

MCAT CARS Practice Test 2

MCAT Critical Analysis and Reasoning Skills • Form 2

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: Archives and absence

An archive is often imagined as a warehouse of everything a society has preserved. The author argues that it is better understood as a record of selection. Documents survive because institutions valued them, because materials were durable, or because researchers later found them useful. Absence cannot prove that an event did not occur, but it can reveal which lives were less likely to leave a trace. Readers should treat silence as a question rather than as evidence of emptiness. Responsible history supplements surviving records with attention to the mechanisms that shaped survival. The archive's silence is thus neither a hidden document nor proof of nonexistence. It is evidence about the conditions under which records become durable and discoverable. Researchers can ask who had access to writing, whose materials institutions preserved, and which categories later historians used to search. The absence becomes informative when connected to those mechanisms. The passage distinguishes silence in a record from proof of nonexistence. In the case of archives and absence, preservation mechanisms determine whose traces remain discoverable; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering archives and absence, 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 archives and absence 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, preservation mechanisms determine whose traces remain discoverable. That observation does not settle every case, because an absent document can reveal an institution's priorities; 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: connect missing evidence to the process that produced the archive, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about archives and absence might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking silence in a record from proof of nonexistence 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 archives and absence. The closing claim about archives and absence 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 connect missing evidence to the process that produced the archive 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: what is missing from a record may reflect the process of preservation, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

1. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?
 - A. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
 - B. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
 - C. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
 - D. a record's silence reflects selection as well as missing events
2. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?
 - A. that the issue has no practical consequences

- B. a contradiction the author never addresses
 - C. historical detail that does not change the argument
 - D. the archive example connects surviving traces to access, durability, and later search
3. The passage most strongly supports which inference?
- A. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.
 - B. absence becomes informative when linked to the mechanisms that produced the record
 - C. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.
 - D. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.
4. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?
- A. the archive is demonstrably complete for this category and contains every event of this kind
 - B. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.
 - C. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.
 - D. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.
5. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:
- A. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally
 - B. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence
 - C. supplement the archive by examining how preservation shaped what can now be known
 - D. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation
6. A historian finds no record of an event and investigates whose materials were preserved before concluding that the event never occurred. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?
- A. treated uncertainty as disproof
 - B. used familiarity as evidence
 - C. It treats the silence as evidence about preservation and access rather than as proof of nonexistence.
 - D. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule

Passage 2: The ethics of convenience

Convenience is usually defended by the time it saves, but saved time is not a complete measure of benefit. A service may shift effort from a visible consumer to an invisible worker or from the present to the future through environmental cost. The author does not reject convenience; people reasonably value relief from exhausting tasks. The point is that convenience should be evaluated by the total pattern of burdens and benefits, including those ordinary accounting hides. A useful technology can still require an honest description of who pays for its ease. The author insists that a complete accounting must include displaced effort. A delivery service may save a customer time while intensifying a worker's schedule; a disposable product may simplify a task while transferring costs to waste systems. These examples do not show that convenience is bad. They show why a benefit cannot be evaluated from the viewpoint of the immediate user alone. The passage distinguishes immediate relief from total social benefit. In the case of the ethics of convenience, effort can be shifted from a visible customer to an invisible worker; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering the ethics of convenience, 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 ethics of convenience 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, effort can be shifted from a visible customer to an invisible worker. That observation does not settle every case, because a useful service can still externalize cost; 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: count who pays for ease and when, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about the ethics of convenience might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking immediate relief from total social benefit 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 ethics of convenience. The closing claim about the ethics of convenience 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 count who pays for ease and when 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: convenience should be evaluated by all distributed costs, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

7. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?
- A. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
 - B. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
 - C. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
 - D. the value of convenience includes burdens shifted away from the immediate user
8. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?
- A. historical detail that does not change the argument
 - B. delivery and disposable-product examples reveal displaced labor and environmental cost
 - C. that the issue has no practical consequences
 - D. a contradiction the author never addresses
9. The passage most strongly supports which inference?
- A. a service can save time without producing an unqualified social benefit
 - B. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.
 - C. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.

D. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.

10. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

A. a consumer's saved time measures the service's total benefit

B. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.

C. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

D. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.

11. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

A. count who performs the hidden work and when the cost appears

B. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation

C. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally

D. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence

12. A delivery service saves customers time, but an evaluation also measures worker scheduling and waste-management burdens. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

A. It counts benefits and displaced costs beyond the immediate user's experience.

B. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule

C. treated uncertainty as disproof

D. used familiarity as evidence

Passage 3: Taste and expertise

A critic claims that taste is purely personal and therefore cannot be argued about. The author grants that preference cannot be proven like a mathematical theorem but maintains that judgments can still be better or worse supported. Attention, comparison, and knowledge of a work's aims allow a critic to explain a response rather than merely announce it. Expertise does not eliminate disagreement; it changes the quality of reasons offered. Subjectivity and reason are not opposites when a judgment remains open to public examination. The critic's standard is not agreement but answerability. A judgment can be personal and still invite reasons, comparisons, and correction. Expertise matters because it expands the range of relevant distinctions, not because it grants immunity from disagreement. The passage consequently treats discussion as a way of improving judgment rather than eliminating preference. The passage distinguishes personal response from unsupported assertion. In the case of taste and expertise, comparison and knowledge expand the reasons a critic can offer; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering taste and expertise, 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 taste and expertise 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, comparison and knowledge expand the reasons a critic can offer. That observation does not settle every case, because expertise does not remove disagreement; 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 a claim by its answerability to public reasons, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about taste and expertise might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking personal response from unsupported assertion 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 taste and expertise. The closing claim about taste and expertise 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 a claim by its answerability to public reasons 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: subjective judgment can still be reasoned and explained, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

13. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?

- A. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
- B. subjective judgment can still be supported by public reasons
- C. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
- D. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.

14. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?

- A. a contradiction the author never addresses
- B. historical detail that does not change the argument
- C. the critic's comparison shows that expertise improves explanation without requiring agreement
- D. that the issue has no practical consequences

15. The passage most strongly supports which inference?

- A. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.
- B. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.
- C. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.

D. disagreement is compatible with better and worse accounts of a work's aims

16. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

A. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.

B. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

C. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.

D. a reasoned judgment must become objective proof

17. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

A. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence

B. evaluate the quality and answerability of the distinctions offered

C. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation

D. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally

18. Two critics disagree about a novel, but one gives specific comparisons that the other can challenge or refine. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

A. treated uncertainty as disproof

B. used familiarity as evidence

C. It treats a judgment as subjective yet answerable to public reasons rather than as either proof or mere preference.

D. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule

Passage 4: Urban green space

A city plants trees partly to improve appearance, but greenery also changes how residents use public space. Shade can lengthen visits, and a comfortable street may invite walking rather than driving. Yet beautification can raise rents and displace residents who made a neighborhood vibrant. Green space is therefore not automatically egalitarian. Its benefits depend on who can remain and who participates in design decisions. The author supports planting but rejects the assumption that environmental improvement has only positive social effects. The author asks planners to treat distribution as part of environmental success. A park can improve air, shade, and public life while also increasing the price of remaining nearby. The relevant comparison is not between trees and no trees in the abstract, but between designs that share benefits and designs that make the original community unable to enjoy them. The passage distinguishes environmental improvement from equal access to its benefits. In the case of urban green space, design and housing pressure determine who can remain nearby; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering urban green space, 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 urban green space 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, design and housing pressure determine who can remain nearby. That observation does not settle every case, because a park can improve air while displacing the people who built community there; 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: include distribution in the definition of environmental success, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about urban green space might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking environmental improvement from equal access to its benefits 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 urban green space. The closing claim about urban green space 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 include distribution in the definition of environmental success 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: urban environmental benefits must be evaluated with displacement risks, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

19. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?
- A. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
 - B. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
 - C. environmental benefits depend on who can remain and participate
 - D. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
20. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?
- A. that the issue has no practical consequences
 - B. a contradiction the author never addresses
 - C. historical detail that does not change the argument
 - D. the tree-planting example connects shade and walking to rent pressure and displacement
21. The passage most strongly supports which inference?
- A. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.
 - B. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.
 - C. a park's success cannot be measured only by its physical improvement

D. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.

22. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

A. any rent increase makes planting environmentally harmful

B. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.

C. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

D. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.

23. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

A. compare the design that creates benefits with the distribution of access to them

B. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation

C. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally

D. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence

24. A city adds a park while protecting nearby affordable housing and tracking who can continue to use the area. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

A. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule

B. treated uncertainty as disproof

C. used familiarity as evidence

D. It measures environmental success together with the distribution of access and displacement risk.

Passage 5: The limits of averages

An average can summarize a group while obscuring the spread of individual experiences. An average commute does not describe workers whose journeys are much longer or less reliable. This does not make averages useless; planners need summaries to see broad patterns. The problem arises when a summary is mistaken for a typical person. The author recommends pairing averages with distributions and with unusual cases that may expose a policy's hidden weakness. A good statistic organizes attention; it should not end it. A distribution can reveal whether an average represents a cluster or hides a sharp division. Unusual cases are not merely anecdotes when they expose a mechanism that the average conceals. The author therefore treats summary and detail as complementary: one locates a pattern, while the other tests how that pattern is lived and where it fails. The passage distinguishes a group summary from a typical individual. In the case of the limits of averages, a distribution shows whether a mean hides a sharp division; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering the limits of averages, 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 limits of averages 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 distribution shows whether a mean hides a sharp division. That observation does not settle every case, because an unusual case can expose a mechanism rather than merely decorate a statistic; 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: pair summary with lived variation, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about the limits of averages might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking a group summary from a typical individual 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 limits of averages. The closing claim about the limits of averages 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 pair summary with lived variation 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: summary statistics need distributions and cases to guide interpretation, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

25. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?
- A. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
 - B. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
 - C. summary statistics organize attention but do not replace distributions
 - D. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
26. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?
- A. that the issue has no practical consequences
 - B. a contradiction the author never addresses
 - C. historical detail that does not change the argument
 - D. the commute example shows why an average can hide a long or unstable burden
27. The passage most strongly supports which inference?
- A. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.
 - B. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.
 - C. an unusual case can reveal the mechanism behind a group pattern

D. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.

28. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

A. an average is useless whenever individual experiences differ

B. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.

C. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

D. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.

29. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

A. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence

B. pair the aggregate pattern with variation that tests where the summary fails

C. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation

D. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally

30. A transit agency reports the mean commute and also publishes the full spread and the experiences of riders with the longest trips. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

A. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule

B. treated uncertainty as disproof

C. used familiarity as evidence

D. It uses the summary to locate a pattern and variation to test where that summary hides a mechanism.

Passage 6: Patience in science

Scientific patience is sometimes confused with passive waiting. The author describes it instead as an active willingness to keep a question open while improving measurements and testing alternatives. A researcher may suspend a favored explanation without suspending judgment altogether. This protects inquiry from premature certainty, but it also requires decisions about when evidence is adequate for action. Patience is thus a discipline of proportion: neither rushing to a conclusion nor treating uncertainty as a reason to do nothing. The passage's patience is active because the researcher continues to improve the question. Waiting without measurement leaves uncertainty untouched; acting without adequate evidence confuses urgency with knowledge. The author proposes a middle discipline in which provisional decisions remain open to specified signs that would justify revision. The passage distinguishes active restraint from passive delay. In the case of patience in science, measurement and alternative testing keep an open question productive; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering patience in science, 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 patience in science 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, measurement and alternative testing keep an open question productive. That observation does not settle every case, because uncertainty can justify a provisional decision without ending inquiry; 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: specify what evidence would trigger revision, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about patience in science might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking active restraint from passive delay 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 patience in science. The closing claim about patience in science 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 specify what evidence would trigger revision 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: scientific patience combines restraint with continued evaluation, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

31. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?
- A. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
 - B. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
 - C. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
 - D. waiting can be an active practice of improving evidence
32. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?
- A. a contradiction the author never addresses
 - B. historical detail that does not change the argument
 - C. the researcher's open question shows how measurement and alternative tests differ from passivity
 - D. that the issue has no practical consequences
33. The passage most strongly supports which inference?
- A. uncertainty can support provisional action when the revision trigger is specified
 - B. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.
 - C. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.

D. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.

34. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

A. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.

B. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

C. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.

D. uncertainty is a reason to avoid every decision

35. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

A. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation

B. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally

C. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence

D. balance the need to act with evidence that would justify changing course

36. A research team delays a strong conclusion, collects a second measure, and states what result would trigger a change in its working model. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

A. used familiarity as evidence

B. It treats waiting as active evidence improvement rather than as passive avoidance of a decision.

C. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule

D. treated uncertainty as disproof

Passage 7: The theater of expertise

Public experts are often expected to speak with certainty when audiences want a clear answer. The author argues that expertise is more valuable when it makes uncertainty legible. A forecast can state its assumptions, likely range, and warning signs without surrendering authority. This differs from evasive vagueness because uncertainty must be specific enough to guide a decision. Expertise should be judged not by confidence of tone alone but by the quality of reasoning made visible. Specific uncertainty can strengthen rather than weaken a forecast. An audience can evaluate assumptions, ranges, and warning signs, then decide how much confidence a decision warrants. The author contrasts this practice with theatrical certainty, which sounds decisive but gives no account of what would count against the prediction. The passage distinguishes legible uncertainty from evasive vagueness. In the case of the theater of expertise, assumptions, ranges, and warning signs let an audience judge a forecast; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering the theater of expertise, 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 theater of expertise 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, assumptions, ranges, and warning signs let an audience judge a forecast. That observation does not settle every case, because confidence of tone is weaker than visible reasoning; 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 what would count against the prediction, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about the theater of expertise might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking legible uncertainty from evasive vagueness 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 theater of expertise. The closing claim about the theater of expertise 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 what would count against the prediction 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: credible expertise explains uncertainty rather than performing certainty, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

37. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?

- A. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
- B. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
- C. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
- D. specific uncertainty can strengthen rather than weaken expertise

38. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?

- A. that the issue has no practical consequences
- B. a contradiction the author never addresses
- C. historical detail that does not change the argument
- D. the forecast example shows how assumptions and warning signs make confidence inspectable

39. The passage most strongly supports which inference?

- A. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.
- B. a confident tone without a revision condition gives less guidance than a qualified range
- C. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.

D. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.

40. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

- A. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.
- B. a forecast is evasive whenever it states a range
- C. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.
- D. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

41. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

- A. ask what assumptions and observations would count against the prediction
- B. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation
- C. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally
- D. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence

42. A forecaster gives a range, lists its assumptions, and identifies warning signs that would make the forecast less reliable. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

- A. used familiarity as evidence
- B. It makes confidence inspectable by connecting the prediction to assumptions and revision conditions.
- C. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule
- D. treated uncertainty as disproof

Passage 8: Repair and replacement

A broken object invites a choice between repair and replacement. The author treats the choice as cultural as well as economic. Repair preserves knowledge of materials and use, while replacement may offer safety or efficiency. Neither option deserves romantic treatment. An object should be repaired when repair keeps its function without unreasonable risk, but replacement can be wasteful when it reflects impatience with visible wear. Maintenance is a form of attention that modern systems often undervalue. Repair is valuable here because it preserves attention, not because old objects are always superior. A repair that creates danger or cannot restore the needed function is not virtuous. The author wants decisions to account for material knowledge, risk, and use instead of treating replacement as the default response to visible imperfection. The passage distinguishes maintenance as attention from nostalgia for old objects. In the case of repair and replacement, function, material knowledge, and risk determine whether repair is responsible; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering repair and replacement, 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 repair and replacement 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, function, material knowledge, and risk determine whether repair is responsible. That observation does not settle every case, because replacement can be wasteful but repair can also be unsafe; 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 options against use rather than habit, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about repair and replacement might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking maintenance as attention from nostalgia for old objects 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 repair and replacement. The closing claim about repair and replacement 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 options against use rather than habit 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: repair decisions require function, risk, and attention rather than habit, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

43. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?
- A. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
 - B. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
 - C. maintenance decisions depend on function and risk rather than nostalgia or impatience
 - D. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
44. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?
- A. a contradiction the author never addresses
 - B. historical detail that does not change the argument
 - C. the broken-object example weighs restored use against safety and efficiency
 - D. that the issue has no practical consequences
45. The passage most strongly supports which inference?
- A. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.
 - B. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.

- C. replacement can waste material while repair can still be irresponsible when it cannot restore function
- D. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.

46. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

- A. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.
- B. repair is always more attentive than replacement
- C. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.
- D. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

47. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

- A. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally
- B. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence
- C. compare the options against the object's needed use and the risks each creates
- D. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation

48. An old device can be repaired, but the repair would create a safety risk and still fail the device's required function. Which judgment best applies the passage's method?

- A. treated uncertainty as disproof
- B. used familiarity as evidence
- C. It compares repair and replacement by use, material, and risk rather than treating either option as automatically virtuous.
- D. ignored setting and consequence in favor of a simple rule

Passage 9: Language and belonging

A language community can welcome newcomers by teaching shared expressions, but one way of speaking should not become the sole proof of membership. Accent and vocabulary may carry history, yet belonging also grows through participation and mutual recognition. Common language can coordinate action; the concern is that correction becomes exclusion when it ranks people rather than clarifying meaning. The author favors a flexible standard that preserves intelligibility without confusing uniformity with community. The author separates coordination from conformity. Shared expressions can make a conversation easier, but a community becomes exclusionary when linguistic correction is used to rank speakers rather than clarify a meaning. Flexible standards can preserve intelligibility while allowing belonging to develop through participation and mutual recognition. The passage distinguishes coordination from conformity. In the case of language and belonging, shared expressions can clarify meaning without ranking speakers; this is why the author resists treating the first appearance of the issue as its complete meaning. For readers considering language and belonging, 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 language and belonging 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, shared expressions can clarify meaning without ranking speakers. That observation does not settle every case, because correction becomes exclusion when it polices membership; 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: preserve intelligibility while allowing participation to create belonging, then revise the judgment if the relevant conditions differ. A reader who wants a simple rule about language and belonging might therefore find the conclusion unsatisfying. The author accepts that cost because overlooking coordination from conformity 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 language and belonging. The closing claim about language and belonging 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 preserve intelligibility while allowing participation to create belonging 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: shared language can coordinate belonging without requiring uniform speech, provided the conditions that make that principle meaningful remain visible.

49. Which statement best captures the author's central claim?
- A. shared language can coordinate action without making uniform speech a membership test
 - B. The subject should be evaluated by a rule that ignores setting and consequence.
 - C. The existence of disagreement makes evaluation impossible.
 - D. A familiar description is sufficient evidence for a general conclusion.
50. The examples in the passage primarily support which point?
- A. the correction example distinguishes clarifying meaning from ranking speakers
 - B. that the issue has no practical consequences
 - C. a contradiction the author never addresses
 - D. historical detail that does not change the argument
51. The passage most strongly supports which inference?
- A. A useful practice must be accepted without examining its distribution of effects.
 - B. Any uncertainty prevents a responsible decision.
 - C. The author considers only the immediate viewpoint of the user or observer.

D. a flexible standard can preserve intelligibility while participation builds belonging

52. Which finding, if true, would require the author to revise the argument?

A. The topic receives a new label but no new consequence.

B. a common language requires one accepted accent and vocabulary

C. A reader reports a different preference without supplying a new condition.

D. The opening example is repeated with the same evidence.

53. A decision-maker applying the author's reasoning should:

A. use certainty of tone as a substitute for evidence

B. separate the communicative purpose of a standard from its use as social gatekeeping

C. treat the first visible benefit as the entire evaluation

D. assume that one procedure distributes burdens equally

Answer Key and Explanations

1. **Answer: D.** The author's central claim is that a record's silence reflects selection as well as missing events.
2. **Answer: D.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the archive example connects surviving traces to access, durability, and later search.
3. **Answer: B.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that absence becomes informative when linked to the mechanisms that produced the record.
4. **Answer: A.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that the archive is demonstrably complete for this category and contains every event of this kind.
5. **Answer: C.** The passage directs the decision-maker to supplement the archive by examining how preservation shaped what can now be known.
6. **Answer: C.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It treats the silence as evidence about preservation and access rather than as proof of nonexistence.
7. **Answer: D.** The author's central claim is that the value of convenience includes burdens shifted away from the immediate user.
8. **Answer: B.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: delivery and disposable-product examples reveal displaced labor and environmental cost.
9. **Answer: A.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that a service can save time without producing an unqualified social benefit.
10. **Answer: A.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that a consumer's saved time measures the service's total benefit.
11. **Answer: A.** The passage directs the decision-maker to count who performs the hidden work and when the cost appears.
12. **Answer: A.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It counts benefits and displaced costs beyond the immediate user's experience.
13. **Answer: B.** The author's central claim is that subjective judgment can still be supported by public reasons.
14. **Answer: C.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the critic's comparison shows that expertise improves explanation without requiring agreement.
15. **Answer: D.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that disagreement is compatible with better and worse accounts of a work's aims.
16. **Answer: D.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that a reasoned judgment must become objective proof.

17. **Answer: B.** The passage directs the decision-maker to evaluate the quality and answerability of the distinctions offered.
18. **Answer: C.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It treats a judgment as subjective yet answerable to public reasons rather than as either proof or mere preference.
19. **Answer: C.** The author's central claim is that environmental benefits depend on who can remain and participate.
20. **Answer: D.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the tree-planting example connects shade and walking to rent pressure and displacement.
21. **Answer: C.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that a park's success cannot be measured only by its physical improvement.
22. **Answer: A.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that any rent increase makes planting environmentally harmful.
23. **Answer: A.** The passage directs the decision-maker to compare the design that creates benefits with the distribution of access to them.
24. **Answer: D.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It measures environmental success together with the distribution of access and displacement risk.
25. **Answer: C.** The author's central claim is that summary statistics organize attention but do not replace distributions.
26. **Answer: D.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the commute example shows why an average can hide a long or unstable burden.
27. **Answer: C.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that an unusual case can reveal the mechanism behind a group pattern.
28. **Answer: A.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that an average is useless whenever individual experiences differ.
29. **Answer: B.** The passage directs the decision-maker to pair the aggregate pattern with variation that tests where the summary fails.
30. **Answer: D.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It uses the summary to locate a pattern and variation to test where that summary hides a mechanism.
31. **Answer: D.** The author's central claim is that waiting can be an active practice of improving evidence.
32. **Answer: C.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the researcher's open question shows how measurement and alternative tests differ from passivity.

- 33. Answer: A.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that uncertainty can support provisional action when the revision trigger is specified.
- 34. Answer: D.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that uncertainty is a reason to avoid every decision.
- 35. Answer: D.** The passage directs the decision-maker to balance the need to act with evidence that would justify changing course.
- 36. Answer: B.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It treats waiting as active evidence improvement rather than as passive avoidance of a decision.
- 37. Answer: D.** The author's central claim is that specific uncertainty can strengthen rather than weaken expertise.
- 38. Answer: D.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the forecast example shows how assumptions and warning signs make confidence inspectable.
- 39. Answer: B.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that a confident tone without a revision condition gives less guidance than a qualified range.
- 40. Answer: B.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that a forecast is evasive whenever it states a range.
- 41. Answer: A.** The passage directs the decision-maker to ask what assumptions and observations would count against the prediction.
- 42. Answer: B.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It makes confidence inspectable by connecting the prediction to assumptions and revision conditions.
- 43. Answer: C.** The author's central claim is that maintenance decisions depend on function and risk rather than nostalgia or impatience.
- 44. Answer: C.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the broken-object example weighs restored use against safety and efficiency.
- 45. Answer: C.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that replacement can waste material while repair can still be irresponsible when it cannot restore function.
- 46. Answer: B.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that repair is always more attentive than replacement.
- 47. Answer: C.** The passage directs the decision-maker to compare the options against the object's needed use and the risks each creates.
- 48. Answer: C.** The proposal transfers the passage's method without dropping its limits: It compares repair and replacement by use, material, and risk rather than treating either option as automatically virtuous.

- 49. Answer: A.** The author's central claim is that shared language can coordinate action without making uniform speech a membership test.
- 50. Answer: A.** The examples make the passage's distinction concrete: the correction example distinguishes clarifying meaning from ranking speakers.
- 51. Answer: D.** The evidence and qualifications support the inference that a flexible standard can preserve intelligibility while participation builds belonging.
- 52. Answer: B.** The argument would require revision if evidence showed that a common language requires one accepted accent and vocabulary.
- 53. Answer: B.** The passage directs the decision-maker to separate the communicative purpose of a standard from its use as social gatekeeping.