

GMAT Verbal Practise Question Paper 9 with Solutions

Time Allowed : 2 hours 15 minutes

Maximum Marks : 100

General Instructions

Read the following instructions very carefully and strictly follow them:

1. The GMAT exam is 2 hours and 15 minutes long (with one optional 10-minute break) and consists of 64 questions in total.
2. The GMAT exam is comprised of three sections:
3. Quantitative Reasoning: 21 questions, 45 minutes
4. Verbal Reasoning: 23 questions, 45 minutes
5. Data Insights: 20 questions, 45 minutes
6. You can answer the three sections in any order. As you move through a section, you can bookmark questions that you would like to review later.
7. When you have answered all questions in a section, you will proceed to the Question Review & Edit screen for that section.
8. If there is no time remaining in the section, you will NOT proceed to the Question Review & Edit screen and you will automatically be moved to your optional break screen or the next section (if you have already taken your optional break).
9. Each Question Review & Edit screen includes a numbered list of the questions in that section and indicates the questions you bookmarked.
10. Clicking a question number will take you to that specific question. You can review as many questions as you would like and can edit up to three (3) answers.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Reading Comprehension

To believe a proposition, say corn flakes have health benefits, is to accept it to be true. However, the question of belief is valid only for those propositions that are understandable. An understandable proposition is one that is expressed using correct grammar and known words.

The dominant view in the scientific community on how human mind believes or disbelieves an understandable proposition is the Cartesian hypothesis, propounded by the seventeenth-century philosopher René Descartes. He said that when an understandable proposition is presented to a human mind, the comprehension of its content happens automatically and passively; however, the assessment of the truth-value of that proposition is a later and deliberate act, the result of which is either belief or disbelief. Thus, this view holds that belief or disbelief in a comprehended proposition is created by rational assessment, and till such an assessment is made,

the intellect neither affirms nor denies a comprehended proposition. It also suggests that the mental effort required to create belief and disbelief is the same: the effort required to assess the comprehended proposition.

In contrast, Descartes's near-contemporary Baruch Spinoza suggested that comprehension of and belief in an understandable proposition happen together, automatically and passively; he said that it is not possible to understand a proposition without, at least temporarily, accepting it to be true. On later, willful assessment, if one judges the believed proposition to be false, it may be unaccepted (disbelieved), and if judged to be true, one may continue to believe in it. Thus, as per the Spinozan hypothesis, the default setting of the human mind is to believe every understandable proposition that is presented to it; disbelief is possible but it comes if it comes at all - from effortful, deliberate assessment done after the initial comprehension-belief.

Both hypotheses continue to have their proponents and opponents. It is, however, a common observation that doubt, suspension of judgment and disbelief are mentally taxing tasks while we naturally - effortlessly - accept and believe most of what we see, hear and read. Research has proved that we systematically err on the side of believing too much, as opposed to rejecting too much. This inherent credulity of the human mind is, in fact, the founding axiom of the fields of advertising and propaganda.

Adapted from a research paper by Professor Daniel Gilbert

1. A supporter of the Cartesian hypothesis would probably agree with which of the following statements?

- (A) Understanding a proposition is one thing and believing another
- (B) Believing is the most effortful thing that a human mind does
- (C) Belief is more quickly and easily acquired than doubt
- (D) Human beings are more prone to rejecting than believing propositions
- (E) Human beings are skeptical and credulous in equal measure

Correct Answer: (A) Understanding a proposition is one thing and believing another

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

The question asks to identify the statement that aligns with the Cartesian hypothesis as described in the passage.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The passage explains the Cartesian hypothesis as follows: "...when an understandable proposition is presented to a human mind, the comprehension of its content happens automatically and passively; however, the assessment of the truth-value of that proposition is a later and deliberate act, the result of which is either belief or disbelief."

This clearly separates the act of comprehension (understanding) from the act of assessment (which leads to belief or disbelief). They are described as two distinct, sequential processes.

Let's analyze the options based on this:

(A) **Understanding a proposition is one thing and believing another:** This statement

perfectly captures the essence of the Cartesian view that comprehension and belief are separate mental events.

(B) **Believing is the most effortful thing that a human mind does:** The passage states that for Descartes, the mental effort to create belief and disbelief is the same. It does not claim it is the "most effortful" thing.

(C) **Belief is more quickly and easily acquired than doubt:** This describes the Spinozan hypothesis, where belief is the automatic default, and disbelief (doubt) requires effort.

(D) **Human beings are more prone to rejecting than believing propositions:** The passage does not support this claim for the Cartesian view. The final paragraph suggests the opposite is true in general, which supports the Spinozan view.

(E) **Human beings are skeptical and credulous in equal measure:** According to Descartes, the effort for belief and disbelief is the same, which might imply this, but statement (A) is a more direct and accurate summary of the core tenet of the hypothesis described. The separation of understanding and believing is the primary point.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Therefore, the statement that a supporter of the Cartesian hypothesis would most agree with is that understanding and believing are two separate processes.

Quick Tip

In reading comprehension, focus on the specific details attributed to each theory or viewpoint. The Cartesian hypothesis's main feature is the two-step process: first understand, then assess to believe/disbelieve.

2. Unlike the Spinozan hypothesis, the Cartesian hypothesis suggests that at any point in time, a human mind may contain some

- (A) ununderstood propositions that are believed
- (B) ununderstood propositions that are neither believed nor disbelieved
- (C) understood propositions that are believed
- (D) understood propositions that are disbelieved
- (E) understood propositions that are neither believed nor disbelieved

Correct Answer: (E) understood propositions that are neither believed nor disbelieved

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This question asks for a key difference between the Cartesian and Spinozan hypotheses concerning the states of propositions in the mind.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Let's contrast the two hypotheses based on the passage:

Cartesian Hypothesis: It posits a two-step process. First, comprehension occurs. Then,

there is a "later and deliberate act" of assessment. The passage explicitly states, "...and till such an assessment is made, the intellect neither affirms nor denies a comprehended proposition." This means there is a period where a proposition is understood but is in a neutral state—neither believed nor disbelieved.

Spinozan Hypothesis: It suggests a one-step process. "...comprehension of and belief in an understandable proposition happen together, automatically and passively." This implies that as soon as a proposition is understood, it is automatically believed (at least temporarily). There is no intermediate state of being understood but not yet believed.

The key difference, therefore, is the existence of this neutral, intermediate state. The Cartesian model allows for a mind to contain propositions that have been understood but not yet assessed for their truth value.

Analyzing the options:

(A) & (B) Both hypotheses state that a proposition must be understood for the question of belief to be valid. So, understood propositions are not considered in this context.

(C) & (D) Both hypotheses agree that a mind can contain understood propositions that are believed or disbelieved. This is the end result in both models.

(E) **understood propositions that are neither believed nor disbelieved:** This state is unique to the Cartesian hypothesis. It is the state after comprehension but before the "deliberate act" of assessment. The Spinozan hypothesis does not allow for this state.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The Cartesian hypothesis, unlike the Spinozan one, allows for the existence of understood propositions that are held in a neutral state of judgment.

Quick Tip

To answer "unlike" or "in contrast to" questions, create a mini-table in your mind (or on scratch paper) listing the key features of each concept being compared. This helps to pinpoint the exact point of difference.

3. Which of the following statements about an understandable and false proposition is not supported by the Spinozan hypothesis?

- (A) Its comprehension is a prerequisite for its rejection.
- (B) Its comprehension does not require effort.
- (C) Its acceptance occurs before its rejection.
- (D) Its comprehension is automatically followed by its acceptance.
- (E) Its rejection does not happen automatically.

Correct Answer: (D) Its comprehension is automatically followed by its acceptance.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

The question asks to identify a statement that is inconsistent with or not supported by the description of the Spinozan hypothesis in the passage, specifically concerning a false proposition.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

According to the passage, the Spinozan hypothesis states that "comprehension of and belief in an understandable proposition **happen together**, automatically and passively". The process for dealing with a false proposition is: first, it is automatically understood and believed. Second, through a "later, willful assessment," it may be "unaccepted (disbelieved)."

Let's evaluate each option against this model:

(A) **Its comprehension is a prerequisite for its rejection.** This is supported. One must first comprehend (and believe) the proposition before they can assess and reject it.

(B) **Its comprehension does not require effort.** This is supported. The passage states comprehension happens "automatically and passively."

(C) **Its acceptance occurs before its rejection.** This is supported. The initial automatic step is comprehension-belief (acceptance). Rejection comes later, if at all.

(E) **Its rejection does not happen automatically.** This is supported. The passage says disbelief comes from an "effortful, deliberate assessment," which is the opposite of automatic.

(D) **Its comprehension is automatically followed by its acceptance.** This statement is subtly incorrect. The passage says comprehension and acceptance (belief) "**happen together**", implying they are a single, simultaneous event, not a sequence of two events where one follows the other, even if automatically. The phrasing "followed by" suggests a sequence: Event 1 (comprehension) happens, and then Event 2 (acceptance) happens. The Spinozan model suggests a single event: Event 1 (comprehension-and-acceptance). This fine distinction makes this statement the one that is not precisely supported by the text's description. The other four statements are direct consequences of the hypothesis as described.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The nuance in the wording "followed by" implies a sequence, whereas the passage states comprehension and belief "happen together." This makes option (D) the statement that is not accurately supported by the text.

Quick Tip

Pay close attention to words that describe relationships, such as "together," "followed by," "before," and "after." In critical reading questions, such subtle differences in meaning can be the key to identifying the correct answer.

4. It can be inferred from the Spinozan hypothesis that when exposed to understandable but suspicious propositions, a person who is too distracted or tired to exert much mental effort is

(A) less likely to comprehend them than when he is alert and mentally fresh

(B) more likely to comprehend them than when he is alert and mentally fresh

- (C) more likely to be uncertain and uncommitted about their truth-value than when he is alert and mentally fresh
- (D) more likely to believe them than when he is alert and mentally fresh
- (E) more likely to disbelieve them than when he is alert and mentally fresh

Correct Answer: (D) more likely to believe them than when he is alert and mentally fresh

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This is an inference question based on the Spinozan hypothesis. We need to apply the principles of the hypothesis to a specific scenario: a person with limited mental energy.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The Spinozan hypothesis posits the following process:

1. **Comprehension and Belief:** This is the default, automatic, and passive process. It requires no effort.
2. **Disbelief (Rejection):** This is a secondary process that requires "effortful, deliberate assessment."

The scenario describes a person who is "too distracted or tired to exert much mental effort." This person has limited cognitive resources.

- Since comprehension is automatic and effortless, their tiredness should not affect their ability to understand the proposition (ruling out A and B).
- The crucial part is that they lack the mental effort required for the second step: assessment and potential disbelief.
- Because they cannot perform the effortful task of disbelief, they will remain in the default state, which is belief.
- Therefore, a tired or distracted person is more likely to simply accept propositions as true because they don't have the energy to question or reject them. This is especially true for "suspicious propositions" which an alert person would likely assess and reject.

Let's check the options:

- (C) **more likely to be uncertain and uncommitted:** This describes the Cartesian intermediate state, not the Spinozan model. In the Spinozan model, the default is belief, not uncertainty.
- (D) **more likely to believe them than when he is alert and mentally fresh:** This is correct. An alert person can exert the effort to disbelieve a suspicious proposition, while a tired person cannot and will be stuck with the initial, automatic belief.
- (E) **more likely to disbelieve them:** This is the opposite of what the hypothesis implies, as disbelief requires effort which the person lacks.

Step 3: Final Answer:

A person with limited mental energy is less capable of the effortful process of disbelief, making them more likely to stick with the automatic initial belief.

Quick Tip

For inference questions, identify the core principle of the theory in question (here, Spinoza's "belief is easy, disbelief is hard"). Then, apply that principle to the new situation (a tired person) to predict the outcome.

5. It can be inferred from the passage that to make his target customers believe his advertisements, an advertiser should

- (A) convey the message only using words familiar to the target customers
- (B) convey the message using the traditional motifs of the target customers
- (C) not use any negative words in his message
- (D) not distract the customer's mind by use of images or stories
- (E) not overwhelm the customer's mind by presenting a lot of information

Correct Answer: (A) convey the message only using words familiar to the target customers

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

The question asks for an inference about effective advertising strategy, based on the principles of belief discussed in the passage.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The passage begins by establishing a fundamental condition for belief: "the question of belief is valid only for those propositions that are **understandable**." It then defines an understandable proposition as one "that is expressed using correct grammar and **known words**."

Regardless of whether the Cartesian or Spinozan model is correct, the first and most essential step for a proposition to even be considered for belief is that it must be understood by the recipient. If an advertiser uses unfamiliar words, the customer will not understand the proposition, and the question of believing the advertisement becomes moot.

Let's consider the other options:

(B) **traditional motifs:** The passage does not discuss cultural motifs.

(C) **negative words:** The passage does not discuss the impact of positive or negative framing.

(D) & (E) **not distract or overwhelm the customer:** According to the Spinozan hypothesis (which the author leans towards), distraction and cognitive load make disbelief *harder*. This means a distracted or overwhelmed customer is *more* likely to believe an ad, not less. Therefore, an advertiser might actually want to use distracting images or overwhelming information to prevent the effortful process of doubt. These options suggest the opposite of what could be inferred.

Thus, the most fundamental and undeniable step an advertiser must take, according to the passage, is to ensure their message is understandable.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Using familiar words ensures the proposition is understandable, which is the necessary first

condition for belief to occur.

Quick Tip

Always look for the most fundamental principle in the text that applies to the question. Here, the prerequisite of "understandability" from the very first paragraph is the key, as it's a condition for both theories of belief.

6. The author of the passage

- (A) supports the Cartesian hypothesis
- (B) supports the Spinozan hypothesis
- (C) has a neutral stance towards the two hypotheses
- (D) rejects both the hypotheses
- (E) belongs to the scientific community

Correct Answer: (B) supports the Spinozan hypothesis

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

The question asks to determine the author's point of view or stance based on the tone and evidence presented in the passage.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The author first presents the Cartesian hypothesis and then the Spinozan hypothesis. The first three paragraphs are largely descriptive. However, the final paragraph shifts from description to evaluation and conclusion.

The author writes: "**It is, however, a common observation** that doubt, suspension of judgment and disbelief are mentally taxing tasks while we naturally - effortlessly - accept and believe most of what we see, hear and read. **Research has proved** that we systematically err on the side of believing too much, as opposed to rejecting too much."

These phrases ("common observation," "Research has proved") are used to introduce evidence. This evidence directly supports the core ideas of the Spinozan hypothesis (belief is effortless and default; disbelief is taxing and effortful) and contradicts the Cartesian view that the effort for belief and disbelief is the same.

The author concludes by linking this "inherent credulity" to the fields of advertising and propaganda, further strengthening the argument for the Spinozan model as having real-world explanatory power.

Let's evaluate the options:

(A) **supports the Cartesian hypothesis:** The evidence provided in the last paragraph contradicts this.

(B) **supports the Spinozan hypothesis:** This is correct. The author uses observational and research-based evidence to favor this view.

- (C) **has a neutral stance:** The final paragraph clearly takes a side by presenting evidence that supports one hypothesis over the other.
- (D) **rejects both the hypotheses:** The author clearly supports one of them.
- (E) **belongs to the scientific community:** While the passage is adapted from a paper by Professor Daniel Gilbert, which suggests the original author is a scientist, the question asks about the author's *stance* in the passage, not their identity. The most accurate description of the author's argument within the text is support for Spinoza.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The author's use of evidence and concluding remarks in the final paragraph indicates a clear preference for the Spinozan hypothesis.

Quick Tip

To find an author's stance in an argumentative or comparative passage, look for transition words (e.g., "however," "in fact") and phrases where the author introduces their own voice or outside evidence ("research shows," "it is a common observation"). This usually happens after they have laid out the different viewpoints.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Critical Reasoning

Topic: Strengthen

Difficulty level: Challenging

1. Amid the present wave of job redundancies for skilled but unemployed youth, the publication of an encouraging report on the viability of garage startup enterprises has led the Federal government to set up an investment fund, under its Federal light-industry program, to provide capital for such enterprises. This plan has drawn opposition from various quarters; the critics claim that similar funds, also set up under the Federal light-industry program, that aim to stimulate small enterprises frequently end up harming other American social groups unconnected to these enterprises.

Which of the following best provides support for the claim made by the critics above?

- (A) Garage enterprises in Washington State now produce almost 12% of the vehicle components previously imported from South East Asia.
- (B) The funding of the Federal light-industry program depends on the reallocation of resources earmarked for disadvantaged groups.
- (C) The debate concerning the Federal light-industry program created a backlog in the Federal legislative schedule.
- (D) The union for Federal light-Industry workers was the prime source of the claim.
- (E) Programs like Federal light-industry programs have yielded great results in past.

Correct Answer: (B) The funding of the Federal light-industry program depends on the

reallocation of resources earmarked for disadvantaged groups.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This is a "Strengthen the Argument" question. We need to find an answer choice that provides evidence to support the critics' claim.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The critics' claim is that government funds for small enterprises (like garage startups) often "end up harming other American social groups unconnected to these enterprises."

We are looking for an option that shows how this harm might occur.

Let's analyze the options:

(A) This shows a positive outcome of the garage enterprises (reducing imports). This weakens the critics' claim, it does not support it.

(B) This states that the money for the new program is taken from funds originally intended for "disadvantaged groups." This is a perfect example of the harm the critics are talking about. Helping one group (skilled youth) comes at the direct expense of another social group (disadvantaged groups). This directly supports the claim.

(C) A legislative backlog is a procedural issue, not a direct harm to a specific "social group" in the way the claim implies.

(D) This option identifies the source of the claim but provides no evidence to support the claim itself. Knowing who made the claim doesn't make the claim stronger.

(E) This states that similar programs have been successful. This is direct evidence *against* the critics' claim, so it weakens the argument.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Option (B) provides a clear mechanism by which funding the new program for unemployed youth causes harm to another social group, thereby strengthening the critics' argument.

Quick Tip

In 'Strengthen' questions, look for an answer choice that provides a reason, an example, or a mechanism that makes the conclusion of the argument more likely to be true. The correct answer often fills a logical gap in the argument.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Critical Reasoning

Topic: Inference

Difficulty level: Challenging

2. Recently developed tourism infrastructure, including ten-story hotels and neon-lit discos, is obscuring the moonlight, disorienting the female turtles as they seek out beaches to lay their eggs. Often the confusion leads them to assume that the hotel pools are the sea and they end up laying their eggs in the pool flowerbeds.

Once the eggs hatch, the hatchlings are unable to find their way to the sea and die. The stringent building regulations that protected the turtles in the past are being flouted openly by organized criminals who either bribe or terrorize officials into turning a blind eye.

Which of the following can be inferred from the above passage?

- (A) Scarcity of turtles results in ecological imbalance of sea.
- (B) Chemicals in pool water are not safe for turtles.
- (C) Moonlight is the only source of light for turtles.
- (D) Turtles are guided by moonlight.
- (E) Organized gangs are ignoring building restrictions.

Correct Answer: (D) Turtles are guided by moonlight.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This is an inference question. We need to find a conclusion that is not explicitly stated but is strongly supported by the information given in the passage.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The passage states that artificial lights from tourism infrastructure are "obscuring the moonlight, disorienting the female turtles."

Let's break down the logic:

- **Cause:** The moonlight is obscured.
- **Effect:** The turtles become disoriented.

This logical connection allows us to infer that moonlight plays a crucial role in the turtles' orientation or navigation. If the absence of moonlight causes disorientation, then its presence must be what guides them.

Let's analyze the options:

- (A) The passage explains why turtles might become scarce, but it never mentions the consequences, such as an "ecological imbalance." This goes beyond the information provided.
- (B) The passage mentions turtles laying eggs in "pool flowerbeds," but it says the hatchlings die because they can't find the sea, not because of chemicals in the pool water.
- (C) The passage implies moonlight is an important source of light for turtle navigation, but it doesn't state it is the *only* source. Using absolute words like "only" makes a statement very strong and often incorrect in inference questions.
- (D) This is a direct and logical inference from the statement that obscuring moonlight causes disorientation. If taking away moonlight confuses them, they must use it for guidance.
- (E) The passage explicitly states that regulations "are being flouted openly by organized criminals." "Ignoring" is synonymous with "flouting." This is a restatement of a fact from the passage, not an inference. An inference requires a logical step beyond what is directly written.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The most logical conclusion that can be drawn from the evidence presented is that turtles use moonlight for guidance.

Quick Tip

A valid inference must be based solely on the text provided. Avoid making assumptions or using outside knowledge. Differentiate between a direct restatement and a logical deduction. A good inference is a logical deduction.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Critical Reasoning

Topic: Inference

Difficulty level: Medium

3. TMC cars has been undergoing some dramatic changes. Gone is the image of a company focused solely upon the US. Now, both the products and the workforce have begun to reflect the global nature of the company. The new works team is composed of people from all over the world. All of the mechanical engineers are the product of an in-house training scheme although, as yet, none of the engineers specializing in hydraulics has won the prestigious Order of Merit bestowed by the Mechanical Engineers Union. So far, only winners of the Order of Merit have gone on to become department heads.

If it is determined that all of the information provided by the passage is true, which of the following must also be true of the works team?

- (A) All of the department heads have received the Order of Merit.
- (B) All of the winners of the Order of Merit have received in-house training.
- (C) None of the department heads who have specialized in hydraulics are the product of an in-house training scheme.
- (D) None of the department heads are from the US.
- (E) None of the non-US mechanical engineers who are the products of in-house training have the Order of Merit.

Correct Answer: (A) All of the department heads have received the Order of Merit.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This is a "Must Be True" question, which requires making a logical deduction based on the given premises. We must find the statement that is a necessary consequence of the information in the passage.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Let's break down the key premises from the passage:

- **Premise 1:** All mechanical engineers (MEs) come from in-house training.
- **Premise 2:** No hydraulics engineer has won the Order of Merit (OoM).
- **Premise 3:** Only winners of the OoM become department heads.

Now let's evaluate each option:

(A) **All of the department heads have received the Order of Merit.** Premise 3 states,

"Only winners of the Order of Merit have gone on to become department heads." This is a conditional statement that can be rephrased as: "If someone is a department head, then they must be a winner of the Order of Merit." This is exactly what option (A) says. This statement must be true.

(B) **All of the winners of the Order of Merit have received in-house training.** We only know that MEs have received in-house training. We don't know if the OoM is exclusively awarded to MEs. Other types of employees might win it, and we don't know about their training. Therefore, this is not necessarily true.

(C) **None of the department heads who have specialized in hydraulics are the product of an in-house training scheme.** From Premise 2 and 3, we can deduce that there are no department heads who specialize in hydraulics (because none have won the OoM, which is a requirement). The statement is about a group of people that doesn't exist. This makes the statement vacuously true, which is logically complex. However, option (A) is a more direct and simple deduction.

(D) **None of the department heads are from the US.** The passage states the company is now global, not that it has no US employees or managers. This cannot be concluded.

(E) **None of the non-US mechanical engineers who are the products of in-house training have the Order of Merit.** The passage gives no information about the nationality of OoM winners. A non-US mechanical engineer could have won it. This is not necessarily true.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Option (A) is the most direct and certain logical deduction from the premises given in the passage. It is a simple rephrasing of the final sentence.

Quick Tip

In "Must Be True" questions, look for direct logical consequences or paraphrases of the given statements. Be wary of options that make assumptions or generalize beyond the scope of the text. The phrase "Only X are Y" translates to "If you are Y, then you must be X."

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Critical Reasoning

Topic: Weaken

Difficulty level: Medium

4. **The Senator Wiley damned the Frequent Flyer schemes, now operated by virtually all major American airlines, as nothing less than a bribe to acquire the accounts of major corporations that are willing to pay excessively high sums to buy Frequent Flyer discount coupons in order to give untaxed rewards to employees. To make the discounted ticket prices viable, airlines raise the initial marked price of the tickets. Thus, the price of tickets for the general public is kept artificially high. Walter Healey, the Vice President of American Airlines, responded to the criticism by saying the Frequent Flyer scheme was enjoyed by millions of Americans who were able to acquire Frequent Flyer tokens from supermarket purchases and credit**

card transactions.

Which of the following, if true, best exposes the flaw in Healey's response to Wiley's criticism?

- (A) Only a few supermarket chains and credit card companies offer Frequent Flyer tokens to customers.
- (B) Fewer people acquire Frequent Flyer tokens through supermarket purchases than through credit card transactions.
- (C) Most airline companies offer bonus tokens for long-haul flights.
- (D) The price of tickets booked under Frequent Flyer schemes is often as low as 50% of the regular ticket price.
- (E) Ticket prices are regularly reviewed by a committee of airline representatives.

Correct Answer: (D) The price of tickets booked under Frequent Flyer schemes is often as low as 50% of the regular ticket price.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This is a "Find the Flaw" or "Weaken" question. We need to identify why Healey's response fails to adequately address Wiley's criticism.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

- **Wiley's Argument:** Frequent Flyer (FF) schemes provide deep discounts to corporate clients. To compensate for this loss, airlines inflate the regular ticket prices for the general public. Thus, the general public is harmed.

- **Healey's Response:** Healey ignores the point about harm to the general public. Instead, he points out that many people benefit from the scheme by getting tokens from supermarkets and credit cards. This is a classic misdirection or "red herring" fallacy; he changes the subject from the group being harmed to a group that benefits.

The task is to find an option that exposes this flaw. A good answer will show that Healey's point is either irrelevant or, even better, actually reinforces Wiley's original criticism.

- (A) This weakens Healey's point that "millions" benefit, but it doesn't expose the core logical flaw in his response, which is ignoring Wiley's main argument.
- (B) This is an irrelevant detail comparing two sources of tokens.
- (C) This strengthens Healey's point about the benefits of the scheme, rather than exposing a flaw.
- (D) This option highlights how significant the discounts are for FF users (as low as 50% off). This directly strengthens Wiley's core argument. If the discounts are that large, it becomes much more plausible that airlines need to significantly inflate the regular prices to remain profitable. By bragging about a key feature of the FF program (deep discounts), Healey is inadvertently providing evidence for Wiley's claim that someone else must be footing the bill. It shows that the "benefit" Healey talks about is the direct cause of the "harm" Wiley is concerned with.

(E) This is an irrelevant procedural detail.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Option (D) best exposes the flaw because it shows that the benefit Healey is championing (deep discounts) is so significant that it makes Wiley's conclusion (inflated prices for others) almost necessary, thereby undermining Healey's response as a defense.

Quick Tip

When an argument is answered with a misdirection, the flaw can be exposed by showing how the respondent's point is either irrelevant or, more powerfully, how it actually supports the original argument it was meant to refute.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Critical Reasoning

Topic: Boldface

Difficulty level: Challenging

5. The move to shift the fiscal obligation to provide community services away from the Federal government to the local communities is welcomed by its proponents as a step forward on the road to true democracy. They claim that by making communities responsible for funding everything from health, welfare and education to the emergency services and housing, not only will improve these services but also foster a greater sense of community. However, such a move would mean that densely-populated areas, having a greater tax base, would be better off, and sparsely-populated, rural communities would still be dependent on supplemental subsidies from Federal sources.

In the given argument, the two portions in boldface play which of the following roles?

(A) The first is a claim that the author calls in question, and the second is a claim that goes against the first.

(B) The first is a claim that the author endorses, and the second is a claim that the author calls in question.

(C) The first is a counter-evidence to the second, and the second is the proponents' prediction.

(D) The first is the author's claim, and the second is the proponents' finding that puts the first questionable.

(E) The first is a prediction that the author elaborates further, and the second is the objection that the argument nullifies.

Correct Answer: (A) The first is a claim that the author calls in question, and the second is a claim that goes against the first.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This is a "Boldface" question that requires analyzing the logical structure of an argument and identifying the role played by specific parts of the text.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Let's analyze the structure of the argument: - **Proponents' Position:** Shifting fiscal obligation to local communities is a good thing (a "step forward to true democracy").

- **Proponents' Reasoning:** It will improve services and foster community.

- **Author's Counter-Argument:** The author introduces a counterpoint with the word "However." This signals that the author is about to present an argument against the proponents' position.

- **First Boldface (BF1):** "...densely-populated areas, having a greater tax base, would be better off". This is the first part of the author's counter-argument. It's a consequence the author predicts.

- **Second Boldface (BF2):** "...sparsely-populated, rural communities would still be dependent on supplemental subsidies from Federal sources." This is the second part of the author's counter-argument.

Now, let's analyze the options based on this structure. There appears to be a significant error in the question's text or the options provided, as they do not accurately describe the roles. However, assuming this is a flawed question from a source and we must choose the 'best fit', a common error in such questions is misplacing the bolded text.

If we assume the first bolded part was intended to be the proponents' claim ("**improve these services but also foster a greater sense of community**") and the second bolded part was the author's counterpoint ("**sparsely-populated, rural communities would still be dependent...**"), let's re-evaluate option (A):

- **The first is a claim that the author calls in question:** Under this corrected assumption, the author is indeed questioning the proponents' optimistic claim by introducing the "However" section. This part fits. - **and the second is a claim that goes against the first:** The author's point about rural dependency directly contradicts or "goes against" the proponents' general claim that the move will be an overall improvement. This part also fits.

Given that none of the options make sense with the bolding as shown in the text, and option (A) makes perfect sense with a plausible correction of the bolded text, we will proceed with this interpretation. The original question is likely flawed. The author uses the two boldfaced claims (as presented in the text) together to call the overall proposal into question. They are two facets of the same objection: the proposal will increase inequality. BF2 does not go against BF1; it complements it. Therefore, the question as written is logically inconsistent with the provided options. The solution provided assumes a corrected version of the question for the sake of finding a coherent answer.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Based on the high likelihood of an error in the question's formulation and interpreting it to be logical, option (A) becomes the only viable answer under the assumption that the first boldface was meant to be the proponents' conclusion.

Quick Tip

Boldface questions are about structure. First, map the argument: find the main conclusion, the premises, and any counterarguments. Use transition words like "however," "therefore," and "since" as guides. If the options don't seem to fit the text, double-check if a different part of the text might have been the intended bolded section.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Sentence Correction

Topics: Agreement; Grammatical Construction; Idiom; Logical Prediction

1. The Brexit negotiations are faltering and the UK government's hopes to opening talks on a future trade deal with the EU this autumn looks likely to be increasingly dashed, the EU's chief negotiator, Michel Barnier, has reported back to the bloc's member states.

(A) hopes to opening talks on a future trade deal with the EU this autumn looks likely to be increasingly dashed

(B) hopes of opening talks on a future trade deal with the EU looks increasingly likely to be dashed this autumn

(C) hopes to open talks on a future trade deal with the EU this autumn look likely to be increasingly dashed

(D) hopes of opening talks on a future trade deal this autumn with the EU look likely to be dashed increasingly

(E) hopes of opening talks on a future trade deal with the EU this autumn look increasingly likely to be dashed

Correct Answer: (E) hopes of opening talks on a future trade deal with the EU this autumn look increasingly likely to be dashed

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This Sentence Correction question tests several grammatical points: subject-verb agreement, idiomatic expressions, and adverb placement.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Let's break down the errors in the original sentence: 1. **Subject-Verb Agreement:** The subject of the clause is "hopes," which is plural. The verb is "looks," which is singular. This is an error. The correct verb form is "look." 2. **Idiom:** The phrase "hopes to opening" is unidiomatic. The correct idioms are "hopes **of opening**" (used with a gerund) or "hopes **to open**" (used with an infinitive). 3. **Adverb Placement:** We need to identify which word the adverb "increasingly" should logically modify. It could modify "dashed" or "likely." Saying something is "increasingly likely" is a very common and logical construction, meaning the probability is rising.

Now let's evaluate the options: (A) **hopes to opening... looks...**: Incorrect idiom and incorrect verb. (B) **hopes of opening... looks...**: Correct idiom but incorrect verb ("looks"

should be "look"). (C) **hopes to open... look...:** Correct idiom and correct verb. This is grammatically correct. (D) **hopes of opening... look... dashed increasingly:** Correct idiom and verb. However, the placement of "increasingly" at the end is awkward. "Increasingly dashed" is better, but "increasingly likely" is the most logical modification. (E) **hopes of opening... look increasingly likely to be dashed:** Correct idiom ("hopes of opening") and correct verb ("look"). The adverb "increasingly" correctly and logically modifies "likely." This construction is clear, logical, and grammatically flawless.

Comparing (C) and (E), both are grammatically sound, but (E) is superior in its logical clarity. The "likelihood" is what is increasing over time. Therefore, modifying "likely" with "increasingly" is the most precise and effective choice.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Option (E) provides the most correct and logically structured sentence, fixing the subject-verb agreement, using a proper idiom, and placing the adverb "increasingly" in its most effective position.

Quick Tip

In Sentence Correction, always check for the "big three" errors first: Subject-Verb Agreement, Pronoun Agreement, and Verb Tense. After that, look for issues with idioms, parallelism, and modifier placement. The best answer is not just grammatically correct, but also the most clear and logical choice.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Sentence Correction

Topics: Diction; Grammatical Construction; Idiom; Logical Prediction

2. But those whom willingly undertake an honest assessment of the era today are also part of an important British tradition which, though not largely forgotten, has been pushed to the limits.

(A) But those whom willingly undertake an honest assessment of the era today are also part of an important British tradition which, though not largely forgotten, has been pushed to the limits.

(B) But those who are willing to undertake an honest assessment of the era today are also part of an important British tradition that, if not largely forgotten, has been pushed to the margins.

(C) But, those whom are undertaking an honest assessment of the era today willingly are also part of an important British tradition which, if not largely forgotten, has been marginalized.

(D) But those who willingly take over an honest assessment of the era today, also being part of an important British tradition which, although not largely forgotten, has been forced to the edges.

(E) But those whom are willing to undertake an honest assessment of the era today are also part of an important British tradition which, in spite of being not largely forgotten, has been pushed to the brim.

Correct Answer: (B) But those who are willing to undertake an honest assessment of the

era today are also part of an important British tradition that, if not largely forgotten, has been pushed to the margins.

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This question tests pronoun case (who vs. whom), grammatical construction, and diction (idiomatic phrases).

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Let's analyze the errors in the original sentence (Option A): 1. **Pronoun Case:** The pronoun refers to the people performing the action "undertake." Therefore, it is the subject of the verb. The correct subject pronoun is **who**, not the object pronoun **whom**. 2. **Diction/Idiom:** While "pushed to the limits" is a valid idiom, other options might provide a more suitable phrase for a "tradition."

Now let's evaluate the options: (A) Incorrect pronoun ("whom"). (B) This option corrects the pronoun to **who**. It uses a smooth construction, "who are willing to undertake." It also uses the idiom "pushed to the margins," which effectively conveys the idea of a tradition becoming less central or important. This is a very strong choice. (C) Incorrect pronoun ("whom"). The adverb placement ("willingly" at the end) is also awkward. (D) The phrasal verb "take over" is incorrect in this context; one "undertakes" an assessment. The phrase "also being part of" is an awkward and ungrammatical construction. (E) Incorrect pronoun ("whom"). The idiom "pushed to the brim" is used for containers and is incorrect for describing a tradition.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Option (B) is the only choice that corrects all the grammatical errors of the original sentence. It uses the correct pronoun "who," employs a clear and standard grammatical structure, and uses an appropriate idiom ("pushed to the margins").

Quick Tip

Remember the simple rule for "who" vs. "whom": **Who** is a subject pronoun (like he, she, they) and performs the action. **Whom** is an object pronoun (like him, her, them) and receives the action. A simple test is to substitute "he" or "him." If "he" fits, use "who." If "him" fits, use "whom." (e.g., *He* undertakes the assessment, so *who* is correct).

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Sentence Correction

Topics: Logical Prediction; Parallelism

3. A magazine, as part of a survey, asked the reasons of the readers working late and the effect of their absence from home affecting their families.

(A) the reasons of its readers working late and the effect of their absence from home affecting their families

(B) its readers why they worked late and their absence from home affecting their families

- (C) why its readers work late and the ways in which their absence from home affects their families
- (D) the reasons why its readers worked late and how their absence from home had affected their families
- (E) its readers why they work late and how their absence from home affects their families

Correct Answer: (E) its readers why they work late and how their absence from home affects their families

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This question tests logical prediction and, most importantly, parallelism. The two items being asked about in the survey should be presented in a grammatically parallel structure.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

The original sentence (Option A) is awkward and lacks parallelism. It asks about "the reasons of..." and "the effect of...". A clearer structure would use interrogative clauses (clauses starting with words like who, what, why, how).

Let's evaluate the options for parallelism: (A) Not parallel and awkward phrasing ("reasons of," "effect... affecting"). (B) The two parts are not parallel. The first is an interrogative clause ("why they worked late"), but the second is a noun phrase ("their absence..."). (C) The two parts are "why its readers work late" and "the ways in which their absence from home affects their families." While both are noun clauses, the structure is not perfectly parallel ("why..." vs. "the ways in which..."). (D) "the reasons why..." is redundant (use either "the reasons" or "why," not both). The verb tenses are inconsistent ("worked" vs. "had affected") without a clear reason for the shift to past perfect. (E) This option presents two perfectly parallel interrogative clauses: "**why** they work late" and "**how** their absence from home affects their families." The structure is 'asked its readers [question word]... and [question word]...'. This is the clearest, most concise, and most grammatically correct option.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Option (E) provides the best correction by using a clear and parallel structure, making the sentence both grammatically sound and easy to understand.

Quick Tip

When you see a coordinating conjunction like "and" in a Sentence Correction question, immediately check for parallelism. The grammatical structures on both sides of the "and" should match. For lists or series, look for patterns like 'verb... and verb...', 'why... and how...', or 'noun... and noun...'.

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Sentence Correction

Topics: Diction; Logical Prediction

4. Humans have become so obsessed with portable devices and overwhelmed by content that we now have attention spans lesser than that of the goldfish.

- (A) lesser than that of the goldfish
- (B) less than the goldfish
- (C) shorter than that of the goldfish
- (D) shorter than the goldfish's attention span
- (E) lesser than the goldfish's attention span

Correct Answer: (D) shorter than the goldfish's attention span

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This question tests correct diction (the right choice of comparative word) and logical comparison.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

There are two main issues to address in the original sentence: 1. **Diction:** "Lesser" is used to compare importance, rank, or quality (e.g., the lesser of two evils). An "attention span" is a measure of duration (time). The correct comparative adjective for duration is **shorter**. 2. **Logical Comparison:** The sentence must compare like things. We are comparing "our attention spans" to "the attention span of a goldfish."

Let's analyze the options: (A) "lesser" is the wrong word. (B) "less than the goldfish" illogically compares a duration ("attention spans") to an animal ("the goldfish"). (C) "shorter than that of the goldfish" uses the correct adjective "shorter." However, the antecedent for the singular pronoun "that" is the plural noun "attention spans." This creates a pronoun-antecedent number disagreement. The correct pronoun would be "those." (D) **shorter than the goldfish's attention span** uses the correct adjective "shorter" and creates a perfectly clear and logical comparison between "our attention spans" and "the goldfish's attention span." It avoids any pronoun issues. (E) "lesser" is the wrong word.

Step 3: Final Answer:

Option (D) is the best choice because it uses the correct comparative adjective ("shorter") and constructs a clear, logical, and grammatically flawless comparison.

Quick Tip

In comparison questions, always check two things: 1) Are you comparing like items (e.g., apples to apples, not apples to oranges)? 2) Are you using the correct comparative word (e.g., shorter for duration, fewer for countable items, less for uncountable quantities)?

Section: Verbal Reasoning - Sentence Correction

Topics: Subject Verb Agreement; Verb Form

5. Periodic changes in the shape of Earth's orbit around the sun lead to Milankovitch cycles that create a complex but predictable change in the temperatures of Earth's surface.

- (A) lead to Milankovitch cycles that create
- (B) leads to Milankovitch cycles creating
- (C) led to Milankovitch cycles that had created
- (D) has led to Milankovitch cycles that create
- (E) lead to Milankovitch cycles, that will create

Correct Answer: (A) lead to Milankovitch cycles that create

Solution:

Step 1: Understanding the Concept:

This question primarily tests subject-verb agreement and appropriate verb tense for a scientific fact.

Step 2: Detailed Explanation:

Let's analyze the original sentence for grammatical correctness.

1. **Main Subject-Verb Agreement:** The main subject of the sentence is "Periodic changes," which is plural. The verb is "lead," which is the correct plural form for the present tense. The agreement is correct.
2. **Relative Clause Subject-Verb Agreement:** The relative clause is "that create..." The pronoun "that" refers to "Milankovitch cycles," which is plural. The verb "create" is the correct plural form. This agreement is also correct.
3. **Verb Tense:** The sentence describes a general scientific principle that is a recurring and ongoing process. The simple present tense ("lead," "create") is the most appropriate tense for stating such facts.

Since the original sentence (A) is grammatically correct in all these aspects, it is the correct answer. Let's briefly review the errors in the other options:

- (B) "leads" is singular and does not agree with the plural subject "changes."
- (C) "led" (past tense) and "had created" (past perfect) are incorrect for describing a general, ongoing scientific principle.
- (D) "has led" is singular and does not agree with the plural subject "changes."
- (E) "will create" (future tense) is incorrect for a general fact. The comma before "that" is also incorrect.

Step 3: Final Answer:

The original underlined portion is grammatically correct. It maintains proper subject-verb agreement and uses the appropriate tense for a scientific fact. Therefore, option (A) is the correct answer.

Quick Tip

When you see a long sentence, the first thing to check is subject-verb agreement. Find the main subject and its verb, ignoring any prepositional phrases or clauses in between. For scientific statements or general truths, the simple present tense is usually the correct choice.
