisions. The seductive allure that tends to surround AI in fact represents one of its dangers. Those working in the field despair that almost every article about AI hypes its powers, and even those about banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots.

The impact of technology on shaping our values is well-established. At a recent roundtable discussion on the ethics of AI, the group I was in spent most of our time discussing the well-known example of the washing machine, which did not simply 'take over' the laundry, but which has had a major impact on attitudes to cleanliness and housework, and on the manufacture of clothing. Because AI is designed to contribute not merely to the laundry, but to how we think and make decisions over an indeterminate number of tasks, we need to consider seriously how it might change our own thought and behaviour.

It's important to remember that AI can take many forms, and be applied in many different ways, so none of this is to argue that using AI will be 'good' or 'bad'. In some cases, AI might nudge us to improve our approach. But in others, it could reduce or atrophy our approach to important issues. It might even skew how we think about values.

We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts. For example, attitudes to privacy have changed considerably along with the vast technological shifts in how we communicate and how data is shared and processed. This is not to say that technology 'alone' has done this, since there are always other social changes operating at the

1) On the basis of the passage, which of the following efforts is likely to be most effective in solving the problem presented by AI?

- Targeting the possibly 'bad' outcomes of any AI by running multiple simulations before okaying that particular project.
- Ensuring that any 'problem' being resolved by AI is one that requires sifting through masses of data at great speed.
- Ensuring that AI does not change our own thought and behaviour in ways that we are unaware of. ✓
- Providing for detailed understanding by the end user of all the implications of using AI in a particular venture.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

According to the passage AI has "the potential to change how we approach tasks, and what we value." [Paragraph 1] It might even "skew how we think about values." [Paragraph 4] And, "We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts" [Paragraph 5]. Implicitly, this is the problem presented by AI. The passage also mentions that changes in our thinking and behaviour are normal and gradual as society changes; however, when technology is adopted too fast we change our thinking and behaviour ahead of these social changes. Option 3 will be an effective way to counter the 'problem' posed by AI. Option 2 which may mislead us into choosing that as the answer highlights the effective use of AI, but does not address the risk posed by AI. Option 1 is another possible answer; in fact, it's a broader solution that also incorporates option 3. But, the 'most effective' solution must be purpose-specific too. In this case, option 3, which focuses on the specific risk, rather than all the "bad outcomes", is the most effective solution. Hence, [3].

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

Artificial intelligence (AI) might have the potential to change how we approach tasks, and what we value. If we are using AI to do our thinking for us, employing AI might atrophy our thinking skills. The AI we have at the moment is narrow AI – it can perform only selected, specific tasks. And even when an AI can perform as well as, or better than, humans at certain tasks, it does not necessarily achieve these results in the same way that humans do. One thing that AI is very good at is sifting through masses of data at great speed.

But because AI might 'think' differently to how humans think, and because of the general tendency to get swept up in its allure, its use could well change how we approach tasks and make decisions. The seductive allure that tends to surround AI in fact represents one of its dangers. Those working in the field despair that almost every article about AI hypes its powers, and even those about banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots.

The impact of technology on shaping our values is well-established. At a recent roundtable discussion on the ethics of AI, the group I was in spent most of our time discussing the well-known example of the washing machine, which did not simply 'take over' the laundry, but which has had a major impact on attitudes to cleanliness and housework, and on the manufacture of clothing. Because AI is designed to contribute not merely to the laundry, but to how we think and make decisions over an indeterminate number of tasks, we need to consider seriously how it might change our own thought and behaviour.

It's important to remember that AI can take many forms, and be applied in many different ways, so none of this is to argue that using AI will be 'good' or 'bad'. In some cases, AI might nudge us to improve our approach. But in others, it could reduce or atrophy our approach to important issues. It might even skew how we think about values.

We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts. For example, attitudes to privacy have changed considerably along with the vast technological shifts in how we communicate and how data is shared and processed. This is not to say that technology 'alone' has done this, since there are always other social changes operating at the

Time taken by you: **349 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **222 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

2) The phrase "… even those banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots…" is used to explain: −

- (●) the extreme fascination for and the exaggeration of the powers of AI. ✓
- ( ) how AI effects a change in the way we make decisions.
- ( ) the unimaginative and possibly harmful applications of AI.
- ( ) how AI can influence us to create killer robots in future.

Video Explanation: ⌄

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

Artificial intelligence (AI) might have the potential to change how we approach tasks, and what we value. If we are using AI to do our thinking for us, employing AI might atrophy our thinking skills. The AI we have at the moment is narrow AI – it can perform only selected, specific tasks. And even when an AI can perform as well as, or better than, humans at certain tasks, it does not necessarily achieve these results in the same way that humans do. One thing that AI is very good at is sifting through masses of data at great speed.

But because AI might 'think' differently to how humans think, and because of the general tendency to get swept up in its allure, its use could well change how we approach tasks and make decisions. The seductive allure that tends to surround AI in fact represents one of its dangers. Those working in the field despair that almost every article about AI hypes its powers, and even those about banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots.

The impact of technology on shaping our values is well-established. At a recent roundtable discussion on the ethics of AI, the group I was in spent most of our time discussing the well-known example of the washing machine, which did not simply 'take over' the laundry, but which has had a major impact on attitudes to cleanliness and housework, and on the manufacture of clothing. Because AI is designed to contribute not merely to the laundry, but to how we think and make decisions over an indeterminate number of tasks, we need to consider seriously how it might change our own thought and behaviour.

It's important to remember that AI can take many forms, and be applied in many different ways, so none of this is to argue that using AI will be 'good' or 'bad'. In some cases, AI might nudge us to improve our approach. But in others, it could reduce or atrophy our approach to important issues. It might even skew how we think about values.

We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts. For example, attitudes to privacy have changed considerably along with the vast technological shifts in how we communicate and how data is shared and processed. This is not to say that technology 'alone' has done this, since there are always other social changes operating at the

Refer the second paragraph: "… because of the general tendency to get swept up in its (AI's) allure, its use could well change how we approach tasks and make decisions. The seductive allure that tends to surround AI, in fact, represents one of its dangers. Those working in the field despair that almost every article about AI hypes its powers and even those about banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots." The author implies that the 'allure and hype' associated with AI leads to representing even its most ordinary qualifications with much superfluity. Hence, option 1 is correct. AI may change the way we make decisions, but the author does not associate 'killer robots' with AI's influence on our decision making. So, option 2 is incorrect. Options 3 and 4 are similar in implication – the harmful applications of AI –"killer robots" have been used to illustrate the exaggerated status given to AI rather than its potential harmful applications. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **18 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **71 %**

3) Which of the following best describes the purpose of the example of the washing machine?

- To demonstrate the effect of AI on a subject with which it's not associated normally.
- To show the impact of an invention and to follow its course.
- To show that AI has the potential to 'take over' any project it is used in.
- To show how technology influences our way of life and value systems. ✓

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

Artificial intelligence (AI) might have the potential to change how we approach tasks, and what we value. If we are using AI to do our thinking for us, employing AI might atrophy our thinking skills. The AI we have at the moment is narrow AI – it can perform only selected, specific tasks. And even when an AI can perform as well as, or better than, humans at certain tasks, it does not necessarily achieve these results in the same way that humans do. One thing that AI is very good at is sifting through masses of data at great speed.

But because AI might 'think' differently to how humans think, and because of the general tendency to get swept up in its allure, its use could well change how we approach tasks and make decisions. The seductive allure that tends to surround AI in fact represents one of its dangers. Those working in the field despair that almost every article about AI hypes its powers, and even those about banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots.

The impact of technology on shaping our values is well-established. At a recent roundtable discussion on the ethics of AI, the group I was in spent most of our time discussing the well-known example of the washing machine, which did not simply 'take over' the laundry, but which has had a major impact on attitudes to cleanliness and housework, and on the manufacture of clothing. Because AI is designed to contribute not merely to the laundry, but to how we think and make decisions over an indeterminate number of tasks, we need to consider seriously how it might change our own thought and behaviour.

It's important to remember that AI can take many forms, and be applied in many different ways, so none of this is to argue that using AI will be 'good' or 'bad'. In some cases, AI might nudge us to improve our approach. But in others, it could reduce or atrophy our approach to important issues. It might even skew how we think about values.

We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts. For example, attitudes to privacy have changed considerably along with the vast technological shifts in how we communicate and how data is shared and processed. This is not to say that technology 'alone' has done this, since there are always other social changes operating at the

Explanation:

Refer paragraph 3: "the well-known example of the washing machine, which did not simply 'take over' the laundry, but which has had a major impact on attitudes to cleanliness and housework, and on the manufacture of clothing. Because AI is designed to contribute not merely to the laundry, but to how we think and make decisions over an indeterminate number of tasks, we need to consider seriously how it might change our own thought and behaviour." Option 1 is too general while the passage is specific about how washing machine changed our way of life-- from hygiene to manufacturing of clothing. Options 2 and 3 are irrelevant to the question. Option 4 aptly states why the "washing machine" example has been used in the passage. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **36 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

4) Based on information provided in the passage we can infer that "change-blindness" refers to:

- the changed attitude to privacy because of changes in how we communicate.
- indifference to changes wrought by adopting AI into the many aspects of life.
- lack of awareness of the changes that new technology can bring about. ✓
- blindness to the fact of changing cultural values brought about by AI.

Video Explanation:

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

Artificial intelligence (AI) might have the potential to change how we approach tasks, and what we value. If we are using AI to do our thinking for us, employing AI might atrophy our thinking skills. The AI we have at the moment is narrow AI – it can perform only selected, specific tasks. And even when an AI can perform as well as, or better than, humans at certain tasks, it does not necessarily achieve these results in the same way that humans do. One thing that AI is very good at is sifting through masses of data at great speed.

But because AI might 'think' differently to how humans think, and because of the general tendency to get swept up in its allure, its use could well change how we approach tasks and make decisions. The seductive allure that tends to surround AI in fact represents one of its dangers. Those working in the field despair that almost every article about AI hypes its powers, and even those about banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots.

The impact of technology on shaping our values is well-established. At a recent roundtable discussion on the ethics of AI, the group I was in spent most of our time discussing the well-known example of the washing machine, which did not simply 'take over' the laundry, but which has had a major impact on attitudes to cleanliness and housework, and on the manufacture of clothing. Because AI is designed to contribute not merely to the laundry, but to how we think and make decisions over an indeterminate number of tasks, we need to consider seriously how it might change our own thought and behaviour.

It's important to remember that AI can take many forms, and be applied in many different ways, so none of this is to argue that using AI will be 'good' or 'bad'. In some cases, AI might nudge us to improve our approach. But in others, it could reduce or atrophy our approach to important issues. It might even skew how we think about values.

We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts. For example, attitudes to privacy have changed considerably along with the vast technological shifts in how we communicate and how data is shared and processed. This is not to say that technology 'alone' has done this, since there are always other social changes operating at the

Refer paragraph 5: "We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts. For example, attitudes to privacy have changed considerably along with the vast technological shifts in how we communicate and how data is shared and processed." Option 1 is incorrect as "privacy" has been mentioned as an example to illustrate the phenomenon. The term "indifference" invalidates option 2. It's not cultural values but values, in a broader a sense that get influenced by advancing technology; this makes option 4 incorrect. Change-blindness is used in the context of the passage, to refer to a lack of awareness of the effects of new technology. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **50 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **64 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **65 %**

5) The "roundtable discussion on the ethics of AI" (Paragraph 3) challenged the assumption that: −

- those working in AI overestimate its powers.
- the power of AI is unjustifiably hyped up. ✓
- AI is designed to improve our standard of living.
- technology shapes our values.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation:

Change Section here ▾

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

Artificial intelligence (AI) might have the potential to change how we approach tasks, and what we value. If we are using AI to do our thinking for us, employing AI might atrophy our thinking skills. The AI we have at the moment is narrow AI – it can perform only selected, specific tasks. And even when an AI can perform as well as, or better than, humans at certain tasks, it does not necessarily achieve these results in the same way that humans do. One thing that AI is very good at is sifting through masses of data at great speed.

But because AI might 'think' differently to how humans think, and because of the general tendency to get swept up in its allure, its use could well change how we approach tasks and make decisions. The seductive allure that tends to surround AI in fact represents one of its dangers. Those working in the field despair that almost every article about AI hypes its powers, and even those about banal uses of AI are illustrated with killer robots.

The impact of technology on shaping our values is well-established. At a recent roundtable discussion on the ethics of AI, the group I was in spent most of our time discussing the well-known example of the washing machine, which did not simply 'take over' the laundry, but which has had a major impact on attitudes to cleanliness and housework, and on the manufacture of clothing. Because AI is designed to contribute not merely to the laundry, but to how we think and make decisions over an indeterminate number of tasks, we need to consider seriously how it might change our own thought and behaviour.

It's important to remember that AI can take many forms, and be applied in many different ways, so none of this is to argue that using AI will be 'good' or 'bad'. In some cases, AI might nudge us to improve our approach. But in others, it could reduce or atrophy our approach to important issues. It might even skew how we think about values.

We can get used to technology very swiftly. Change-blindness and fast adaptation to technology can mean we're not fully aware of such cultural and value shifts. For example, attitudes to privacy have changed considerably along with the vast technological shifts in how we communicate and how data is shared and processed. This is not to say that technology 'alone' has done this, since there are always other social changes operating at the

The roundtable discussion focused on the far reaching impact that technology had on people's lives. The example of the washing machine shows how a device to clean laundry impacted a whole way of life and even the manufacturing of clothing. So, the impact is real and not unjustifiably hyped up. Option 1 is irrelevant – no assumption related to those working in AI is implicit in the discussion. Options 3 and 4 are assumptions that are not challenged. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **143 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

Loading...

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

History, as a discipline, turns away from two of the main ways of reading that have dominated the humanities for the past half-century. These methods have been productive, but perhaps they also bear some responsibility for today's corrosive lack of generosity. The two approaches have different genealogies, but share a significant feature: at heart, they are adversarial.

One mode of reading, first described by Paul Ricoeur and known as 'the hermeneutics of suspicion', aims to uncover the hidden meaning or agenda of a text. The reader interprets what happens on the surface as a symptom of something deeper and more dubious, from economic inequality to sexual anxiety. The reader's task is to reject the face value of a work, and to plumb for a submerged truth.

A second form of interpretation, known as 'deconstruction', was developed by Jacques Derrida. It aims to identify and reveal a text's hidden contradictions – ambiguities and even contradictions that eluded the author. For example, Derrida detected a bias that favoured speech over writing in many influential philosophical texts of the Western tradition, from Plato to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The fact that written texts could privilege the immediacy and truth of speech was a paradox that revealed unarticulated metaphysical commitments at the heart of Western philosophy.

Both of these ways of reading pit reader against text. The reader's goal becomes to uncover meanings or problems that the work does not explicitly express. In both cases, intelligence and moral probity are displayed at the expense of what's been written. In the 20th century, these approaches empowered critics to detect and denounce the workings of power in all kinds of materials. They do, however, foster a prosecutorial attitude among academics and public intellectuals. As a colleague once told me: 'I am always looking for the Freudian slip.' He scours the writings of his peers to spot when they trip up and betray their problematic intellectual commitments. One poorly chosen phrase can sully an entire work.

Not surprisingly, these methods have fostered a rather paranoid atmosphere in modern academia. One error is taken as the symptom of problematic thinking; it can spoil not just a whole book, but perhaps even the author's entire oeuvre.

1) By "adversarial humanities" the author means:

- (●) An approach that sets the reader into opposition with the text. ✓
- ( ) An approach that treats all texts as inaccurate.
- ( ) An approach that assumes that text is necessarily hypocritical.
- ( ) An approach in which the reader treats the writer as an adversary.

Video Explanation: ⌄

Explanation: ⌄

Refer to paragraph 3. "Both of these ways of reading pit reader against text. The reader's goal becomes to uncover meanings or problems that the work does not explicitly express." This justifies option 1. Inaccurate in option 2 and hypocritical in option 3 are not justifiable. Option 4 is incorrect because it is an approach towards (studying/analysing) text – and not an approach towards the writer. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **297 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **200 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **66 %**

2) According to the author, the goal of both modes of reading is …

- ( ) to establish the superiority of written text over the immediacy and truth of speech.
- (●) to dissect text in order to determine its hidden meanings and problems. ✓
- ( ) to uncover and denounce the concealed intellectual commitments of the writer.
- ( ) to display the intelligence and moral superiority of the reader.

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

History, as a discipline, turns away from two of the main ways of reading that have dominated the humanities for the past half-century. These methods have been productive, but perhaps they also bear some responsibility for today's corrosive lack of generosity. The two approaches have different genealogies, but share a significant feature: at heart, they are adversarial.

One mode of reading, first described by Paul Ricoeur and known as 'the hermeneutics of suspicion', aims to uncover the hidden meaning or agenda of a text. The reader interprets what happens on the surface as a symptom of something deeper and more dubious, from economic inequality to sexual anxiety. The reader's task is to reject the face value of a work, and to plumb for a submerged truth.

A second form of interpretation, known as 'deconstruction', was developed by Jacques Derrida. It aims to identify and reveal a text's hidden contradictions – ambiguities and even contradictions that eluded the author. For example, Derrida detected a bias that favoured speech over writing in many influential philosophical texts of the Western tradition, from Plato to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The fact that written texts could privilege the immediacy and truth of speech was a paradox that revealed unarticulated metaphysical commitments at the heart of Western philosophy.

Both of these ways of reading pit reader against text. The reader's goal becomes to uncover meanings or problems that the work does not explicitly express. In both cases, intelligence and moral probity are displayed at the expense of what's been written. In the 20th century, these approaches empowered critics to detect and denounce the workings of power in all kinds of materials. They do, however, foster a prosecutorial attitude among academics and public intellectuals. As a colleague once told me: 'I am always looking for the Freudian slip.' He scours the writings of his peers to spot when they trip up and betray their problematic intellectual commitments. One poorly chosen phrase can sully an entire work.

Not surprisingly, these methods have fostered a rather paranoid atmosphere in modern academia. One error is taken as the symptom of problematic thinking; it can spoil not just a whole book, but perhaps even the author's entire oeuvre.

Explanation:

The third paragraph states, "Both of these ways of reading pit reader against text. The reader's goal becomes to uncover meanings or problems that the work does not explicitly express. In both cases, intelligence and moral probity are displayed at the expense of what's been written." From this point of view, options 2 and 4 need to be closely looked at. Option 1 describes a paradox that characterizes the Western Philosophy. This doesn't establish the goal of 'adversarial humanities'. Option 3 refers to the growing "prosecutorial attitude among academics and public intellectuals" [Paragraph 4]. Option 4 is a corollary to the 'adversarial humanities' approach to reading texts. Option 2 is the stated goal, while option 4 is its consequence. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **48 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **72 %**

3) According to the author, how has 'adversarial humanities' influenced academics and intellectuals?

- They detect and denounce the workings of power in all kinds of text.
- They concentrate on trivial errors in text and miss its real context and significance.
- They have caused a corrosive lack of generosity in public discourse.
- They have become eager to spoil not just single books but the entire corpus of a writer's work.

Video Explanation:

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

History, as a discipline, turns away from two of the main ways of reading that have dominated the humanities for the past half-century. These methods have been productive, but perhaps they also bear some responsibility for today's corrosive lack of generosity. The two approaches have different genealogies, but share a significant feature: at heart, they are adversarial.

One mode of reading, first described by Paul Ricoeur and known as 'the hermeneutics of suspicion', aims to uncover the hidden meaning or agenda of a text. The reader interprets what happens on the surface as a symptom of something deeper and more dubious, from economic inequality to sexual anxiety. The reader's task is to reject the face value of a work, and to plumb for a submerged truth.

A second form of interpretation, known as 'deconstruction', was developed by Jacques Derrida. It aims to identify and reveal a text's hidden contradictions – ambiguities and even contradictions that eluded the author. For example, Derrida detected a bias that favoured speech over writing in many influential philosophical texts of the Western tradition, from Plato to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The fact that written texts could privilege the immediacy and truth of speech was a paradox that revealed unarticulated metaphysical commitments at the heart of Western philosophy.

Both of these ways of reading pit reader against text. The reader's goal becomes to uncover meanings or problems that the work does not explicitly express. In both cases, intelligence and moral probity are displayed at the expense of what's been written. In the 20th century, these approaches empowered critics to detect and denounce the workings of power in all kinds of materials. They do, however, foster a prosecutorial attitude among academics and public intellectuals. As a colleague once told me: 'I am always looking for the Freudian slip.' He scours the writings of his peers to spot when they trip up and betray their problematic intellectual commitments. One poorly chosen phrase can sully an entire work.

Not surprisingly, these methods have fostered a rather paranoid atmosphere in modern academia. One error is taken as the symptom of problematic thinking; it can spoil not just a whole book, but perhaps even the author's entire oeuvre.

Refer to paragraph 3. The influence of the approach on academics and public intellectuals is mentioned as "They do, however, foster a prosecutorial attitude among academics and public intellectuals. As a colleague once told me: 'I am always looking for the Freudian slip.' He scours … it can spoil not just a whole book, but perhaps even the author's entire oeuvre." The influence and its example are made explicit here. Hence, option 2 is inferable. Options 1 and 3 describe how it has affected the discipline of humanities as a whole, and not academics in particular. Option 4 is a misrepresentation—the primary aim is not to ruin a writer's career. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **42 secs**

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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

4) One can conclude from the passage that: −

- the adversarial approach to text is unproductive.
- history does not follow the 'adversarial' approach.
- adversarial approach does not benefit teachers.
- reading, unlike speech, is always evaluative.

Video Explanation: ⌄

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

History, as a discipline, turns away from two of the main ways of reading that have dominated the humanities for the past half-century. These methods have been productive, but perhaps they also bear some responsibility for today's corrosive lack of generosity. The two approaches have different genealogies, but share a significant feature: at heart, they are adversarial.

One mode of reading, first described by Paul Ricoeur and known as 'the hermeneutics of suspicion', aims to uncover the hidden meaning or agenda of a text. The reader interprets what happens on the surface as a symptom of something deeper and more dubious, from economic inequality to sexual anxiety. The reader's task is to reject the face value of a work, and to plumb for a submerged truth.

A second form of interpretation, known as 'deconstruction', was developed by Jacques Derrida. It aims to identify and reveal a text's hidden contradictions – ambiguities and even contradictions that eluded the author. For example, Derrida detected a bias that favoured speech over writing in many influential philosophical texts of the Western tradition, from Plato to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The fact that written texts could privilege the immediacy and truth of speech was a paradox that revealed unarticulated metaphysical commitments at the heart of Western philosophy.

Both of these ways of reading pit reader against text. The reader's goal becomes to uncover meanings or problems that the work does not explicitly express. In both cases, intelligence and moral probity are displayed at the expense of what's been written. In the 20th century, these approaches empowered critics to detect and denounce the workings of power in all kinds of materials. They do, however, foster a prosecutorial attitude among academics and public intellectuals. As a colleague once told me: 'I am always looking for the Freudian slip.' He scours the writings of his peers to spot when they trip up and betray their problematic intellectual commitments. One poorly chosen phrase can sully an entire work.

Not surprisingly, these methods have fostered a rather paranoid atmosphere in modern academia. One error is taken as the symptom of problematic thinking; it can spoil not just a whole book, but perhaps even the author's entire oeuvre.

The passage examines the two ways of reading that has dominated the discipline of humanities, concluding that they are 'adversarial' in nature. However, it states right at the beginning that History 'turns away' from these two types of reading. So, we can conclude that History, unlike these two ways of reading, is not adversarial. Therefore, option 2 is the correct answer. Option 1 is incorrect as the first paragraph mentions that "these methods have been productive…" Option 3 is incorrect – the last paragraph states that "showing students how to take a text apart bestows authority." Option 4 is incorrect as the passage discusses two major ways of reading, but does not conclude that reading, unlike speech, is always evaluative. For instance, reading of history is not evaluative. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **0 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Skipped**

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

5) "Freudian slip" (Paragraph 3) most likely means:

- a clear expression of one's intellectual position.
- an expression that betrays one's inner paranoia. ✗
- an unintended expression of one's problematic thinking.
- an expression that is meant to hide one's intellectual standpoint.

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

Change Section here ▾

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

History, as a discipline, turns away from two of the main ways of reading that have dominated the humanities for the past half-century. These methods have been productive, but perhaps they also bear some responsibility for today's corrosive lack of generosity. The two approaches have different genealogies, but share a significant feature: at heart, they are adversarial.

One mode of reading, first described by Paul Ricoeur and known as 'the hermeneutics of suspicion', aims to uncover the hidden meaning or agenda of a text. The reader interprets what happens on the surface as a symptom of something deeper and more dubious, from economic inequality to sexual anxiety. The reader's task is to reject the face value of a work, and to plumb for a submerged truth.

A second form of interpretation, known as 'deconstruction', was developed by Jacques Derrida. It aims to identify and reveal a text's hidden contradictions – ambiguities and even contradictions that eluded the author. For example, Derrida detected a bias that favoured speech over writing in many influential philosophical texts of the Western tradition, from Plato to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The fact that written texts could privilege the immediacy and truth of speech was a paradox that revealed unarticulated metaphysical commitments at the heart of Western philosophy.

Both of these ways of reading pit reader against text. The reader's goal becomes to uncover meanings or problems that the work does not explicitly express. In both cases, intelligence and moral probity are displayed at the expense of what's been written. In the 20th century, these approaches empowered critics to detect and denounce the workings of power in all kinds of materials. They do, however, foster a prosecutorial attitude among academics and public intellectuals. As a colleague once told me: 'I am always looking for the Freudian slip.' He scours the writings of his peers to spot when they trip up and betray their problematic intellectual commitments. One poorly chosen phrase can sully an entire work.

Not surprisingly, these methods have fostered a rather paranoid atmosphere in modern academia. One error is taken as the symptom of problematic thinking; it can spoil not just a whole book, but perhaps even the author's entire oeuvre.

The dictionary meaning of Freudian slip is "an unintentional error regarded as revealing subconscious feelings." Paragraph 3 elaborates on the term through the words of the author's colleague: "I am always looking for the Freudian slip.' He scours the writings of his peers to spot when they trip up and betray their problematic intellectual commitments." The slip that betrays their problematic intellectual commitments corresponds to option 3. Other options do not give the sense of "unintentionality", and hence are incorrect. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer: ⌄

Time taken by you: **6 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

Loading...

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

Compared with mammals, living members of the crocodile clan have exceptionally boring dentition. From the slender-snouted gharials of India and the nocturnal caimans of South America to the saltwater behemoths of the South Pacific, crocodile teeth vary little in morphology. All are conical and pointed. Each tooth in an animal's mouth is almost identical to its neighbours—as befits a group of animals that feed on a mixture of fish and the occasional careless beast that strays too close to the shore, or even into the water itself. This predilection for pointed fangs is not, however, how it has always been. During the days of the dinosaurs, the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods, crocodile-clan members showed extraordinary dental diversity. Many of their teeth have proved so bizarre that some palaeontologists have theorised that, far from being carnivorous, these ancient species might have been eating plants.

When trying to work out what ancient animals ate, palaeontologists usually look to modern analogues. If teeth from an extinct beast match those of a modern species, the two are quite likely to have had similar diets. With extinct crocodilians, however, this palaeontological tactic has routinely been stymied because their teeth, which are adorned with many rows of cusps and wrinkled enamel, look nothing like what is found in the mouths of animals alive today. This has left the topic of what ancient crocodilians ate very much up for grabs. Some palaeontologists argue that certain species were vegetarian. To solve the puzzle Mr Melstrom and Dr Irmis turned to Orientation Patch Count Rotated (opcr) analysis. This technique scans a tooth and measures the complexity of its surfaces. Use of opcr has demonstrated that diet is closely related to tooth complexity. Until now the technique has been used mostly on the molars of living mammals. Indeed, the lack of testing in crocodilians made sense, because living crocodilians have no complex tooth morphologies to analyse unlike the strange teeth of ancient crocodiles.

In total, they threw 146 teeth from 16 extinct crocodilians at opcr. For comparison, they also added teeth from a modern caiman into the mix. The analysis revealed that two of the extinct species were carnivorous. The system identified two of the species as "durophagus", meaning that their teeth looked as if they would be good at crushing the shells of clams, crabs and other armoured invertebrates. One species was identified as omnivorous.

1) The dentition of ancient crocodiles …

- was similar to that of mammals.
- showed variations in form and structure. ✓
- had the same form and structure.
- was exceptionally sharp and pointed.

Video Explanation:

Explanation:

The first paragraph states that the dentition of modern crocodiles has 'exceptionally boring dentition' and 'vary little in morphology.' The ancient crocodiles 'showed extraordinary dental diversity'. Hence, option 2 is correct. The comparison in option 1 does not appear in the passage – in fact, modern crocodiles' dentition is contrasted with mammals' in terms of dental diversity. Option 3 is contrary to the answer, and option 4 is said about the dentition of modern crocodiles. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **397 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **255 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **84 %**

2) According to the passage, the crocodilians …

- have an ancestrally carnivorous lineage.
- had diverse dietary habits as they evolved into modern crocodiles. ✓
- were compulsorily vegetarians at some point during evolution.
- fed on fish and occasional animals that strayed into the water.

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

Compared with mammals, living members of the crocodile clan have exceptionally boring dentition. From the slender-snouted gharials of India and the nocturnal caimans of South America to the saltwater behemoths of the South Pacific, crocodile teeth vary little in morphology. All are conical and pointed. Each tooth in an animal's mouth is almost identical to its neighbours—as befits a group of animals that feed on a mixture of fish and the occasional careless beast that strays too close to the shore, or even into the water itself. This predilection for pointed fangs is not, however, how it has always been. During the days of the dinosaurs, the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods, crocodile-clan members showed extraordinary dental diversity. Many of their teeth have proved so bizarre that some palaeontologists have theorised that, far from being carnivorous, these ancient species might have been eating plants.

When trying to work out what ancient animals ate, palaeontologists usually look to modern analogues. If teeth from an extinct beast match those of a modern species, the two are quite likely to have had similar diets. With extinct crocodilians, however, this palaeontological tactic has routinely been stymied because their teeth, which are adorned with many rows of cusps and wrinkled enamel, look nothing like what is found in the mouths of animals alive today. This has left the topic of what ancient crocodilians ate very much up for grabs. Some palaeontologists argue that certain species were vegetarian. To solve the puzzle Mr Melstrom and Dr Irmis turned to Orientation Patch Count Rotated (opcr) analysis. This technique scans a tooth and measures the complexity of its surfaces. Use of opcr has demonstrated that diet is closely related to tooth complexity. Until now the technique has been used mostly on the molars of living mammals. Indeed, the lack of testing in crocodilians made sense, because living crocodilians have no complex tooth morphologies to analyse unlike the strange teeth of ancient crocodiles.

In total, they threw 146 teeth from 16 extinct crocodilians at opcr. For comparison, they also added teeth from a modern caiman into the mix. The analysis revealed that two of the extinct species were carnivorous. The system identified two of the species as "durophagus", meaning that their teeth looked as if they would be good at crushing the shells of clams, crabs and other armoured invertebrates. One species was identified as omnivorous.

Explanation:

The 2nd option can be inferred from the last paragraph. The opcr analysis showed that the extinct crocodiles were carnivores, omnivores, and herbivores and insectivores [Paragraph 3]; this information leads to the conclusion in option 2. Option 1 is contrary to the answer choice. Options 3 and 4 are true only about certain types of crocodiles and not about the crocodilian family of animals. Hence, [2].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **74 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **87 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

3) Unlike in mammals, "the lack of (opcr) testing in crocodilians made sense" (Paragraph 2), because:

- Mammals displayed wide variations in tooth morphology.
- Crocodilians were carnivores, herbivores, and omnivores.
- The tooth morphology of crocodiles was assumed to be unrelated to their diet.
- They had conical pointed teeth, each one identical to the next. ✓

Video Explanation:

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

Compared with mammals, living members of the crocodile clan have exceptionally boring dentition. From the slender-snouted gharials of India and the nocturnal caimans of South America to the saltwater behemoths of the South Pacific, crocodile teeth vary little in morphology. All are conical and pointed. Each tooth in an animal's mouth is almost identical to its neighbours—as befits a group of animals that feed on a mixture of fish and the occasional careless beast that strays too close to the shore, or even into the water itself. This predilection for pointed fangs is not, however, how it has always been. During the days of the dinosaurs, the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods, crocodile-clan members showed extraordinary dental diversity. Many of their teeth have proved so bizarre that some palaeontologists have theorised that, far from being carnivorous, these ancient species might have been eating plants.

When trying to work out what ancient animals ate, palaeontologists usually look to modern analogues. If teeth from an extinct beast match those of a modern species, the two are quite likely to have had similar diets. With extinct crocodilians, however, this palaeontological tactic has routinely been stymied because their teeth, which are adorned with many rows of cusps and wrinkled enamel, look nothing like what is found in the mouths of animals alive today. This has left the topic of what ancient crocodilians ate very much up for grabs. Some palaeontologists argue that certain species were vegetarian. To solve the puzzle Mr Melstrom and Dr Irmis turned to Orientation Patch Count Rotated (opcr) analysis. This technique scans a tooth and measures the complexity of its surfaces. Use of opcr has demonstrated that diet is closely related to tooth complexity. Until now the technique has been used mostly on the molars of living mammals. Indeed, the lack of testing in crocodilians made sense, because living crocodilians have no complex tooth morphologies to analyse unlike the strange teeth of ancient crocodiles.

In total, they threw 146 teeth from 16 extinct crocodilians at opcr. For comparison, they also added teeth from a modern caiman into the mix. The analysis revealed that two of the extinct species were carnivorous. The system identified two of the species as "durophagus", meaning that their teeth looked as if they would be good at crushing the shells of clams, crabs and other armoured invertebrates. One species was identified as omnivorous.

Refer paragraph 2 " Indeed, the lack of testing in crocodilians made sense, because living crocodilians have no complex tooth morphologies to analyze unlike the strange teeth of ancient crocodiles." – Hence, there was no need to analyze the teeth again. The option closest to this idea is option 4 – their (the living crocodilians, whose teeth were not tested) tooth morphology was already known. Options 1 and 2 are irrelevant. Option 3 is contrary to the passage. Passage asserts that "diet is closely related to tooth complexity." Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **22 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

4) All of the following are true about crocodiles EXCEPT:

- Modern crocodiles inhabit saltwater habitats.
- Modern crocodiles are obligate carnivores.
- For millions of years some of the crocodilians were obligate vegetarians.
- Herbivorous crocodiles owed their extinction to their dinosaur counterparts. ✓

Video Explanation:

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

Compared with mammals, living members of the crocodile clan have exceptionally boring dentition. From the slender-snouted gharials of India and the nocturnal caimans of South America to the saltwater behemoths of the South Pacific, crocodile teeth vary little in morphology. All are conical and pointed. Each tooth in an animal's mouth is almost identical to its neighbours—as befits a group of animals that feed on a mixture of fish and the occasional careless beast that strays too close to the shore, or even into the water itself. This predilection for pointed fangs is not, however, how it has always been. During the days of the dinosaurs, the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods, crocodile-clan members showed extraordinary dental diversity. Many of their teeth have proved so bizarre that some palaeontologists have theorised that, far from being carnivorous, these ancient species might have been eating plants.

When trying to work out what ancient animals ate, palaeontologists usually look to modern analogues. If teeth from an extinct beast match those of a modern species, the two are quite likely to have had similar diets. With extinct crocodilians, however, this palaeontological tactic has routinely been stymied because their teeth, which are adorned with many rows of cusps and wrinkled enamel, look nothing like what is found in the mouths of animals alive today. This has left the topic of what ancient crocodilians ate very much up for grabs. Some palaeontologists argue that certain species were vegetarian. To solve the puzzle Mr Melstrom and Dr Irmis turned to Orientation Patch Count Rotated (opcr) analysis. This technique scans a tooth and measures the complexity of its surfaces. Use of opcr has demonstrated that diet is closely related to tooth complexity. Until now the technique has been used mostly on the molars of living mammals. Indeed, the lack of testing in crocodilians made sense, because living crocodilians have no complex tooth morphologies to analyse unlike the strange teeth of ancient crocodiles.

In total, they threw 146 teeth from 16 extinct crocodilians at opcr. For comparison, they also added teeth from a modern caiman into the mix. The analysis revealed that two of the extinct species were carnivorous. The system identified two of the species as "durophagus", meaning that their teeth looked as if they would be good at crushing the shells of clams, crabs and other armoured invertebrates. One species was identified as omnivorous.

Explanation:

The first sentence of the essay mentions "… caimans of south America to the saltwater behemoths of the South Pacific…" So, option 1 is not an exception. Option 2 is true – the passage states that the dentition of modern crocodile "vary little in morphology" and was that of a predator. Option 3 is true-- the opcr analysis showed that certain extinct crocodiles were herbivorous. The last paragraph states that "Herbivorous crocodiles of the Jurassic and Cretaceous, then, were capable of competing successfully with their dinosaur counterparts…." The mention of the two periods, Jurassic and Cretaceous justifies the use of the phrase "millions of years" in option 3 [Technically, in the geology, an era is divided into periods, for instance, Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous periods constitute the Mesozoic Era]. Hence, option 3 is not an exception. Also, the above excerpt, which implies that dinosaurs couldn't have been the cause of the extinction of herbivorous crocodiles, makes option 4 untrue, and therefore the exception. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **30 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **60 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **72 %**

5) Which of the following, if true, casts the most serious doubt on the opcr analysis, which established several ancient crocodilians as obligate herbivores?

- Of the 146 teeth in the opcr analysis, 100 were identified as either "durophagus" or omnivorous.
- Only some of the samples under opcr analysis displayed variations in morphology. ✗
- The samples in the opcr analysis were dated from 50 to 150 million years ago.
- The three samples that were hard to classify included the teeth from modern caiman.

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

Compared with mammals, living members of the crocodile clan have exceptionally boring dentition. From the slender-snouted gharials of India and the nocturnal caimans of South America to the saltwater behemoths of the South Pacific, crocodile teeth vary little in morphology. All are conical and pointed. Each tooth in an animal's mouth is almost identical to its neighbours—as befits a group of animals that feed on a mixture of fish and the occasional careless beast that strays too close to the shore, or even into the water itself. This predilection for pointed fangs is not, however, how it has always been. During the days of the dinosaurs, the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods, crocodile-clan members showed extraordinary dental diversity. Many of their teeth have proved so bizarre that some palaeontologists have theorised that, far from being carnivorous, these ancient species might have been eating plants.

When trying to work out what ancient animals ate, palaeontologists usually look to modern analogues. If teeth from an extinct beast match those of a modern species, the two are quite likely to have had similar diets. With extinct crocodilians, however, this palaeontological tactic has routinely been stymied because their teeth, which are adorned with many rows of cusps and wrinkled enamel, look nothing like what is found in the mouths of animals alive today. This has left the topic of what ancient crocodilians ate very much up for grabs. Some palaeontologists argue that certain species were vegetarian. To solve the puzzle Mr Melstrom and Dr Irmis turned to Orientation Patch Count Rotated (opcr) analysis. This technique scans a tooth and measures the complexity of its surfaces. Use of opcr has demonstrated that diet is closely related to tooth complexity. Until now the technique has been used mostly on the molars of living mammals. Indeed, the lack of testing in crocodilians made sense, because living crocodilians have no complex tooth morphologies to analyse unlike the strange teeth of ancient crocodiles.

In total, they threw 146 teeth from 16 extinct crocodilians at opcr. For comparison, they also added teeth from a modern caiman into the mix. The analysis revealed that two of the extinct species were carnivorous. The system identified two of the species as "durophagus", meaning that their teeth looked as if they would be good at crushing the shells of clams, crabs and other armoured invertebrates. One species was identified as omnivorous.

Explanation:

Option 1 does not affect the credibility of the study as the 100 samples must have actually belonged to "durophagus" or omnivorous; hence, the identification could be correct. This would implicitly strengthen the study. Option 2 does not affect the conclusion of the argument because those that displayed variations also might have been identified correctly. Option 3 does not affect the analysis as it is stated that the samples were of extinct crocodilians except for the caiman sample. Option 4, if true, questions the credibility of the study. If the analysis could not establish the caiman samples were of a carnivore and left it uncertain – the entire analysis comes under a cloud. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **94 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **25 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

Loading...

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

Lasting almost 10 years from late 1929 until about 1939 and affecting nearly every country in the world, The Great Depression was marked by steep declines in industrial production and in prices, deflation, mass unemployment, banking panics, and sharp increases in rates of poverty and homelessness. In the United States, where the effects of the depression were generally worst, between 1929 and 1933 industrial production fell nearly 47 percent, gross domestic product declined by 30 percent, and unemployment reached more than 20 percent. By comparison, during the Great Recession of 2007–09, the second largest economic downturn in U.S. history, GDP declined by 4.3 percent, and unemployment reached slightly less than 10 percent.

- The Great Depression of the late 1920s and '30s remains the longest and the most severe global economic downturn in modern history, especially in the U.S.
- The Great Depression of 1929-1939 and the Great Recession of 2007-09 were marked by a sharp decline in GDP and rise in poverty all over the world.
- The economic downturn of the late 1920s and '30s, called The Great depression was far more severe than the Great Recession of 2007-09. ✖
- The Great Depression from 1929 to 1939 that affected every country in the world, especially the U.S., is the most severe in modern history.

Oops, you got it wrong!

Explanation:

The author explains the Great depression of 1929 to 1939 (which was marked by steep declines in industrial production and in prices, deflation, mass unemployment, banking panics, and sharp increases in rates of poverty and homelessness). He states that the US economy was the worst affected. A comparison is made between the Great depression and the great recession of 2007-09. To understand the severity of 1930's depression he compares the impact of these two downturns on the US economy. The author is trying to communicate his position that the great depression was far more severe than any economic downturn the world and the US have ever experienced. This idea is best expressed in option 1. Option 4 is very close, but does not mention the 'economic downturn' leaving it to the reader to use their prior knowledge. In that respect, option 1 makes things explicit. Hence, [1].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **127 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **42 secs**

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

% Students got it correct: **21 %**

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

About 300 million years ago, Earth didn't have seven continents, but instead one massive supercontinent called Pangaea, which was surrounded by a single ocean. Pangaea existed between about 300 million years ago to about 180 million years ago. Pangaea was fully assembled by the Early Permian Epoch - some 300 million to 273 million years ago. It remained in its fully assembled state for some 100 million years before it began to break up. The supercontinent began to break apart about 200 million years ago, during the Early Jurassic Epoch - 201 million to 174 million years ago, eventually forming the modern continents.

- Between 300 and 180 million years ago the earth's entire landmass existed in one massive supercontinent called Pangaea, surrounded by a global ocean.
- Pangaea, the supercontinent that came into existence 300 million years ago remained in fully assembled state for 100 million years before breaking up into the seven continents.
- The modern continents and oceans were formed by the breakdown of the massive landmass and ocean that existed 300 million years ago.
- Pangaea, in early geologic time, was a supercontinent that incorporated all the landmasses of Earth, which eventually broke apart to form the modern continents. ✔

Congratulations, you got it correct!

Explanation:

Option 1 is deficient in that it doesn't mention the formation of modern continents. Option 2 doesn't describe the author's viewpoint—its focus is on the supercontinent (and its dissolution) rather than the fact that the seven continents formed from it. Besides, it's a misrepresentation in implying that the Pangaea "came into existence" 300 million years ago; it didn't begin existing 300 million years ago, but was reaching the final stage of its formation. Option 3 leaves out the name Pangaea and is problematic in the use of the word "breakdown." Option 4 captures the essence of the paragraph without any distortion. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **88 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **52 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

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

According to his biographer Suetonius, the Roman emperor Nero "practiced every sort of obscenity," ranging from incest to cruelty to animals to homicide. Nero was such a bad guy, in fact, that he may very well have been the first Antichrist in the Christian tradition. But did Nero actually fiddle while Rome burned? Ancient tradition has it that Nero was so moved by the sight of the great fire that swept across the capital of his empire in the summer of 64 CE that he climbed to the top of the city walls and declaimed from a now-lost epic poem concerning the destruction of Troy. It is said that he wept copiously while reciting lines describing the conflagration that the Greeks put to the fallen city of Troy. So did Nero fiddle while Rome burned? No. Sort of. Maybe. More likely, he strummed a proto-guitar while dreaming of the new city that he hoped would arise in the fire's ashes. That isn't quite the same thing as doing nothing, but it isn't the sort of decisive leadership one might hope for either.

- Though the Roman emperor Nero was a despicable person as well as a weak emperor, he did not actually fiddle while Rome burned.
- According to his biographer, the Roman Emperor Nero practiced every sort of obscenity; however, he was only reciting a poem, and not fiddling, while Rome burned.
- According to his biographer Suetonius, the Roman emperor Nero was the first Antichrist, but that he actually fiddled while Rome burned is a historical overstatement.
- Though Nero practiced every sort of atrocity and was a weak emperor, that he actually fiddled while Rome burned is at best a historically inaccurate statement. ✔

Congratulations, you got it correct!

Explanation:

Option 1 is categorical in stating that Nero “did not actually fiddle while Rome burned.” The paragraph, in fact, hints that it may not be a fact. Option 2 is inaccurate in saying that “he was only reciting a poem, and not fiddling”. Option 3 is incorrect in asserting that Nero was the ‘first Antichrist’. Option 4 captures the essence of the passage. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **156 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **30 %**

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. However, there is potentially a wide range of practical applications of the psychology of religion that also merit attention.
2. Those are the kind of basic questions that any area of psychology needs to address.
3. So far, psychology of religion has been largely concerned with basic issues— conditions in which particular forms of religion arise, what effects they have, and so on.
4. They have not been fully developed as they might be, but it's likely that the 21st C will see a growing body of applied work on the psychology of religion.

3214

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

Explanation:

Only sentence 3 can be the starter. It talks of how, so far, psychology has been concerned only with the basic issues. This is followed by sentence 2—'those' in sentence 2 refers to the 'basic issues' [sentence 3]. Sentence 2 argues that these are issues (or questions) that concern any area of psychology-- not psychology of religion in particular. Thus, we get the mandatory pair 3-2. We have two alternatives now—3214 and 3241. However, 4 can't follow 1 as the antecedent of the pronoun 'they' in 4 is "range of practical issues' mentioned in sentence 1. Hence, sentence 4 has to follow 1. Hence, 3214.

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **48 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **68 secs**

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

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. Widely hailed in the press for the opportunity it offers workers to graduate from college debt-free, the program has seen 7,500 employee enrollments.
2. It offered workers the opportunity to enroll in online degree programs for $1 a day in business, technology, and supply chain management at three different universities.
3. A year later, the program expanded to six universities and 14 areas of study, including cyber security and computer science.
4. In a move to build a more skilled, educated workforce, Walmart introduced its Academies program in 2018.

4231

Congratulations, you got it correct!

Explanation:

Sentences 1, 2 and 3 cannot start the paragraph. The pronoun “it” in sentences 1 and 2, and “A year later…” in sentence 3 are not logical in a starter. Sentence 4, on the other hand, introduces the theme of the paragraph-- Walmart’s Academies program. Sentence 2 follows sentence 4 because it explains what Walmart’s Academies program is all about. Sentence 3 comes after the 4-2 pair because it talks about the expansion of the program “a year later.” Sentence 1 then closes the paragraph with “the program has seen 7,500 employee enrollments.” The present perfect verb (has seen) makes the sentence unfit in any other place in the paragraph; anywhere else in the paragraph, the sentence will have to be in the past tense (the program saw 7500 enrollments…). Hence, 4231.

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **112 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% 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. But it isn't that simple to cast judgment on this treaty, which took concrete steps at a time when there was far less scientific evidence for human-made climate change.
2. It's been 22 years since the Kyoto Protocol—the first international effort to cut back greenhouse gas emissions and slow the pace of human-induced climate change—took effect.
3. More than two decades after it was written, world economies continue to rely heavily on fossil fuels, and greenhouse gases in the atmosphere continue to rise to unprecedented levels.
4. On the face of it, the goals of this far-reaching treaty were ambitious: "It bound member states to act in the interests of human safety even in the face of scientific uncertainty."

2431

Congratulations, you got it correct!

Explanation:

The treaty mentioned in sentences 1 and 4 is specified in sentence 2 as the 'Kyoto Protocol'. Hence, sentence 2 starts the paragraph, introducing and explaining the "Kyoto Protocol." Sentence 4, which specifies the goals of the treaty comes after sentence 2. 2- 4 is a mandatory pair. The 2-4 pair is the followed by sentence 3 because "on the face of it..." in sentence 4 prepares for the lack of success of the treaty in reducing emissions as stated in sentence 3. So, 2-4-3 is a logical sequence, which is concluded by sentence 1. Hence, 2431.

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **123 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

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

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. And yet many people are questioning the capitalist system that produced those gains.
2. This is created by the three big rifts: between cities and small towns, the educated and the uneducated, the high- and middle-income countries and the fragile states.
3. If you measure by things like GDP growth and lifespan, life is better for more people around the world than it has ever been.
4. There's an understandable sense that the system is in crisis.

4231

Oops, you got it wrong!

Explanation:

"...and yet" in sentence 1, "this is because" in sentence 2 and "the system" in sentence 4 make them unsuitable for the starter. So, the standalone sentence 3 starts the paragraph. Sentence 1 comes next, with a contrasting idea; beginning with '...and yet', it highlights the idea that capitalism, in spite of causing the advancement [sentence 3], is being questioned by the people. This questioning arises from an understandable sense of crisis (in the system).Hence, sentence 4 follows 3-1, and sentence 2 comes at the end, concluding that the sense of crisis is created by the three big rifts. Hence, 3142.

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **74 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

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. But arguably the most notable aspect of the event is the all-white dress code for all participants.
2. The Wimbledon Championships are the oldest and most prestigious of the four tennis Grand Slam tournaments.
3. When the dress code was written in the genteel 1880s, sweat stains were considered so improper it was decided that white should be worn to minimize their visibility.
4. Another tradition is the Royal Box, which has been reserved for members of the English nobility since 1922; and the iconic - and still advertisement-free - Centre Court.
5. As such, Wimbledon is awash in long-lasting traditions and features, such as the habit of calling the men's and women's competitions "Gentlemen's" and "Ladies'," respectively.

4

Oops, you got it wrong!

Explanation:

Sentence 2 is a general description of the Wimbledon and serves as an introduction to the theme of the paragraph – it's the oldest and the most prestigious of the four tennis Grand Slam tournaments. Sentence 5 links to this statement directly. 'As such' in 5 attributes its 'traditions and features' directly to its long history, and names one of the traditions. Sentences 1 and 4 name more of these traditions or features – the Royal Box, the Centre court, and the all-white dress code. Sentence 3, however, explains how the all-white dress code came into being – this is a deviation from the main theme. Hence, [3].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **176 secs**

Avg Time taken by all students: **36 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. He claims that most news sources are “fake,” and Google searches are biased against him.
2. Donald Trump notoriously explains away critique by appealing to this skepticism.
3. But skepticism about new media can make us easy prey for old-fashioned propaganda.
4. If democracy depends on informed citizens, democracy is in trouble.
5. We are constantly being told to watch out for bots and biased search engines.

1

Oops, you got it wrong!

Explanation:

Sentences 2 and 3 refer to “skepticism about new media” and Donald Trump using “this skepticism” to explain the criticism directed against him. Sentence 1 spells out the explanation that Donald Trump offers [in favour of this skepticism]. Hence, the sequence 321 in that order is part of a narrative. Either sentence 4 or sentence 5 needs to define the skepticism mentioned in sentence 3. Sentence 5 states that we are being cautioned against biased search engines or ‘new media’. Sentence 4 expresses skepticism about democracy itself. Sentence 4 is thus not as closely related to the theme as sentence 5 is. Besides, 5-3 is logical whereas 4-3 is not. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **49 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Wrong**

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

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. Birds that build their nests on the ground might want to keep them well camouflaged to help hide them from predators.
2. Birds in a cold climate, for example, might line their nests with insulating materials, such as grass, to help keep the eggs warm.
3. Depending on the location and climate of the bird's habitat, bird nests might need to serve different purposes.
4. Some birds weave together grass and twigs to form a basket; others might use binding materials, such as mud or even their own saliva to build or help support the nest.
5. Birds that build their nests in trees need them to be well supported so they don't get blown out by a gust of wind.

4

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

Explanation:

The theme of the paragraph is stated in sentence 3 – depending on the location and climate the birds' nests serve different purposes. Sentences 1, 2 and 5 describe different locations or climates and how birds design their nests accordingly. Sentence 1 describes nests on the ground, sentence 2 describes nests in places with cold climate, and sentence 5 describes nests built in trees. Sentence 4 however talks about how birds build their nests. This is not related to the common theme. Hence, [4].

Correct Answer:

Time taken by you: **38 secs**

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

Your Attempt: **Correct**

% Students got it correct: **57 %**