

Passage 1: Predictive Policing and Historical Data

Police departments increasingly use predictive systems that analyse historical crime data to identify areas where crimes are considered more likely to occur. Supporters argue that such systems enable police departments to allocate limited resources more efficiently. If officers know which locations face a higher probability of certain crimes, they can patrol those areas more frequently and potentially prevent offences before they occur.

Critics, however, question whether historical data provides a neutral basis for prediction. Crime data does not merely record where crimes occurred; it often records where crimes were detected and reported. Areas subjected to more intensive policing may consequently generate more recorded offences, even if their actual crime rates are not proportionately higher. If a predictive system uses such data to direct additional police resources to the same areas, increased policing may lead to increased detection, which then produces more data apparently confirming that those areas require further surveillance. Thus, what appears to be an objective prediction may partly reproduce the patterns created by earlier policing decisions.

Supporters respond that imperfect data does not make prediction useless. Human decision-makers also rely on incomplete information and may themselves possess unconscious biases. A properly designed system, they argue, could identify and correct distortions in historical data more consistently than individual officers can. The relevant comparison, therefore, is not between an imperfect algorithm and an ideal decision-maker, but between an imperfect algorithm and the imperfect human processes it may replace.

Yet this response leaves an important question unanswered. A system may be better than unaided human judgment in predicting recorded crime without being better at predicting actual crime. If the objective of policing is merely to predict where offences will be recorded, historical data may be sufficient. But if the objective is to understand where offences are actually occurring, the distinction between recorded and actual crime becomes crucial. Evaluating predictive policing, therefore, requires clarity not only about the accuracy of its predictions but also about what exactly those predictions are intended to measure.

1. Which of the following best states the central conclusion of the passage?

- A. Predictive policing systems should immediately replace all human police officers.
- B. Historical crime data is inherently unreliable and should never be used for decision-making.
- C. The usefulness of predictive policing can be evaluated only after identifying what the system's predictions are intended to measure.
- D. Human police officers are necessarily more biased than algorithms.
- E. Areas with higher recorded crime always have higher actual crime.

2. Which of the following most strongly supports the critics' concern about a self-reinforcing cycle?

- A. Predictive systems can process large quantities of information quickly.
- B. Areas receiving more police patrols experience more opportunities for offences to be detected and recorded.
- C. Some crimes are never reported to the police.

- D. Police officers disagree about how resources should be allocated.
- E. Algorithms are generally designed by computer programmers.

3. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the argument that higher recorded crime in heavily policed areas may partly result from increased detection?

- A. The predictive system is updated every month.
- B. Independent victimisation surveys show that actual crime rates are also substantially higher in the same heavily policed areas.
- C. Some police departments do not use predictive systems.
- D. Citizens often have different perceptions of crime in their neighbourhoods.
- E. Recorded crime data includes offences from several different categories.

4. The supporters' comparison between algorithms and human decision-makers depends most directly on which assumption?

- A. Human decision-making is entirely free from errors.
- B. An algorithm can never contain bias introduced through its design.
- C. The relevant standard for judging an algorithm is whether it improves upon realistically available alternatives.
- D. Predictive systems are less expensive than employing additional police officers.
- E. Historical crime data accurately measures all criminal activity.

5. Which of the following can most reasonably be inferred from the passage?

- A. A system can accurately predict recorded crime while failing to accurately predict the actual distribution of crime.
- B. Recorded crime and actual crime are always unrelated.
- C. Any algorithm using historical data necessarily produces discriminatory outcomes.
- D. Human decision-makers cannot be evaluated using objective standards.
- E. The primary purpose of policing is to increase the number of recorded offences.

Passage 2: The Problem with Performance Rankings

Universities, hospitals and public institutions are increasingly ranked according to measurable indicators of performance. Such rankings are often defended on the ground that they promote accountability. Citizens, it is argued, cannot easily judge the quality of complex institutions, and rankings convert complicated information into simple comparisons.

However, critics argue that what is easy to measure is not necessarily what is important. Once an institution knows that its position depends heavily on particular indicators, it has an incentive to improve those indicators, even when doing so does not improve its underlying performance. A university evaluated primarily on graduate salaries, for example, may favour programmes leading to high-paying professions over programmes that contribute equally to knowledge or society but produce lower salaries. Similarly, a hospital judged heavily on short waiting times may avoid treating patients whose cases are complex and likely to require lengthy treatment.

Defenders of rankings respond that these examples demonstrate the need for better indicators rather than the abandonment of measurement. No single indicator need determine an institution's

rank. A combination of measures, they argue, can reduce the possibility that institutions manipulate any one of them. Moreover, without measurable indicators, accountability may depend entirely on subjective impressions.

This response is persuasive only to a point. Adding more indicators may make manipulation more difficult, but it may also create new problems. Institutions may devote increasing resources to collecting and reporting data rather than performing their primary functions. Further, even a large collection of indicators may fail to capture qualities that are difficult to quantify. The issue, therefore, is not whether institutions should ever be measured, but whether numerical rankings should be treated as sufficiently complete representations of institutional quality.

6. Which of the following best describes the structure of the passage?

- A. It rejects measurement entirely because numerical information is always misleading.
- B. It presents a criticism of rankings, considers a response to that criticism, and argues that the response does not completely resolve the underlying concern.
- C. It argues that subjective impressions are superior to all measurable evidence.
- D. It proves that universities and hospitals should never be compared.
- E. It claims that increasing the number of indicators will necessarily make rankings less accurate.

7. Which of the following would most strengthen the critics' argument regarding incentives created by rankings?

- A. Institutions often publish their rankings in advertisements.
- B. An institution substantially improves its ranking by changing its reporting methods, although independent assessments find no corresponding improvement in the quality of its services.
- C. Different ranking systems sometimes use different indicators.
- D. Some institutions refuse to participate voluntarily in ranking exercises.
- E. Numerical data can be processed more quickly than written reports.

8. Which of the following is most strongly supported by the passage?

- A. More indicators always produce more accurate rankings.
- B. Accountability is impossible without numerical rankings.
- C. An improvement in a ranking does not necessarily establish an improvement in underlying institutional quality.
- D. Institutions should be judged exclusively on qualities that cannot be quantified.
- E. Hospitals with shorter waiting times necessarily provide inferior treatment.

9. Which of the following would most weaken the concern that institutions may devote excessive resources to measurement rather than their primary functions?

- A. Data collection requires specialised software.
- B. Most indicators used in the ranking can be generated automatically from information that institutions already collect for operational purposes.
- C. Rankings are published once every year.
- D. Institutions often employ people specifically responsible for communications.
- E. Some indicators are easier to understand than others.

10. The final paragraph most strongly suggests that the author would agree with which statement?

- A. Numerical rankings are useful only when they contain exactly five indicators.
- B. Measurement and ranking are identical activities.
- C. Institutions should not be evaluated at all unless every aspect of their performance can be quantified.
- D. Numerical rankings may be useful, but they should not automatically be regarded as complete measures of institutional quality.
- E. Subjective judgments should replace all forms of measurable assessment.

Passage 3: Free Speech and Platform Responsibility

Large digital platforms frequently defend their decisions about content moderation by appealing to the principle of free expression. According to this view, platforms should generally allow users to express controversial or unpopular opinions, since suppressing speech merely because it offends others may permit those with power to silence dissenting voices.

Yet the principle does not by itself determine every moderation decision. Speech does not occur in a vacuum. A platform's design can influence which voices are heard, how widely particular content spreads and what incentives users have to produce increasingly provocative material. A platform that allows all speech in principle may nevertheless actively amplify certain forms of speech through recommendation systems. Consequently, the decision to refrain from removing content is different from the decision to promote it.

This distinction matters because defenders of unrestricted speech often treat moderation as though there were only two alternatives: either content remains available or it is censored. But platforms can choose among many intermediate responses. They may reduce the prominence of misleading content without removing it, attach contextual information, limit automated recommendations or modify financial incentives that reward sensationalism.

Critics of such interventions argue that any reduction in visibility is itself a form of censorship. However, this claim assumes that users possess an entitlement not merely to speak but to receive a particular level of distribution. That assumption is difficult to justify. No speaker can ordinarily demand that a newspaper publish an article or that a broadcaster give it prime-time coverage. Similarly, although platforms may have reasons to protect users' ability to express themselves, it does not follow that they must use their own systems to maximise the audience for every expression.

This does not mean that platforms can restrict visibility without concern for fairness. Because their decisions can substantially influence public debate, they should establish clear rules and apply them consistently. The appropriate question is therefore not whether platforms should moderate content at all, but how they can exercise control over visibility and amplification without arbitrarily discriminating against particular viewpoints.

11. Which of the following is the main conclusion of the passage?

- A. Digital platforms should remove all controversial content.
- B. Free expression gives every user an unlimited right to maximum online visibility.
- C. The key issue is how platforms can manage visibility and amplification fairly rather than

whether they should moderate content at all.

D. Any reduction in the visibility of content is necessarily censorship.

E. Recommendation systems have no effect on public debate.

12. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the author's distinction between allowing speech and promoting speech?

A. A platform can technically remove content more quickly than it can modify its recommendation system.

B. Users whose posts are not recommended can still make those posts available to anyone who directly visits their profiles.

C. Most users prefer reading popular content.

D. Platforms receive complaints about both removed and visible content.

E. Some users post controversial opinions to attract attention.

13. The critics' claim that reducing visibility amounts to censorship relies most strongly on which assumption?

A. Platforms should disclose all their moderation rules publicly.

B. Users have a legitimate right to a particular degree of distribution for their speech once it is allowed on a platform.

C. Misleading information is always intentionally created.

D. Newspapers and broadcasters have no editorial freedom.

E. Users cannot express opinions outside digital platforms.

14. Which of the following would most weaken the author's argument?

A. A platform's recommendation system can significantly influence the number of people who encounter particular content.

B. Platforms can reduce the visibility of content while leaving it accessible through direct searches.

C. In practice, reducing visibility on a dominant platform makes content effectively inaccessible to almost all of its intended audience, while the criteria used are secret and applied inconsistently.

D. Platforms can attach contextual information to misleading content.

E. Some controversial opinions later become widely accepted.

15. Which of the following is most analogous to the distinction drawn by the author?

A. A library purchasing a book and lending it to every visitor automatically.

B. A newspaper permitting a reader to submit a letter but choosing not to place that letter on its front page.

C. A government prohibiting all citizens from expressing criticism.

D. A teacher requiring students to memorise an article.

E. A reader disagreeing with the opinion expressed in a book.

Passage 4: Scientific Consensus and Public Policy

Public debates often invoke scientific consensus as though the existence of agreement among experts automatically determines what governments should do. This reasoning overlooks an important distinction. Scientific inquiry can help establish what is likely to happen under particular conditions, but public policy also requires judgments about which outcomes should be prioritised and which costs are acceptable.

Suppose, for example, that scientists agree that a particular environmental policy will significantly reduce pollution. That conclusion provides strong evidence regarding one consequence of the policy. It does not, by itself, establish how the economic costs of implementing the policy should be distributed, whether alternative policies would achieve similar results at lower cost, or how society should weigh environmental improvements against other objectives.

None of this implies that scientific evidence is irrelevant to policy. On the contrary, policy decisions made without regard to reliable evidence are likely to rest on false assumptions about their consequences. The mistake lies in treating scientific consensus either as sufficient for deciding policy or as irrelevant because scientists cannot answer every moral or political question.

The proper role of scientific evidence is therefore neither to replace public judgment nor to be subordinated entirely to it. Policymakers should distinguish between questions concerning facts and predictions, where scientific methods may provide particularly strong guidance, and questions concerning values and priorities, where scientific expertise alone cannot determine the answer. This distinction may not always be perfectly clear because factual predictions and value judgments often interact. Nevertheless, recognising the difference helps prevent both the misuse of scientific authority and the dismissal of relevant evidence.

16. Which of the following best captures the author's position?

- A. Scientific consensus should always determine government policy.
- B. Scientific evidence is irrelevant whenever a policy involves moral considerations.
- C. Public policy should be based exclusively on majority opinion.
- D. Scientific evidence is essential for understanding likely consequences, but it does not by itself resolve questions involving values and priorities.
- E. Scientists should be prohibited from participating in public policy debates.

17. Which of the following arguments most closely resembles the error criticised in the first paragraph?

- A. "Experts predict that this bridge will last for 50 years; therefore, we should examine its maintenance costs before deciding whether to build it."
- B. "Scientists agree that this medicine reduces symptoms; therefore, the government must provide it free of charge to every citizen."
- C. "Scientists disagree about the effects of the policy; therefore, further research may be necessary."
- D. "The policy may reduce pollution, but its effect on employment should also be examined."
- E. "Scientific evidence should be considered together with information about the policy's costs."

18. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the author's argument?

- A. Scientific predictions are sometimes uncertain and later revised.
- B. Two policies may produce similar reductions in pollution while imposing significantly different economic costs on different groups.
- C. Most scientists support greater public funding for research.
- D. Governments often consult experts before making major decisions.
- E. Citizens frequently disagree about political issues.

19. Which of the following is most strongly supported by the passage?

- A. A policy can be scientifically effective while still raising legitimate disagreements about whether it should be adopted.
- B. Whenever scientists agree on a factual question, citizens must agree on the appropriate policy response.
- C. Value judgments can always be separated completely from factual questions.
- D. Policies based on scientific evidence never produce unintended consequences.
- E. Scientific methods are incapable of predicting future outcomes.

20. Which of the following would most directly contradict the author's reasoning?

- A. Scientific evidence can clarify the likely consequences of alternative policies.
- B. Questions about fairness may require judgments that cannot be derived solely from scientific findings.
- C. Once scientific consensus exists regarding the consequences of a policy, no further consideration is required before deciding whether to adopt it.
- D. Policymakers may misuse science when they present factual findings as though those findings automatically settle value questions.
- E. Ignoring reliable evidence can lead to policy decisions based on incorrect assumptions.

Passage 5: Efficiency and Resilience

Businesses and governments increasingly seek to make supply systems more efficient by reducing unused capacity, minimising inventories and relying on specialised suppliers. Under ordinary conditions, such systems can reduce costs. A manufacturer that stores fewer components, for example, need not spend as much on warehouses or risk holding materials that become obsolete.

However, efficiency under normal conditions is not identical to resilience under disruption. A system with no spare capacity may perform extremely well when everything functions as expected, yet fail rapidly when a supplier is unable to operate, a transport route is interrupted or demand suddenly changes. Maintaining backup suppliers or additional inventory may therefore appear inefficient when judged solely by short-term costs, while providing considerable value during rare but serious disruptions.

Defenders of highly efficient systems may respond that preparing for every conceivable disruption would be prohibitively expensive. This is correct, but it does not follow that no preparation is justified. The relevant issue is not whether organisations can eliminate every risk. Rather, they must determine which risks are sufficiently serious and sufficiently probable to justify the cost of reducing their consequences.

This requires a broader understanding of efficiency. A system that saves a small amount every day but suffers enormous losses during a predictable disruption may be less efficient over time

than a system with higher routine costs but greater capacity to recover. The appropriate comparison, therefore, must include not only the costs incurred during normal operations but also the expected costs of disruption.

The passage does not argue that every organisation should maintain maximum redundancy. Different systems face different risks, and the appropriate level of backup depends on the consequences of failure, the likelihood of disruption and the cost of precaution. What it rejects is the assumption that the cheapest system under normal conditions is necessarily the most economically rational system overall.

21. Which of the following is the main conclusion of the passage?

- A. Organisations should always maintain the maximum possible inventory.
- B. Systems that minimise short-term costs are necessarily inefficient.
- C. The economic efficiency of a system should be assessed by considering both normal operating costs and the expected costs of disruption.
- D. Rare disruptions can never be predicted.
- E. Specialised suppliers should be completely avoided.

22. Which of the following would most strengthen the author's argument?

- A. A company with minimal inventory saves money every month but suffers losses several times greater than those savings whenever predictable seasonal transport disruptions occur.
- B. Warehouses require significant amounts of physical space.
- C. Some organisations prefer specialised suppliers because they provide high-quality products.
- D. Maintaining inventory can create the risk that some goods become obsolete.
- E. Supply disruptions are impossible to eliminate completely.

23. The argument that preparing for every conceivable disruption would be prohibitively expensive is treated by the author as:

- A. A complete justification for ignoring all risks.
- B. A reason to distinguish between preparing for every risk and preparing selectively for significant risks.
- C. Evidence that highly efficient systems cannot fail.
- D. Proof that additional inventory is always wasteful.
- E. A contradiction of the claim that disruptions can cause losses.

24. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the argument for maintaining additional backup capacity?

- A. The cost of maintaining backup capacity is low compared with the losses caused by disruptions.
- B. Major disruptions are becoming more frequent.
- C. A highly reliable system of instant emergency supply can replace disrupted suppliers at negligible cost without requiring organisations to maintain backup capacity themselves.
- D. Some supply disruptions affect multiple organisations simultaneously.
- E. Certain industries depend on components produced by only a few suppliers.

25. Which principle is most strongly supported by the passage?

- A. The best system is always the one with the lowest immediate operating cost.
- B. A decision should be evaluated solely according to the most likely outcome.
- C. Costs incurred to reduce significant future risks may be economically justified even when they increase present-day operating expenses.
- D. Every possible risk must be prevented regardless of cost.
- E. Rare events should never influence economic decision-making.



Answer Key with Brief Explanations

Q.	Answer	Explanation
1	C	The passage ultimately argues that evaluation depends on what the prediction is supposed to measure.
2	B	More policing can directly create more opportunities for detection and recording.
3	B	Independent evidence of genuinely higher actual crime weakens the detection-bias explanation.
4	C	The supporters compare algorithms with realistic human alternatives, not an ideal standard.
5	A	The passage explicitly distinguishes predicting recorded crime from predicting actual crime.
6	B	Criticism → response → explanation of why the response is only partly satisfactory.
7	B	It demonstrates improved metrics without genuine improvement in underlying performance.
8	C	Rankings may improve even when actual institutional quality does not.
9	B	If data is already collected automatically, the resource-diversion concern is weakened.
10	D	Rankings may help, but should not be treated as complete representations of quality.

Q.	Answer	Explanation
11	C	The focus is on fair control of visibility and amplification, not an all-or-nothing moderation debate.
12	B	Content remains available, demonstrating the distinction between access and promotion.
13	B	The censorship claim assumes a right to distribution, not merely a right to speak.
14	C	This challenges the practical distinction between reducing visibility and effective suppression.
15	B	Submission is permitted, but prominent distribution is not guaranteed.
16	D	Science informs consequences; values and priorities still require public judgment.
17	B	It incorrectly moves directly from a scientific fact to a mandatory policy choice.
18	B	Different policies with similar scientific outcomes can still require value-based choices.
19	A	Scientific effectiveness alone does not settle whether a policy should be adopted.
20	C	This directly contradicts the distinction between factual consensus and policy judgment.
21	C	The passage argues for evaluating efficiency across both ordinary and disruptive conditions.
22	A	This provides concrete evidence that short-term

Q.	Answer	Explanation
23	B	savings can be outweighed by disruption losses. The author accepts the concern but rejects the conclusion that no preparation should occur.
24	C	If disruption can be solved cheaply and instantly, maintaining costly internal redundancy becomes less necessary.
25	C	The passage supports spending now when doing so economically reduces significant future risks.

GreatLearnPro

TRAIN - ELEVATE - SHINE