

MCAT CARS Practice Test 1

MCAT Critical Analysis and Reasoning Skills • Form 1

Directions. This is an original independent practice form designed to mirror the current MCAT section structure. Select the best answer for each question. Do not use the answer fields or explanations until you have completed the form. **Timing.** 90 minutes. The practice form uses the AAMC section timing; it is not an official AAMC form and does not produce an official scaled score. **Blueprint note.** Foundations of Comprehension 30%; Reasoning Within the Text 30%; Reasoning Beyond the Text 40%; humanities 50%; social sciences 50%.

Passage 1: Public memory and monuments

A community debates whether a monument should remain in a central square. One group treats it as a record of an earlier political order; another argues that its prominent location converts memory into present honor. The author does not treat removal as erasure. Relocation to a museum can preserve the object while changing the public meaning attached to it. The dispute therefore concerns not only what a society remembers but also who controls the setting in which remembering occurs. Responsible commemoration should make history visible without requiring the public to accept an inherited hierarchy as its own. The author distinguishes an object's physical survival from the social meaning of its placement. A museum label can make a history available for inspection, whereas a civic square can make an inherited hierarchy seem ordinary. This distinction does not settle every dispute about removal, but it changes the question from whether an object exists to what public arrangement asks viewers to honor. The passage distinguishes physical survival from civic honor. In the case of public memory and monuments, relocation changes the audience's relationship to an object; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering public memory and monuments, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of public memory and monuments then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, relocation changes the audience's relationship to an object. That observation does not settle every case, because visibility can normalize a hierarchy; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: compare preservation with placement, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about public memory and monuments might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking physical survival from civic honor can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about public memory and monuments. The closing claim about public memory and monuments follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should compare preservation with placement when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: setting changes the civic meaning of historical objects, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

1. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
 - A. preservation does not determine what a public setting honors
 - B. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - C. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - D. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
2. The author's discussion of public memory and monuments most nearly reveals which point?
 - A. a historical description that replaces the author's argument

- B. the relocation example separates keeping an object from endorsing its former civic role
 - C. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
 - D. that the practice has no legitimate use
3. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. a monument can remain historically available while its prominent placement still communicates present approval
 - B. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.
 - C. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.
 - D. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.
4. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?
- A. A preference for a different style of presentation.
 - B. the object has the same public meaning wherever it is placed
 - C. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.
 - D. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
5. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:
- A. evaluate both the record preserved and the hierarchy signaled by the setting
 - B. judge the issue only by its most visible result
 - C. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
 - D. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
6. A city moves a monument from its civic plaza to a museum with a contextual label. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?
- A. judged the issue only by its most visible result
 - B. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present
 - C. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy
 - D. It preserves access to the record while reconsidering what the civic setting publicly honors.

Passage 2: The value of idleness

Some writers praise idleness as the enemy of productivity, while others defend unoccupied time as a condition for reflection. The author distinguishes passive delay from deliberate unstructured attention. A person who walks without a destination may notice relationships that a schedule would hide. The author does not claim that every idle hour produces insight. Rather, a culture organized entirely around measurable output loses thought that cannot be assigned a predictable duration. Idleness is treated less as a moral virtue than as a practical space where unexpected connections can appear. The author is careful about the difference between unstructured attention and avoidance. A person who refuses every obligation is not thereby more perceptive. The narrower claim concerns intervals in which attention is not assigned an output in advance. Such intervals can expose relationships that a production schedule would treat as irrelevant, although the resulting insight cannot be guaranteed. The passage distinguishes unassigned attention from avoidance. In the case of the value of idleness, a schedule measures output but not every form of noticing; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering the value of idleness, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of the value of idleness then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, a schedule measures output but not every form of noticing. That observation does not settle every case, because insight is possible without being guaranteed; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: judge an interval by its effects rather than by a moral label, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about the value of idleness might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking unassigned attention from avoidance can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about the value of idleness. The closing claim about the value of idleness follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should judge an interval by its effects rather than by a moral label when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: unstructured time can support forms of thought that schedules suppress, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

7. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - B. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - C. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
 - D. unstructured time can support attention without becoming a universal virtue
8. The author's discussion of the value of idleness most nearly reveals which point?
- A. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
 - B. the walking example distinguishes deliberate openness from refusal of responsibility
 - C. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
 - D. that the practice has no legitimate use
9. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.
 - B. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.

- C. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.
 - D. a scheduled activity can be productive while still excluding discoveries that have no preset output
10. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?
- A. all unstructured time produces valuable insight
 - B. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.
 - C. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
 - D. A preference for a different style of presentation.
11. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:
- A. compare the kind of attention an interval permits with the obligations it displaces
 - B. judge the issue only by its most visible result
 - C. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
 - D. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
12. A school protects a short period for unguided observation and evaluates the reflections rather than counting immediate products. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?
- A. judged the issue only by its most visible result
 - B. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present
 - C. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy
 - D. It tests whether unassigned attention creates useful noticing without treating all unstructured time as valuable.

Passage 3: Maps and authority

A map appears to offer neutral description, but every map selects some features and omits others. A map designed for taxation emphasizes parcels; one designed for evacuation emphasizes routes and hazards. Neither is simply false, yet each directs attention toward a particular purpose. The appearance of precision can disguise the choices that produced the representation. Readers should ask what a map was made to accomplish before treating it as a complete account of a place. Maps are useful, but their usefulness depends on recognizing their intended function. The choice of scale, boundary, and symbol is therefore part of the map's argument. A road map and a map of flood risk may represent the same place without answering the same question. Precision in measurement does not erase selectivity in design. The reader's task is to connect a representation to the decision it is meant to support. The passage distinguishes selection from neutrality. In the case of maps and authority, scale, boundary, and symbol encode a purpose; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering maps and authority, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of maps and authority then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, scale, boundary, and symbol encode a purpose. That observation does not settle every case, because precision can conceal omission; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: ask which decision the representation is meant to support, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about maps and authority might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking selection from neutrality can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about maps and authority. The closing claim about maps and authority follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should ask which decision the representation is meant to support when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: a representation is shaped by the purpose for which it was made, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

13. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - B. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - C. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
 - D. a map's purpose shapes what counts as relevant detail
14. The author's discussion of maps and authority most nearly reveals which point?
- A. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
 - B. the tax and evacuation examples show that different selections can be accurate for different decisions
 - C. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
 - D. that the practice has no legitimate use
15. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.
 - B. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.
 - C. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.

D. precision does not turn a purpose-built representation into a complete account

16. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?

- A. a map includes every feature of the place equally
- B. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.
- C. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
- D. A preference for a different style of presentation.

17. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:

- A. judge the issue only by its most visible result
- B. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
- C. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
- D. ask what decision the map's omissions and symbols are designed to support

18. An emergency map emphasizes flood depth and evacuation routes but omits businesses that are irrelevant to the evacuation decision. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

- A. It evaluates the map by the decision it supports rather than demanding that it represent every feature equally.
- B. judged the issue only by its most visible result
- C. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present
- D. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy

Passage 4: Comedy and social permission

Comedy can challenge social rules while sometimes reinforcing them. A joke may expose a contradiction by making an audience laugh at authority, but laughter can also release tension without changing authority's position. The author rejects a simple equation between humor and resistance. The effect depends on who tells the joke, who is allowed to laugh, and whether the target can answer back. Comedy may create temporary distance from convention, yet that distance can close when the audience returns to ordinary habits. Political evaluation therefore requires attention to consequences, not merely rebellious tone. The author therefore asks readers to examine the social distribution of laughter. A joke that lets an audience imagine dissent may still leave the institution untouched if the audience receives release without changing practice. Conversely, a comic form can create a vocabulary for criticism when its targets can no longer control the interpretation. The effect is conditional, not automatic. The passage distinguishes temporary release from durable resistance. In the case of comedy and social permission, the distribution of laughter determines who can answer back; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering comedy and social permission, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of comedy and social permission then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, the distribution of laughter determines who can answer back. That observation does not settle every case, because distance from convention may close without changed practice; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: trace consequences rather than rewarding rebellious tone, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about comedy and social permission might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking temporary release from durable resistance can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about comedy and social permission. The closing claim about comedy and social permission follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should trace consequences rather than rewarding rebellious tone when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: humor may interrupt authority without necessarily transforming it, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

19. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - B. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - C. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
 - D. humor's political effect depends on social consequences rather than rebellious appearance
20. The author's discussion of comedy and social permission most nearly reveals which point?
- A. that the practice has no legitimate use
 - B. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
 - C. the audience and target determine whether laughter opens or closes room for criticism
 - D. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
21. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.
 - B. a joke can expose contradiction while leaving the institution's practice unchanged

- C. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.
 - D. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.
22. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?
- A. laughter necessarily transfers power to the target of a joke
 - B. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.
 - C. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
 - D. A preference for a different style of presentation.
23. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:
- A. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
 - B. trace who can answer, what changes afterward, and whether release substitutes for action
 - C. judge the issue only by its most visible result
 - D. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
24. A satirical performance criticizes a public agency, but the audience's laughter is followed by no change in the agency's practice. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?
- A. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy
 - B. It distinguishes the release produced by the joke from evidence that the institution's power actually changed.
 - C. judged the issue only by its most visible result
 - D. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present

Passage 5: Craft and authenticity

A novelist claims that natural writing should arrive without visible labor. The author disputes this by comparing literary craft to skilled translation. A finished sentence may seem inevitable precisely because revision removed the alternatives that would reveal its construction. Hidden labor does not make a result artificial; it makes the writer responsible for the effects of form. Excessive polish can flatten a voice, but spontaneity is an insufficient standard. Authenticity is not the absence of technique but the fit between technique and the experience a work seeks to communicate. Revision is presented as a form of fidelity rather than concealment. The writer tests whether the rhythm, omission, and emphasis suit the experience being represented. The visible smoothness of the final sentence may be evidence that alternatives were considered and rejected. What matters is not whether labor can be seen but whether the form remains answerable to the work's subject. The passage distinguishes visible spontaneity from faithful construction. In the case of craft and authenticity, revision removes alternatives that would distract from the experience; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering craft and authenticity, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of craft and authenticity then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, revision removes alternatives that would distract from the experience. That observation does not settle every case, because polish can flatten a voice without making technique suspect; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: test the fit between form and the subject represented, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about craft and authenticity might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking visible spontaneity from faithful construction can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about craft and authenticity. The closing claim about craft and authenticity follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should test the fit between form and the subject represented when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: authenticity can be produced through disciplined craft, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

25. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. technique can make a work feel faithful rather than artificial
 - B. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - C. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - D. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
26. The author's discussion of craft and authenticity most nearly reveals which point?
- A. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
 - B. revision shows how hidden choices can produce an apparently inevitable sentence
 - C. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
 - D. that the practice has no legitimate use
27. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.
 - B. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.

- C. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.
 - D. spontaneous wording is not a sufficient test of authenticity
28. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?
- A. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.
 - B. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
 - C. A preference for a different style of presentation.
 - D. visible labor always makes a voice less genuine
29. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:
- A. judge whether formal choices remain answerable to the experience represented
 - B. judge the issue only by its most visible result
 - C. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
 - D. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
30. A writer revises sentence rhythm and removes familiar phrases so that a character's experience is represented more precisely. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?
- A. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy
 - B. It treats revision as potentially faithful when the formal choices remain answerable to the experience represented.
 - C. judged the issue only by its most visible result
 - D. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present

Passage 6: Public health and trust

A public health campaign may assume that accurate information produces compliance. The author argues that accuracy is necessary but not sufficient. People judge the messenger, the fairness of the request, and whether institutions have previously acknowledged uncertainty. A campaign that treats hesitation as ignorance may intensify distrust even when its facts are correct. The better approach explains what is known, what is not, and how decisions may be revised. Trust is not a substitute for evidence; it is a condition that helps evidence become actionable. The author also rejects the idea that transparency means listing every uncertainty without judgment. Institutions must identify which uncertainties matter for the decision and what evidence would change the recommendation. Trust grows when revision is explained rather than hidden. Accuracy remains indispensable, but it becomes useful through a relationship in which people can evaluate the messenger's conduct. The passage distinguishes accurate information from actionable communication. In the case of public health and trust, fairness and transparent revision affect whether evidence can be used; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering public health and trust, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of public health and trust then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, fairness and transparent revision affect whether evidence can be used. That observation does not settle every case, because uncertainty can increase trust when its limits are specific; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: evaluate the relationship between messenger and audience, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about public health and trust might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking accurate information from actionable communication can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about public health and trust. The closing claim about public health and trust follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should evaluate the relationship between messenger and audience when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: trust depends on transparent relationships as well as accurate facts, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

31. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - B. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
 - C. accurate information becomes actionable through a fair and transparent relationship
 - D. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
32. The author's discussion of public health and trust most nearly reveals which point?
- A. the campaign example shows why acknowledging revision can matter as much as stating facts
 - B. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
 - C. that the practice has no legitimate use
 - D. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
33. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.
 - B. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.

- C. a correct recommendation may fail when the audience cannot evaluate the messenger's conduct
- D. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.

34. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?

- A. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
- B. A preference for a different style of presentation.
- C. transparency requires listing every uncertainty without prioritizing any
- D. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.

35. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:

- A. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
- B. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
- C. consider evidence, fairness, and the conditions under which people can act on it
- D. judge the issue only by its most visible result

36. A health agency explains why its recommendation changed, identifies the uncertainty that mattered, and states what evidence would change it again. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

- A. judged the issue only by its most visible result
- B. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present
- C. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy
- D. It treats transparency as actionable explanation rather than an undifferentiated list of every uncertainty.

Passage 7: The politics of queues

Queues are often described as impersonal mechanisms that give everyone an equal chance. The author notes that a queue can be fair in one sense while imposing unequal costs on people with different time, mobility, or information. A first-come rule ignores that arriving early may be easier for one group than another. Queues remain useful, but should be evaluated by the burdens they distribute as well as the order they produce. Efficiency and fairness may converge, but they cannot be assumed to do so. The queue's apparent neutrality can therefore conceal a theory of whose time counts. A rule may distribute places evenly while distributing waiting unequally. The author favors comparison among procedures rather than a universal rejection of order. The proper question is which arrangement meets the purpose with the least unjustified burden. The passage distinguishes equal order from equal burden. In the case of the politics of queues, time, mobility, and information affect the cost of waiting; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering the politics of queues, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of the politics of queues then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, time, mobility, and information affect the cost of waiting. That observation does not settle every case, because a first-come rule can distribute places evenly while distributing sacrifice unevenly; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: compare procedures by purpose and burden, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about the politics of queues might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking equal order from equal burden can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about the politics of queues. The closing claim about the politics of queues follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should compare procedures by purpose and burden when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: procedural equality does not guarantee equal burden, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

37. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. equal sequence does not by itself create equal burden
 - B. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - C. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - D. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
38. The author's discussion of the politics of queues most nearly reveals which point?
- A. that the practice has no legitimate use
 - B. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
 - C. the first-come rule exposes how time and mobility alter the cost of the same procedure
 - D. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
39. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.
 - B. a queue can be procedurally even while imposing unequal waiting costs
 - C. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.

D. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.

40. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?

A. A preference for a different style of presentation.

B. a first-come rule gives every person the same practical opportunity to arrive early

C. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.

D. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.

41. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:

A. reject the practice whenever any cost is present

B. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy

C. compare procedures by the burdens they distribute, not only by the order they produce

D. judge the issue only by its most visible result

42. A clinic replaces first-come service with scheduled access and accommodations for people who cannot wait for hours. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

A. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present

B. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy

C. It compares procedures by the burdens they distribute instead of assuming equal sequence creates equal opportunity.

D. judged the issue only by its most visible result

Passage 8: Scientific metaphors

Metaphors make unfamiliar processes thinkable, but they also import associations that may not fit. Calling the brain a computer can emphasize information processing while obscuring embodiment and emotion. The author recommends using metaphors provisionally, asking what each reveals and hides. The goal is not literal accuracy in every detail, which a metaphor cannot provide, but disciplined comparison. A metaphor earns its keep when it generates questions rather than ending inquiry with a familiar image. A metaphor is most productive when its mismatch becomes visible. The computer analogy may invite questions about coding and storage, but the questions change once emotion, bodily regulation, or social context enters the picture. The author treats this friction as a resource for inquiry, provided that readers do not mistake a useful comparison for an identity. The passage distinguishes a revealing comparison from a complete identity. In the case of scientific metaphors, the computer analogy foregrounds processing while hiding embodiment; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering scientific metaphors, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of scientific metaphors then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, the computer analogy foregrounds processing while hiding embodiment. That observation does not settle every case, because a mismatch can generate a better question; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: use a metaphor provisionally and test its limits, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about scientific metaphors might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking a revealing comparison from a complete identity can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about scientific metaphors. The closing claim about scientific metaphors follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should use a metaphor provisionally and test its limits when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: a useful metaphor should guide inquiry while revealing its limits, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

43. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
 - B. a metaphor is useful when its limits remain available for inspection
 - C. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - D. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
44. The author's discussion of scientific metaphors most nearly reveals which point?
- A. the computer analogy makes one feature visible while inviting questions about what it leaves out
 - B. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
 - C. that the practice has no legitimate use
 - D. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
45. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. a mismatch between metaphor and subject can generate rather than end inquiry
 - B. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.
 - C. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.

D. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.

46. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?

- A. a familiar metaphor supplies a complete literal model
- B. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.
- C. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
- D. A preference for a different style of presentation.

47. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:

- A. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
- B. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
- C. use the comparison to form a question, then test where the comparison breaks
- D. judge the issue only by its most visible result

48. A teacher uses a computer metaphor for memory, then asks students where bodily and social context make the comparison fail. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

- A. judged the issue only by its most visible result
- B. rejected the practice whenever any cost was present
- C. treated confidence as evidence of accuracy
- D. It uses the metaphor to generate a testable question without treating the comparison as a complete identity.

Passage 9: Education and uncertainty

A school that rewards only correct answers may teach students to hide uncertainty rather than investigate it. The author argues that intellectual confidence should mean willingness to revise a belief when evidence changes, not certainty before evidence is available. Students can rank explanations while acknowledging what would change their minds. The author favors classrooms where reasons are examined publicly and revision is treated as progress. The concern is not indecision but the confusion of confidence with infallibility. The classroom described by the author does not reward indecision for its own sake. It rewards reasons that identify what is known, what is uncertain, and what evidence would discriminate among explanations. A student can therefore be confident in a method while provisional about a conclusion. Revision becomes a sign that reasoning has responded to evidence. The passage distinguishes methodological confidence from premature certainty. In the case of education and uncertainty, students can rank explanations and state what would change their minds; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering education and uncertainty, the point is not that the familiar description is false, but that it leaves out the condition that makes the description reliable or unreliable. The analysis of education and uncertainty then turns that distinction into a method. A reader must identify the purpose at stake, inspect the process by which the claimed effect occurs, and ask who or what bears the consequence. Here, students can rank explanations and state what would change their minds. That observation does not settle every case, because revision can be progress rather than failure; it tells the reader what additional evidence or comparison is needed. The author therefore preserves a limited benefit while rejecting an unqualified generalization. The passage's standard is practical: separate confidence in a method from confidence in a conclusion, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about education and uncertainty might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking methodological confidence from premature certainty can mistake a visible result for a complete evaluation. A stronger objection would have to show not merely that the practice sometimes works, but that the omitted condition does not alter the outcome in the cases under discussion. Conversely, a qualification is not a command to reject the practice. It is a request to compare concrete arrangements, identify their effects, and keep the argument answerable to evidence about education and uncertainty. The closing claim about education and uncertainty follows from that discipline of comparison. The author does not deny the initial observation; the author denies that it is sufficient by itself. For this topic, the decision-maker should separate confidence in a method from confidence in a conclusion when the audience, setting, timing, and distribution of burdens change. A conclusion that preserves these limits may sound less dramatic than a universal rule, but it travels better across new examples. The reader is left with a qualified principle: intellectual confidence includes disciplined willingness to revise, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

49. The passage is primarily concerned with which of the following?
- A. a familiar practice should be accepted without qualification
 - B. the issue can be settled by choosing between two absolute positions
 - C. personal response makes public reasoning unnecessary
 - D. intellectual confidence includes disciplined revision
50. The author's discussion of education and uncertainty most nearly reveals which point?
- A. that the practice has no legitimate use
 - B. a historical description that replaces the author's argument
 - C. the classroom example turns uncertainty into a reasoned comparison of explanations
 - D. a background detail that has no effect on the conclusion
51. Which inference is most strongly supported by the passage?
- A. A visible result is always more important than an indirect consequence.
 - B. The author believes disagreement cannot be reasoned about.

- C. a student can be confident in a method while provisional about a conclusion
- D. Any qualification makes a recommendation impossible.

52. Which of the following would most seriously challenge the author's reasoning?

- A. A statement that the topic is difficult to discuss.
- B. A preference for a different style of presentation.
- C. the best classroom rewards only immediate correctness
- D. A case that repeats the opening example without adding evidence.

53. The author's method could be applied most appropriately by a reader who would:

- A. reject the practice whenever any cost is present
- B. treat a confident description as evidence of its own accuracy
- C. ask what evidence would change the student's ranking of explanations
- D. judge the issue only by its most visible result

Answer Key and Explanations

1. **Answer: A.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that preservation does not determine what a public setting honors.
2. **Answer: B.** The example matters because the relocation example separates keeping an object from endorsing its former civic role.
3. **Answer: A.** The passage supports this inference: a monument can remain historically available while its prominent placement still communicates present approval.
4. **Answer: B.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that the object has the same public meaning wherever it is placed.
5. **Answer: A.** The application preserves the passage's method: evaluate both the record preserved and the hierarchy signaled by the setting.
6. **Answer: D.** The case applies the passage's method: It preserves access to the record while reconsidering what the civic setting publicly honors.
7. **Answer: D.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that unstructured time can support attention without becoming a universal virtue.
8. **Answer: B.** The example matters because the walking example distinguishes deliberate openness from refusal of responsibility.
9. **Answer: D.** The passage supports this inference: a scheduled activity can be productive while still excluding discoveries that have no preset output.
10. **Answer: A.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that all unstructured time produces valuable insight.
11. **Answer: A.** The application preserves the passage's method: compare the kind of attention an interval permits with the obligations it displaces.
12. **Answer: D.** The case applies the passage's method: It tests whether unassigned attention creates useful noticing without treating all unstructured time as valuable.
13. **Answer: D.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that a map's purpose shapes what counts as relevant detail.
14. **Answer: B.** The example matters because the tax and evacuation examples show that different selections can be accurate for different decisions.
15. **Answer: D.** The passage supports this inference: precision does not turn a purpose-built representation into a complete account.
16. **Answer: A.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that a map includes every feature of the place equally.

17. **Answer: D.** The application preserves the passage's method: ask what decision the map's omissions and symbols are designed to support.
18. **Answer: A.** The case applies the passage's method: It evaluates the map by the decision it supports rather than demanding that it represent every feature equally.
19. **Answer: D.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that humor's political effect depends on social consequences rather than rebellious appearance.
20. **Answer: C.** The example matters because the audience and target determine whether laughter opens or closes room for criticism.
21. **Answer: B.** The passage supports this inference: a joke can expose contradiction while leaving the institution's practice unchanged.
22. **Answer: A.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that laughter necessarily transfers power to the target of a joke.
23. **Answer: B.** The application preserves the passage's method: trace who can answer, what changes afterward, and whether release substitutes for action.
24. **Answer: B.** The case applies the passage's method: It distinguishes the release produced by the joke from evidence that the institution's power actually changed.
25. **Answer: A.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that technique can make a work feel faithful rather than artificial.
26. **Answer: B.** The example matters because revision shows how hidden choices can produce an apparently inevitable sentence.
27. **Answer: D.** The passage supports this inference: spontaneous wording is not a sufficient test of authenticity.
28. **Answer: D.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that visible labor always makes a voice less genuine.
29. **Answer: A.** The application preserves the passage's method: judge whether formal choices remain answerable to the experience represented.
30. **Answer: B.** The case applies the passage's method: It treats revision as potentially faithful when the formal choices remain answerable to the experience represented.
31. **Answer: C.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that accurate information becomes actionable through a fair and transparent relationship.
32. **Answer: A.** The example matters because the campaign example shows why acknowledging revision can matter as much as stating facts.

- 33. Answer: C.** The passage supports this inference: a correct recommendation may fail when the audience cannot evaluate the messenger's conduct.
- 34. Answer: C.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that transparency requires listing every uncertainty without prioritizing any.
- 35. Answer: C.** The application preserves the passage's method: consider evidence, fairness, and the conditions under which people can act on it.
- 36. Answer: D.** The case applies the passage's method: It treats transparency as actionable explanation rather than an undifferentiated list of every uncertainty.
- 37. Answer: A.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that equal sequence does not by itself create equal burden.
- 38. Answer: C.** The example matters because the first-come rule exposes how time and mobility alter the cost of the same procedure.
- 39. Answer: B.** The passage supports this inference: a queue can be procedurally even while imposing unequal waiting costs.
- 40. Answer: B.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that a first-come rule gives every person the same practical opportunity to arrive early.
- 41. Answer: C.** The application preserves the passage's method: compare procedures by the burdens they distribute, not only by the order they produce.
- 42. Answer: C.** The case applies the passage's method: It compares procedures by the burdens they distribute instead of assuming equal sequence creates equal opportunity.
- 43. Answer: B.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that a metaphor is useful when its limits remain available for inspection.
- 44. Answer: A.** The example matters because the computer analogy makes one feature visible while inviting questions about what it leaves out.
- 45. Answer: A.** The passage supports this inference: a mismatch between metaphor and subject can generate rather than end inquiry.
- 46. Answer: A.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that a familiar metaphor supplies a complete literal model.
- 47. Answer: C.** The application preserves the passage's method: use the comparison to form a question, then test where the comparison breaks.
- 48. Answer: D.** The case applies the passage's method: It uses the metaphor to generate a testable question without treating the comparison as a complete identity.

- 49. Answer: D.** The passage's examples and conclusion develop the qualified claim that intellectual confidence includes disciplined revision.
- 50. Answer: C.** The example matters because the classroom example turns uncertainty into a reasoned comparison of explanations.
- 51. Answer: C.** The passage supports this inference: a student can be confident in a method while provisional about a conclusion.
- 52. Answer: C.** The argument would be weakened by evidence that the best classroom rewards only immediate correctness.
- 53. Answer: C.** The application preserves the passage's method: ask what evidence would change the student's ranking of explanations.