

READING TEST

35 Minutes—40 Questions

DIRECTIONS: There are several passages in this test. Each passage is accompanied by several questions. After reading a passage, choose the best answer to each question and fill in the corresponding oval on your answer document. You may refer to the passages as often as necessary.

Passage I

PROSE FICTION: This passage is adapted from the novel *Stones for Ibarra* by Harriet Doerr (©1984 by Harriet Doerr).

Here they are, two North Americans, a man and a woman just over and just under forty, come to spend their lives in Mexico and already lost as they travel cross-country over the central plateau. The driver of the station wagon is Richard Everton, a blue-eyed, black-haired stubborn man. On the seat beside him is his wife, Sara. She pictures the adobe house where they intend to sleep tonight. It is a mile and a half high on the outskirts of Ibarra, a declining village of one thousand souls. Tunneled into the mountain is the copper mine Richard's grandfather abandoned fifty years ago during the Revolution of 1910.

Dark is coming on and, unless they find a road, night will trap at this desolate spot both the future operator of the Malagueña mine and the fair-haired unsuspecting future mistress of the adobe house. Sara Everton is anticipating their arrival at a place curtained and warm, though she knows the house has neither electricity nor furniture and, least of all, kindling beside the hearth. There is some doubt about running water in the pipes. The Malagueña mine, on the other hand, is flooded up to the second level.

"Let's stop and ask the way," says Sara. And they take a diagonal course across a cleared space of land. But the owner of this field is nowhere in sight.

"We won't get to Ibarra before dark," says Sara. "Do you think we'll recognize the house?"

"Yes," he says, and without speaking they separately recall a faded photograph of a wide, low structure with a long veranda in front. On the veranda is a hammock, and in the hammock is Richard's grandmother, dressed in eyelet embroidery and holding a fluted fan.

Five days ago the Evertons left San Francisco in order to extend the family's Mexican history and patch the present onto the past. To find out if there was still copper underground and how much of the rest of it was true, the width of the sky, the depth of the stars, the air like new wine. To weave chance and hope into a fabric that would clothe them as long as they lived.

Even their closest friends have failed to understand. "Call us when you get there," they said. "Send a telegram." But Ibarra lacks these services. "What will you do for light?" they were asked. And, "How long since someone lived in the house?" But this question collapsed of its own weight before a reply could be composed.

Every day for a month Richard has reminded Sara, "We mustn't expect too much." And each time his wife answered, "no." But the Evertons expect too much. They have experienced the terrible persuasion of a great-aunt's recollections and adopted them as their own. They have not considered that memories are like corks left out of bottles. They swell. They no longer fit.

Now here, lost in the Mexican interior, Richard and Sara remember the rock pick Richard's grandfather gave him when he was six. His grandfather had used the pick himself to chip away copper ore from extrusions that coursed like exposed arteries down the slopes of the mountains.

"What does he know about mining?" Richard's friends have asked one another. "What does she know about gasoline stoves? In case of burns, where will they find a doctor?" The friends learn that the Evertons are taking a first aid manual, antibiotics for dysentery, and a snakebite kit. There are other questions relating to symphony season tickets, Christmas, golf, sailing. To these, the answers are evasive.

A farmer, leading a burro, approaches the car from behind. He regards the two Americans. "You are not on the road to Ibarra," he says. "Permit me a moment." And he gazes first at his feet, then at the mountains, then at their luggage. "You must drive north on that dry arroyo for two kilometers and turn left when you reach a road. You will recognize it by the tire tracks of the morning bus unless rain has fallen. But this is the dry season."

"Without a tail wind we won't be bothered by the dust," says Richard, and turns north.

He is mistaken. The arroyo is smooth and soft with dust that, even in still air, spins from the car's wheels and sifts through sealed surfaces, the flooring, the dashboard, the factory-tested weather stripping. It etches black lines on their palms, sands their skin, powders their lashes, and deposits a bitter taste on their tongues.

"This must be the wrong way," says Sara, from under the sweater she has pulled over her head.

Richard says nothing. He knows it is the right way, as right as a way to Ibarra can be, as right as his decision to reopen an idle mine and bring his wife to a house built half of nostalgia and half of clay.

1. The passage is told from what point of view?
 - A. First person, narrated by a minor character
 - B. First person, narrated by a main character
 - C. Third person, narrated by a voice outside the action of the story
 - D. Third person, narrated through the perspective of one character
2. What does the passage suggest about how many, if any, preceding visits the Evertons have made to Ibarra?
 - F. They have visited Ibarra before, but not for several years.
 - G. They have been to Ibarra regularly to visit Richard's grandmother.
 - H. They visited Ibarra once before to examine the Malagueña mine.
 - J. They have not been to Ibarra prior to this visit.
3. The main point made in the eighth paragraph (lines 48-54) is that:
 - A. when everything is carefully planned, there's no risk of disappointment.
 - B. older relatives should not try to persuade family members to change lifestyles.
 - C. people cannot live on their own memories but should instead look to the future.
 - D. it's unwise to form expectations based on other people's enticing stories of another time.
4. Based on the passage, how does the house in Sara's thoughts most likely compare to the actual house where the Evertons plan to sleep?
 - F. Sara's imagined house is much more inviting than the actual house.
 - G. Sara pictured a house that's nearly a perfect copy of the actual house.
 - H. The actual house is much grander than Sara is imagining.
 - J. The actual house is just as uninviting as the house in Sara's imagination.
5. It could most reasonably be considered ironic that while Richard and Sara's copper mine:
 - A. is located on the side of a mountain, they get lost traveling cross-country to Ibarra.
 - B. was abandoned in 1910, Sara still remembers the rock pick Richard was given when he was six.
 - C. is located near the village of Ibarra, no one has lived in the house for several years.
 - D. is flooded to the second level, the house is likely to be without running water.
6. Richard thinks he and Sara will recognize the house where they intend to sleep because:
 - F. it's made of adobe.
 - G. Richard's grandmother described it to them.
 - H. they have seen an old photograph of it.
 - J. it's the only house with a veranda.
7. As it is used in line 37, the phrase "the rest of it" refers to the:
 - A. amount of copper still left to be dug out of the mine.
 - B. stories that Richard and Sara have heard about the natural appeal of the region.
 - C. town of Ibarra that Richard is anxious to find out more about.
 - D. close friends they left behind along with their old lives in San Francisco.
8. The services mentioned in line 43 specifically refer to:
 - F. symphony tickets and sailing excursions.
 - G. medical aid and antibiotics.
 - H. electricity and running water.
 - J. telephone calls and telegrams.
9. The list "symphony season tickets, Christmas, golf, sailing" (line 67) is a reference to Richard and Sara's:
 - A. unwillingness to spend money frivolously.
 - B. concerns about heading for Ibarra.
 - C. recreational opportunities in Mexico.
 - D. former social lives in San Francisco.
10. According to the passage, the farmer tells the Evertons that it's the dry season to make the point that the:
 - F. tire tracks of the bus should still be visible on the road.
 - G. drive to Ibarra will be hot and dusty.
 - H. Evertons should reach Ibarra before it begins to rain.
 - J. Evertons should have brought drinking water with them.

Passage II

SOCIAL SCIENCE: This passage is adapted from the article “Reviving the Lost Art of Naming the World” by Carol Kaesuk Yoon (©2009 by The New York Times Company).

Despite the field of taxonomy’s now blatant modernity, with practitioners using DNA sequences, sophisticated evolutionary theory and supercomputers to order and name all of life, jobs for taxonomists continue to be in steady decline. The natural history collections crucial to the work are tossed.

Outside taxonomy, no one is much up in arms about this, but perhaps we should be, because the ordering and naming of life is no esoteric science. The past few decades have seen a stream of studies that show that sorting and naming the natural world is a universal, deep-seated and fundamental human activity, one we cannot afford to lose because it is essential to understanding the living world, and our place in it.

Anthropologists were the first to recognize that taxonomy might be more than the science officially founded by Carl Linnaeus, the Swedish botanist, in the 1700s. Studying how nonscientists order and name life, creating what are called folk taxonomies, anthropologists began to realize that when people across the globe were creating ordered groups and giving names to what lived around them, they followed highly stereotyped patterns, appearing unconsciously to follow a set of unwritten rules. Not that conformity to rules was at first obvious to anthropologists who were instead understandably dazzled by the variety in folk taxonomies. The Ilongots, for example, a people of the Philippines, name gorgeous wild orchids after human body parts. There bloom the thighs, there fingernails, yonder elbows and thumbs. The Rofaifo people of New Guinea classify the cassowary, a giant bird complete with requisite feathers and beak, as a mammal. In fact, there seemed, at first glance, to be little room even for agreement among people, let alone a set of universally followed rules. More recently, however, deep underlying similarities have begun to become apparent.

Cecil Brown, an anthropologist who has studied folk taxonomies in 188 languages, has found that people recognize the same basic categories repeatedly, including fish, birds, snakes, mammals, “wugs” (meaning worms and insects), trees, vines, herbs and bushes.

Dr. Brown’s finding would be considerably less interesting if these categories were clear-cut depictions of reality that must inevitably be recognized. But tree and bush are hardly that, since there is no way to define a tree versus a bush. The two categories grade insensibly into one another. Wugs, likewise, are neither an evolutionarily nor ecologically nor otherwise cohesive group. Still, people repeatedly recognize and name these oddities.

Likewise, people consistently use two-word epithets to designate specific organisms within a larger group of organisms, despite there being an infinitude of

potentially more logical methods. It is so familiar that it is hard to notice. In English, among the oaks, we distinguish the pin oak, among bears, grizzly bears. When Mayan Indians, familiar with the wild piglike creature known as peccaries, encountered Spaniards’ pigs, they dubbed them “village peccaries.” We use two-part names for ourselves as well: Sally Smith or Li Wen. Even scientists are bound by this practice, insisting on Latin binomials for species.

There appears to be such a profound unconscious agreement that people will even concur on which exact words make the best names for particular organisms. Brent Berlin, an ethnobiologist at the University of Georgia, discovered this when he read 50 pairs of names, each consisting of one bird and one fish name, to a group of 100 undergraduates, and asked them to identify which was which. The names had been randomly chosen from the language of Peru’s Huambisa people, to which the students had had no previous exposure. With such a large sample size—there were 5,000 choices being made—the students should have scored 50 percent or very close to it if they were blindly guessing. Instead, they identified the bird and fish names correctly 58 percent of the time, significantly more often than expected for random guessing. Somehow they were often able to intuit the names’ birdiness or fishiness.

Some researchers hypothesize that there might be a specific part of the brain that is devoted to the doing of taxonomy. Without the power to order and name life, a person simply does not know how to live in the world, how to understand it. How to tell the carrot from the cat—which to grate and which to pet? To order and name life is to have a sense of the world around, and, as a result, what one’s place is in it.

11. The primary function of the statement in lines 35–36 is to:
- A. signal a shift in the direction of the discussion.
 - B. summarize the main idea of the third paragraph (lines 15–36).
 - C. define a new anthropological term.
 - D. anticipate and refute a counterargument.
12. Which of the following hypotheses does the passage introduce but not elaborate on?
- F. A particular part of the brain might be devoted to the ordering and naming of life.
 - G. Taxonomy might be more than the science founded by Linnaeus.
 - H. Basic ways of categorizing organisms might be similar across cultures.
 - J. Prior to Linnaeus’s taxonomy, animals might have been categorized based on how they moved.

13. The main idea of the second paragraph (lines 7–14) is that:
- A. surveys have shown that the number of taxonomy experts has declined in the past few decades.
 - B. natural history collections should be preserved and made accessible.
 - C. taxonomy is no esoteric science because it is so widely studied.
 - D. we should be concerned about the state of taxonomy because it is vital to all of us.
14. The passage refers to the Ilongots and the Rofaifo people primarily to:
- F. provide examples of some variances that anthropologists observed in taxonomies.
 - G. illustrate that categories such as bird and mammal are common in taxonomies.
 - H. support the claim that anthropologists were the first to recognize the importance of taxonomy.
 - J. expose the underlying similarities among the taxonomies of different cultures.
15. As it is used in the passage, the term *wugs* most nearly refers to:
- A. an oddity recognized in only a few cultures' taxonomies.
 - B. species that are usually named with more than two-word labels.
 - C. a noncohesive group consisting of worms and insects.
 - D. miscellaneous species that Linnaeus couldn't fit in another category.
16. According to the passage, using two-word labels to name organisms is a practice that:
- F. was introduced by Linnaeus.
 - G. has been abandoned by taxonomists.
 - H. is common across cultures.
 - J. was initiated by anthropologists.
17. The passage draws which of the following conclusions based on Berlin's experiment?
- A. Random guessing yields a correct answer at least 58 percent of the time.
 - B. Languages share recognizable and somewhat similar characteristics in names of organisms.
 - C. Bird and fish names can't be identified more than 50 percent of the time in most languages.
 - D. Most of the words in the language of Peru's Huambisa people are similar to English words.
18. The first paragraph indicates that the number of taxonomy jobs has decreased despite:
- F. recent discoveries of numerous unnamed species.
 - G. technological advances in the field of taxonomy.
 - H. the need to correct longstanding errors in Linnaeus's work.
 - J. anthropologists' interest in collaborating with taxonomists.
19. It can most reasonably be inferred from the passage that the author regards natural history collections as being:
- A. not worth the expense of maintaining.
 - B. outdated and therefore ready to be tossed.
 - C. essential for the work of taxonomists.
 - D. crucial to Berlin's ethnobiology research.
20. The passage most strongly suggests that one of the reasons Berlin chose the language of Peru's Huambisa people for use in his experiment was that:
- F. the language doesn't use a binomial system to name organisms.
 - G. his test subjects wouldn't have been exposed to the language.
 - H. the language has roughly the same number of words for birds as it does for fish.
 - J. his test subjects would be able to learn the language quickly.

Passage III

HUMANITIES: Passage A is adapted from the article “Dear Jerry: My adventures answering J. D. Salinger’s mail” by Joanna Smith Rakoff (©2010 by Washingtonpost.Newsweek Interactive Co LLC). Passage B is adapted from the article “Betraying Salinger” by Roger Lathbury (©2010 by New York Magazine Holdings LLC).

Passage A by Joanna Smith Rakoff

I knew, I suppose, that Salinger was a recluse, but I didn’t understand the extent of his removal from society, in general, and the realms of literature and publishing, specifically. Nor did I understand—naïve as this sounds—the cultlike devotion of his fans.

At Harold Ober Associates, a literary agency, we were Salinger’s gatekeepers—charged with protecting his life and work. We had to believe that Salinger’s privacy was the most important thing in the world, to be protected at all costs.

During my first months on the job, Salinger remained a comfortably abstract concept. Then, in June, he called, anxious to speak to Phyllis Westberg, the company’s president. My stomach lurched a little when I realized that it was Salinger, for real, on the other end of the phone.

It turned out something momentous was afoot in Salingerland: Eight years earlier, a small publisher in Alexandria, Virginia, had written to him, asking whether they might put out a book consisting solely of Salinger’s novella *Hapworth 16, 1924*, which had appeared in *The New Yorker* magazine in 1965. To the shock of Phyllis, Salinger had, after years of thought, decided that this “fellow in Virginia” could publish *Hapworth*. Suddenly, he was calling all the time, anxious about the details of this new deal, which seemed like it might mark a tentative re-entry into the world he’d abandoned 30 years earlier. Ober, just as suddenly, seemed charged with a frenetic energy. Phyllis bustled around the office and had long conversations with Salinger, going over the details of the new book, from the cloth of the binding to the font to the paper stock. She asked him about the publisher, a retired professor, whom Salinger seemed to like very much, to Phyllis’ surprise. It was not often, I supposed, that Salinger took a shine to someone new. In a way, I realized, the Virginia publisher was simply one of the fans whose letters I fielded, one who had managed to break through the wall of Ober’s protectorate and prove to Salinger that, yes, they really were kindred spirits.

The *Hapworth* book never materialized. The publisher gave an interview about Salinger to a local magazine, and Salinger decided his new friend was a phony after all.

Passage B by Roger Lathbury

It was 1988, and I had written to J. D. Salinger with a proposal: I wanted my tiny Virginia publishing

house, Orchises Press, to publish his novella *Hapworth 16, 1924*. And Salinger himself had improbably written in reply, saying that he would consider it. I was ecstatic, even if I doubted that he’d proceed. And then, silence.

Eight years went by. In May of 1996, I received a letter from Phyllis Westberg saying that Mr. Salinger would soon write to me.

Why had he said yes? I think he chose me because I didn’t chase him. I had left him alone for eight years; I wasn’t pushy in the commercial way he found offensive.

Two weeks later, a full-page letter arrived, and it took my breath away. Chatty, personal, it expressed Salinger’s high pleasure in finding a way to put out *Hapworth*.

Well into discussions about the deal, I unwittingly made the first move that would unravel the whole thing. I applied for Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data.

It sounds innocent. CIP data are the information printed on the copyright page. The filings are public information, but I didn’t imagine that anyone would notice one among thousands.

Then I made another, bigger mistake. What I know now, but did not then, was that CIP listings are not only public but also appear on Amazon.com. Someone spotted *Hapworth* there, and his sister was a reporter for a local paper in Arlington. She telephoned.

It seems clear now how everything happened. She asked me basic questions. Foolishly—if reasonably—I answered most of them. I thought I could control myself, but my ego came into play. Anyway, what harm could it do? This was a tiny paper.

Then someone at *The Washington Post* saw it and called. I refused to speak at first, then answered a few questions, nervously.

After the story appeared in the *Post*, my phone nearly exploded. Newspapers, magazines, television stations, book distributors, strangers, foreign publishers, movie people. South Africa, Catalonia, Australia. The only one who didn’t call me was Salinger. I couldn’t proceed without him, because we still had too many details unsettled.

I yearned to write to Salinger, but I knew that it would do no good. He must have been furious with me, for betraying him by leaking news to the press, or even confirming it. I could no longer be trusted. I had proven myself part of the crass, opportunistic world that Salinger’s heroes disdain.

Questions 21–23 ask about Passage A.

21. It can most reasonably be inferred from Passage A that before Rakoff began working at Harold Ober Associates, she:
- A. was a fan of Salinger's work and took the job in hopes of meeting Salinger.
 - B. knew Salinger himself but was unaware of his fame and unfamiliar with *Hapworth 16, 1924*.
 - C. knew of Salinger but did not realize the extent of his reclusiveness nor the depths of his fame.
 - D. had read *Hapworth 16, 1924*, and hoped to help publish it again.
22. Which of the following is a detail from Passage A that best supports the idea that Salinger was removed from the realms of literature and publishing?
- F. Salinger didn't want to be bothered reading letters from fans.
 - G. Salinger had resorted to publishing his writing in magazines like *The New Yorker*.
 - H. Salinger had not published any work in thirty years.
 - J. Salinger was anxious about going over the details of publishing his book with Westberg.
23. Regarding the publication of *Hapworth 16, 1924*, Passage A makes clear that the text was:
- A. published by a small Virginia company thirty years after Salinger had written it.
 - B. about to be published in *The New Yorker* when Salinger decided he wanted it in book form.
 - C. once published in book form, but the book is no longer in print.
 - D. once published in *The New Yorker*, but a later deal to publish it in book form fell apart.

Questions 24–27 ask about Passage B.

24. Based on Passage B, Lathbury's reaction to Salinger's first letter was:
- F. elation, but also doubt about whether Salinger would actually proceed with the deal.
 - G. amusement, but also suspicion that someone claiming to be Salinger had written the letter.
 - H. optimism; he was certain that Salinger would agree to a business proposition regarding his novella.
 - J. anxiety; he was concerned that his tiny publishing house couldn't handle a book deal with Salinger.
25. According to Lathbury, the tone of Salinger's second letter can best be described as:
- A. stilted and reticent.
 - B. informal and friendly.
 - C. clear but patronizing.
 - D. agreeable but hesitant.

26. It can most reasonably be inferred from Passage B that Lathbury responded to the first interviewer's questions in part because he:
- F. believed the questions were in-depth and thought provoking.
 - G. hoped the article would increase demand for Salinger's other books.
 - H. was proud of having made a book deal with Salinger.
 - J. was related to the interviewer and wanted to give her the story.
27. Lines 89–90 most nearly mean that Lathbury:
- A. felt uncertain about his friendship with Salinger and wanted to hear from him again.
 - B. was worried about Salinger's reaction to the interviews Lathbury had given.
 - C. couldn't publish the book without further discussions with Salinger.
 - D. had a lot of unanswered questions about Salinger's life.

Questions 28–30 ask about both passages.

28. Which statement most accurately compares the content of the two passages?
- F. Both focus on philosophical reasons for Salinger's withdrawal from the public eye.
 - G. Both use the same stories about Salinger to explain how he changed over time.
 - H. Both describe Salinger's devoted fans but offer different reasons for his fame.
 - J. Both give an insider's account of an incident involving Salinger but tell the story from a different angle.
29. Based on the passages, it's most likely that Rakoff and Lathbury would agree that giving interviews about Salinger was:
- A. ill-advised; Salinger avoided publicity and didn't want others speaking about him.
 - B. aggravating; reporters exaggerated facts about Salinger no matter what was said in the interview.
 - C. profitable; Salinger would finish writing a book more quickly when people were anticipating it.
 - D. clever; good publicity was a way to inflate Salinger's ego so he'd be cooperative.
30. It can most reasonably be inferred from the passages that "the Virginia publisher" referred to in lines 36–37 is:
- F. Roger Lathbury.
 - G. Phyllis Westberg.
 - H. Joanna Smith Rakoff.
 - J. Harold Ober Associates.

Passage IV

NATURAL SCIENCE: This passage is adapted from the article "Swarm Savvy" by Susan Milius (©2009 by Society for Science & the Public).

Only a few millimeters long, rock ants (*Temnothorax albipennis*) prove difficult to track in the wild but excellent for the tabletop world of the laboratory.

When something terrible happens to a rock ant home, such as a researcher lifting off the roof, the majority of ants cluster in the ruins. A quarter to a third of the colony scurries out looking for new possibilities.

"I think of the ants as a sort of search engine," ant biologist Nigel Franks says. In one set of tests, he and his students disrupted a nest and watched to see what the ants would make of a series of new possibilities that improved with distance. The best nest was almost three meters distant, nine times as far from the original home as a nearby but less appealing choice. "It was just such fun doing this experiment because the ants won," Franks says.

In spite of the epic distances, the ants typically found and agreed to move into the best nest. "They're fantastic at it," Franks says.

Franks and Elva Robinson, both of the University of Bristol, monitored rock ants by fitting them with radio-frequency identification tags. The data suggest that each scout follows a simpler rule than previously thought, Robinson, Franks and their colleagues reported online in *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*.

Instead of making direct comparisons between sites, a scout follows a threshold rule. If she finds a poor site, she keeps searching. When she finds a site that exceeds her "good enough" threshold, she returns to the original nest.

Next, previous work shows, the scout recruits a new scout to join her on a trek to the good site. She dashes around tapping her antennae on other ants and releasing a pheromone from her sting gland, explains Stephen Pratt of Arizona State University in Tempe. Usually she finds a volunteer within a minute or so, and the two set off tandem running.

Scout A, who knows the way, runs back toward the nest while her follower, B, jogs closely enough to tap antennae against the leader. Should A sprint a little too fast and dash beyond antennae range, she slows until her partner catches up. Periodically the two ants stop, and the newbie looks around as if learning landmarks. It's a slow way to get to the site, and Franks argues that it qualifies as animal teaching.

When the ants do reach the possible site, the recruit explores it and, depending on her assessment, returns to recruit yet another scout.

As with bees, it's the quorum of scouts at the sites that matters. When enough of them gather at a particular place to encounter each other at a sufficiently high rate, they've got a decision.

Once scouts reach that decision, their behavior changes. Each scout dashes back to the nest, but instead of coaxing a nest mate for a tour, she just grabs somebody. She uses a mouthpart hook, an over-the-shoulder throw, and off she goes with the passive nest mate curled on her back in an ant version of the fetal position. Carrying takes about a third as long as leading would, and scouts can haul the rest of the colony to a new home within hours. The ants shift from the independent info gathering of scouts to group implementation of the quorum's decision.

Rock ants' willingness to thrive in the lab allows experiments on finer points of collective decision making, Pratt says. For example, forcing a crisis among the ants demonstrates that they will, in a pinch, trade accuracy for speed. When researchers destroy an old nest so that ants are completely exposed, the ants scope and relocate within hours. Other experiments that just offer the ants a better nest but don't ruin their current one can result in days of deliberation. Speed has its costs, and ants in a hurry now and then make mistakes, such as splitting the colony between two nests. Slower moves prove more accurate.

The quorum system could be widespread in group behavior in nature, Pratt says. Overall it's a beautiful tool, allowing for carefully balanced independence plus some shortcut speed. Yet the system "has a dark side," he acknowledges. Once individuals have made their independent assessments and then a quorum has reached agreement, fellows copy the quorum behavior. The chances are low that the whole quorum will reach the same wrong decision. But flukes can happen. In most uses of a quorum, "it's going to make a decision more accurate," he says, "but it also slightly increases the incidence of these rare events when you get it really spectacularly wrong."

31. The passage makes clear that a main objective of the research of Franks and Robinson was to:
- determine the properties of rock ant scouts' pheromones.
 - destroy rock ant habitats in the laboratory.
 - observe the behavior of rock ant scouts in the wild.
 - study the decision making of rock ant scouts.
32. In the passage, Franks reacts to his findings regarding the behavior of rock ants with what could best be described as:
- frustration and impatience.
 - surprise and confusion.
 - concern and empathy.
 - amusement and admiration.

33. Based on the passage, an example of rock ants working as “a sort of search engine” (line 8) would be:
- A. a colony selecting one scout ant to find the best site for a new nest.
 - B. a third of a colony deciding to nest at a nearby but somewhat deficient site.
 - C. several ants bypassing a poor nest site for the purpose of finding a better site.
 - D. individual ants leading nest mates one by one to a new nest.
34. The passage suggests that which action of Scout A most strongly influences Scout B to follow Scout A to a new nest site?
- F. Scout A tapping its head against the ground
 - G. Scout A dashing to and from the new site
 - H. Scout A releasing a pheromone
 - J. Scout A rejecting a poor site
35. In the passage, Pratt suggests that the dark side of the quorum system is that the remainder of the colony:
- A. follows the quorum decision even when the quorum is wrong.
 - B. is often left behind in the old nest after a quorum decision.
 - C. sometimes challenges the quorum, leading to a split in the colony.
 - D. is in danger of not knowing how to reach the new nest.
36. As it is used in line 43, the word *newbie* most nearly refers to:
- F. Scout A.
 - G. Scout B.
 - H. either Scout A or Scout B.
 - J. any ant at the original nest.
37. Based on the passage, if Scout B believes that a site Scout A found is acceptable, what does Scout B do next?
- A. Returns to the original nest
 - B. Taps its antennae on Scout A
 - C. Begins building at the new site
 - D. Examines the area surrounding the new site
38. The passage states that the final decision to move a colony to a new site is made by rock ant scouts when:
- F. the first scout to approve a new site brings a second ant to the site.
 - G. there are enough scouts at the site that they encounter each other at a sufficiently high rate.
 - H. at least half of the colony has already relocated to the new site.
 - J. two scouts set off tandem running to a new site and other ants follow.
39. The passage suggests that the shortest length of time in which rock ant scouts can move a colony to a new home is:
- A. minutes.
 - B. hours.
 - C. days.
 - D. weeks.
40. Compared to their behavior when their current nest is disrupted by researchers, how does the behavior of rock ants differ when their current nest is left intact but they're offered a better nest?
- F. They make a decision about where to move collectively as opposed to individually.
 - G. They're not as concerned with the accuracy of their decision to move.
 - H. They take more time deciding whether to move the colony to the new nest.
 - J. They split the colony between the current nest and the new nest instead of moving the entire colony.

END OF TEST 3

STOP! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

DO NOT RETURN TO A PREVIOUS TEST.