Note to Users

Welcome to the CAAP Sample Critical Thinking Test!

You are about to look at some sample test questions as you prepare to take the actual CAAP test. The examples in this booklet are similar to the kinds of test questions you will see when you take the actual CAAP test. Since this is a practice exercise, you won't receive a real test score. The aim of this booklet is to give a sense of the kinds of questions examinees will face and their levels of difficulty. An answer key is provided at the end of the booklet.

We hope you benefit from these sample questions, and we wish you success as you pursue your education and career goals!

CAAP Critical Thinking Test

The CAAP Critical Thinking Test is a 32-item, 40-minute test that measures students’ skills at analyzing, evaluating, and extending arguments. An argument is defined as a sequence of statements that includes a claim that one of the statements, the conclusion, follows from the other statements. The Critical Thinking Test consists of four passages that are representative of the kinds of issues commonly encountered in a postsecondary curriculum.

A passage typically presents a series of subarguments in support of a more general conclusion or conclusions. Each passage presents one or more arguments using a variety of formats, including case studies, debates, dialogues, overlapping positions, statistical arguments, experimental results, or editorials.

Samples of test questions in the CAAP Critical Thinking Test are provided on the following pages.
CRITICAL THINKING TEST
40 Minutes—32 Questions

DIRECTIONS: There are four passages in this test. Each passage is followed by several questions. After reading a passage, choose the best answer to each question by circling the corresponding answer option. You may refer to the passages as often as necessary.
Passage I

*Keepit, Givit, and Wait* are discussing whether to make regular voluntary donations to charitable organizations.

**Keepit:** I ought not contribute to charities. What good would it do? My contribution would never be noticed as part of a million-dollar budget. But that same amount of money would be very noticeable if kept in my own family budget; that’s where it makes the biggest difference, and hence does the most substantial good. In any case, our first moral obligation is always to the well-being of our own families. My family would rightly resent my favoring strangers over them. Given my level of income, any money of mine that is not needed for their present well-being should be saved for their future.

**Givit:** People have a right to have their most basic needs satisfied. Rights entail obligations. So anyone who has more than enough money to satisfy his or her own basic needs has a constant moral obligation to help meet the most basic needs of others. Hence we are each morally obliged to contribute to charities, and to refuse is blameworthy.

**Wait:** I haven’t decided what to do yet. I agree that it is good to contribute; still, it is not morally obligatory for us. Our money comes from wages we earn by our own labor, utilizing our own abilities. And so long as people don’t use the money to harm others, they are morally entitled to put earned wages to whatever use they choose. People who contribute hard-earned money to charities deserve praise. But no one should be blamed for not contributing such money.

**Givit:** Some people are not as lucky as you: their abilities are fewer, or their legitimate needs are greater. For example, some people are born with serious physical or mental disabilities; others require expensive medical treatments. Why should they suffer for such accidents of fate? When our economic system provides you with luxuries while failing to meet their most basic needs, you are getting more than your fair share. I’m not saying that money should be taken from you by force, but I am saying that you have a constant moral obligation to help right such wrongs.

**Wait:** Your principles go too far. Suppose we do have a constant moral obligation of the kind you describe. Then even if people act morally, they will find themselves with a continuing obligation to keep giving until they can just barely satisfy their own most basic needs. Be honest. We are all planning to buy season football tickets, which are not basic needs. Do you think we are obliged to forgo the tickets and give the money to charity instead?

**Keepit:** The economic system may treat some people unfairly, but that does not mean that I am obliged to help them at the expense of my own family. The wealthiest 5 percent own 35 percent of the country’s wealth, so obviously they have more money than they can use for their own families. And if they would contribute just a tenth of that wealth, charities would have all the money they need. Thus, there is no need for ordinary people like us to contribute, and hence no obligation.

1. Keepit’s stated principles entail that:
   A. people who have no families have no moral obligations.
   B. Keepit is not morally obligated to contribute earned wages to charities.
   C. every action is either praiseworthy or blameworthy.
   D. it is fair to pay people on the basis of their abilities as well as their labor.

2. Wait states that so long as people don’t use the money to harm others, they are morally entitled to put earned wages to whatever use they choose. In making this statement, Wait is:
   F. trying to establish that Wait, Keepit, and Givit are not morally obligated to contribute to charities.
   G. trying to establish that it is good to contribute to charities.
   H. trying to establish that charities should receive money from sources other than earned wages.
   J. contradicting Wait’s own claim that those who contribute hard-earned money to charities deserve praise.

3. Givit’s argument assumes, although it does not explicitly state, that:
   I. Keepit, Givit, and Wait each have more than enough money to satisfy their most basic needs.
   II. contributing to charities is a way to help some people satisfy their most basic needs.
   III. if people refuse to contribute to charities voluntarily, governments should force them to contribute.
   A. I only
   B. II only
   C. III only
   D. I and II only

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
4. Keepit states that the truly wealthy have more money than they can use for their own families. Which of the following is NOT true of Keepit’s statement?

   F. It is part of Keepit’s attempt to establish that there is no need for ordinary people to contribute to charity.
   G. It is consistent with Keepit’s claim that charities would have all the money they need if the truly wealthy would contribute one-tenth of their wealth.
   H. It supports Givit’s claim that we each have a moral obligation to contribute to charities.
   J. It is part of Keepit’s attempt to refute Givit.

5. Which of the following, if true, would most substantially weaken Keepit’s argument for not contributing?

   A. Keepit does not really want to contribute.
   B. If Keepit were to contribute, the contribution would go entirely to a needy family who otherwise would not have received assistance.
   C. Rights entail responsibilities.
   D. The wealthiest 5% own much more than 35% of the country’s wealth.

6. Keepit’s argument for the conclusion that there is no need for ordinary people to contribute to charity is subject to a reasonable objection on the grounds that:

   F. the wealthy must spend some of their money on their own families.
   G. it may not be possible to induce the wealthiest 5% to contribute one-tenth of their wealth to charity.
   H. Keepit assumes that the wealthy have not earned their wealth.
   J. the conclusion is not relevant to Keepit’s main point.

7. Which of the following best explains why Wait’s reference to the season football tickets is relevant to a logical evaluation of Givit’s argument?

   A. It implies that Givit is a hypocrite.
   B. It illustrates a possible consequence of Givit’s position concerning the extent of the obligation to help those in need.
   C. It demonstrates an inconsistency in Givit’s position concerning one’s obligations to one’s family.
   D. It indicates that Givit overestimates the willingness of others to join with him in rendering substantial charitable aid.

8. Keepit and Wait clearly agree, while Givit clearly denies, that:

   F. Keepit should not be blamed for refusing to contribute.
   G. contributing to charities is an ineffective way to help those in need.
   H. the first moral obligation is to one’s own family.
   J. the present economic system is fair.
Passage II

The college at which Professor Burke teaches regularly asks students to evaluate faculty teaching performance. The announced purpose of these evaluations is to give information to faculty about their strengths and weaknesses as teachers, and to allow those who make decisions about salary increases and promotions to reward the better teachers. Professor Burke, who never does very well on those evaluations, recently wrote the following letter of objection to the college president:

"It has become common practice in many colleges and universities for students to write formal evaluations of their professors and submit these to those who make salary and promotion decisions. Of course we do that here as well. This practice is supposed to provide valuable evidence both to faculty members and to decision makers regarding how well the faculty are teaching their courses. Despite all that, I believe this practice has so many undesirable consequences that it ought to be abandoned. I grant that those who advocate the use of student opinion surveys as a way of evaluating teaching have laudable goals. However, they have overlooked the disastrous effects which inevitably flow from this practice.

In order for students to learn effectively, two requirements must be met: Students must be informed when they are in error, and they must be challenged to stretch their minds as far as possible. But this requires faculty members to be frank in criticizing student work. It also requires faculty members to set high standards so as to challenge all students to develop fully. Should a faculty member come to fear that being critical toward student work will result in loss of salary raises and denial of promotions, that faculty member is not likely to set high standards. Should a faculty member come to fear that maintaining high academic standards will result in loss of raises and denial of promotions, that faculty member is not likely to make critical comments when they are needed. These things are exactly what happens when student evaluations are used by colleges to help make salary and promotion decisions. These things are happening here.

It doesn't take long for a faculty member to discover that many students react negatively to criticism, and that most students feel quite put upon when they are expected really to strive in a course outside of their major fields. True, some students do respond positively to a challenge, and many take criticism well, but what about those who don't? By not being critical and by having low standards, a faculty member can keep every student happy. By being critical and setting high standards, a faculty member runs the risk of making only a few students happy. There is no payoff for the faculty member in alienating a significant number of those who will be filling out the course evaluation form at the end of the term, when the results of those forms will be considered in future decisions about the faculty member's career advancement. Several of my colleagues have deliberately lowered their standards in order to curry student favor on these evaluations, and I note they have done far better than I in getting raises in recent years.

Because of these factors, student evaluation of college faculty represents an important pressure to lower academic standards. Such erosion in standards of achievement tends, of course, to promote a general climate of mediocrity in which no one expects of any student anything more than average performance. Students who have the ability to do better than average lose out from this process by not being encouraged to become all they can be. And society simply cannot afford to continue to allow this weakening of our educational system when the crying need is for ever larger numbers of well-trained, well-educated citizens.

Thus, for the benefit of students and society alike, we must stop using student opinion surveys to evaluate college faculty performance for salary and promotion decisions. It would be far better to ask certain selected faculty members to write evaluations of the teaching performance of other faculty members, based on classroom visits. This would avoid the difficulties described above and give us expert, objective opinions about teaching performance, which could be used as evidence for making salary and promotion decisions.

I urge you to take whatever action is necessary to bring about these changes on our campus."

9. Which of the following is a conclusion which Professor Burke argues for in this passage?
A. There is a crying need for large numbers of well-trained, well-educated citizens in our society.
B. Some of Burke's fellow faculty members lowered their standards in order to get better student evaluations of their teaching.
C. The practice of using student evaluations of teaching performance as evidence for faculty salary decisions has very undesirable consequences.
D. If a faculty member fears that maintaining high standards will result in loss of salary raises, that faculty member will not be likely to maintain high standards.

10. From what is said in this passage, we can see Professor Burke explicitly assumes without argument that:
F. students today are less academically ambitious and more critical of their instructors than students used to be.
G. effective student learning requires that students be told of their mistakes.
H. administrators believe all the negative comments made by students about faculty teaching.
J. students lack the background necessary for making accurate judgments regarding faculty knowledge of course subject matter.
11. Burke claims that a faculty member can keep every student happy by not being critical and by having low standards, while that faculty member can make only a few good students happy by being critical and having high standards. What’s the immediate point of these remarks?
A. When a faculty member is critical and has high standards, that benefits only a few good students.
B. Unfortunately, there are more weak than good students attending the college where Burke teaches.
C. Using student evaluations for making salary and promotion decisions leads to desirable results.
D. There is no reward for the critical faculty member with high standards in a school that uses student evaluations in salary and promotion decisions.

12. Burke mentions some colleagues who lowered their standards and subsequently received higher raises than Burke. In order to make the overall argument as logical as possible, what does Burke need to establish with respect to these cases?
F. That these teachers are not as good at teaching as Burke
G. That the higher raises were due in part to the lowering of academic standards mentioned
H. That the higher raises were not merely some sort of accidental quirk in the salary system
J. That the standards maintained by these faculty members before they lowered their standards were unreasonably high

13. Although the passage does not explicitly say so, Burke is apparently assuming that:
A. students generally feel that faculty criticism of their work is unfairly harsh.
B. students who react negatively to criticism and challenge will not give a favorable rating to the teaching of demanding instructors.
C. most faculty members at Burke’s college have lowered their standards in response to pressures created by student evaluation of instruction.
D. being willing to criticize student work when needed and maintaining high academic standards are the two most important aspects of good teaching.

14. Given what Burke says in the passage, which of the following statements would Burke most likely agree with?
F. Student evaluations of faculty performance provide useful information for decision making about faculty salaries and promotions.
G. All students desire their college courses to be less demanding than reasonable faculty members do.
H. There are disadvantages associated with the use of student evaluations as evidence in salary and promotion decisions.
J. There is a real danger that students will deliberately use evaluations of faculty performance to lower academic standards.

15. Which one of the following, if known to be true, would do the most to undermine Burke’s argument in favor of having faculty, rather than students, evaluate teaching performance?
A. Faculty are generally reluctant to have other faculty members visit their classrooms.
B. Most faculty members who would do the evaluating believe in upholding reasonably high academic standards.
C. Most faculty members who would do the evaluating believe that it is possible to be too highly critical of student work.
D. Because of personal relationships between faculty members, those who would do the evaluating could not be good judges of teaching performance.

16. In a school that uses student evaluation of instruction as evidence in salary and promotion decisions, according to Burke, the following three items are related to one another:
I. Faculty members fear that being critical of student work will have bad career consequences for the faculty member.
II. Faculty members experience negative student reaction to criticism of student work.
III. Undesirable educational practices are promoted at the institution.
Which of the following represents the most satisfactory summary of the logical relations between I, II, and III as Burke sees them?
F. I and II cause III.
G. I promotes II, and II causes III.
H. II causes I which then results in III.
J. III causes II which in turn results in I.
Passage III

Silver is an attorney specializing in criminal defense. In a conversation with her friends Brown, Green, and Gray, she mentioned that she has recently become utterly convinced of the guilt of one of her clients, a client who has not yet gone to trial but insists on pleading not guilty. Brown, Green, and Gray are discussing Silver’s moral obligations in such a case.

Brown: If I were Silver, I would withdraw from the case. If she continued to serve as the client’s attorney, she would have a moral obligation to her client, based on the implicit promise involved in the attorney/client relationship, to do her best to win an acquittal. But that obligation would conflict with an absolute moral obligation she has to her fellow citizens, and shares with them: the obligation not to hinder the conviction of persons one strongly believes to be guilty. She cannot cancel that obligation to her fellow citizens, but she can cancel the obligation to her client—by withdrawing from the case. Moreover, to defend her client, she would have to argue contrary to her beliefs, which is dishonest. But dishonesty is always wrong. So it is her duty to withdraw.

Green: And what good will that do? Any defendant can always easily get another attorney who will keep the case and fight for an acquittal. Suppose the new attorney wins an acquittal, and Silver’s client then goes on to commit more crimes. Part of the responsibility for those crimes would rest with Silver, since she can prevent them by keeping the case and seeing to it that her client is convicted and punished, as all criminals should be. For example, she could subtly highlight inconsistencies in her client’s story, and refrain from introducing misleading evidence of innocence. She could intentionally be less aggressive than usual in cross-examination, and give less than her best effort in her closing arguments to the jury. After all, no one can ever have an obligation to protect criminals from the just consequences of their actions. Her highest obligation is to the public good, the general welfare of people. It is not enough for Silver to wash her hands of the case and thereby make it someone else’s problem. In order to fully protect the general welfare, she must see to it that her client is convicted.

Brown: But that would be dishonest—perhaps even more dishonest than defending a client whom she knows to be guilty. If Silver did what you suggest, she would have to mislead both her client and the judge about her true aims in the case. For if she admitted to her client what she was trying to do, the client would fire her for self-interest; and if she admitted to the judge what she was trying to do, the judge would be legally bound to remove her from the case.

Green: Don’t you sometimes pay compliments that are insincere? Wouldn’t you lie to an enemy in order to protect the lives of your friends? But I am not even advising Silver to tell a lie—just to keep the truth about her intentions to herself.

Gray: I agree with Green that Silver should not withdraw. After all, the vast majority of criminal defendants in this country are guilty—if they weren’t, there would have to be something very wrong with our police or prosecutors. If defense attorneys withdrew every time they became convinced of their clients’ guilt, the legal system would become a shambles. And many defendants wouldn’t even be able to find attorneys willing to keep their cases. But I also agree with Brown that Silver has a duty to give her client her best effort to win acquittal if she remains. That is because human history shows by direct examination that, of the various systems tried, the best criminal justice system is one that works as a true adversary system, where each side strives skillfully to present a persuasive and successful case. Such a system tends ultimately to produce correct decisions more consistently than any other, and hence, best serves the general welfare; that is why we adopted an adversary system in the first place. When one side does less than its very best, the criminal justice system does not work as effectively; and so, in the long run, justice is not served as often. The guilt or innocence of the accused is for the judge to decide—it is not even for the judge to decide, let alone for the competing attorneys. An attorney’s job is to formulate the strongest case available for whichever side the attorney is given to represent. If the attorney does that, then his or her whole duty in the case has been fulfilled, and he or she is blameless. Silver should keep her client and do her best to win an acquittal.

17. Gray disagrees with Brown’s claim that:
   A. short-term benefits usually outweigh long-term benefits.
   B. Silver’s decisive moral obligation is to the public welfare.
   C. it is Silver’s duty to withdraw from the case.
   D. Silver should allow her own judgment of her client’s guilt or innocence to guide her actions.

18. If human history shows by direct examination, as Gray claims, that of the various systems tried, a true adversary system makes more consistently correct decisions than any other kind of criminal justice system, which of the following must be true?
   I. The present criminal justice system was never intended to be a true adversary system.
   II. Human history contains examples of criminal justice systems that are not true adversary systems.
   III. There is a way of evaluating how consistently a criminal justice system makes correct decisions.
   F. II only
   G. III only
   H. II and III only
   J. I, II, and III
19. By using a parallel argument adapted to the case of judges, Green could argue equally well from his stated principles that judges should:

I. not disqualify themselves from cases in which they have a financial interest.
II. not disqualify themselves from cases in which they have a personal relationship with the victim.
III. try to influence juries to convict defendants whom the judges know to be guilty.

A. II only
B. III only
C. I and II only
D. I, II, and III

20. Brown and Green evidently disagree about which of the following principles?

F. If attorneys accept cases, then they should do their best to win them.
G. Attorneys should always act ethically.
H. Our legal system, as presently constituted, is a true adversary system.
J. People generally act from self-interest.

21. Gray’s remark (lines 59–60) that “the vast majority of criminal defendants in this country are guilty” is relevant to his argument because it:

I. expresses a lack of confidence in police and prosecutors.
II. suggests that defense attorneys will frequently become convinced of their clients’ guilt.
III. supports the claim that our present legal system was intentionally adopted as a true adversary system.

A. I only
B. II only
C. III only
D. I, II, and III

22. Which of the following, if true, would do the most to strengthen Gray’s overall argument and weaken Green’s argument?

F. Some innocent clients have an attorney who believes that the client is guilty.
G. Attorneys very often judge a client to be innocent when in fact the client is guilty.
H. Police and prosecutors do their jobs effectively on the whole.
J. Most attorneys would concur with Gray’s advice.

23. Which of the following claims does Brown make without offering supporting argumentation?

A. Silver has a duty to withdraw from the case.
B. Silver would have to act dishonestly if she were to follow Green’s advice.
C. Silver wants to behave honestly.
D. A judge would be legally bound to remove Silver from the case if she admitted to the judge that she was not trying her best to acquit her client.

24. Green’s two questions, about insincere compliments and lying to one’s enemies (lines 53–55), are relevant to establishing the correctness of Green’s conclusions to the extent that the questions:

F. suggest that Brown is a hypocrite.
G. indicate that lying is only one kind of dishonesty.
H. show that Brown’s argument contradicts itself.
J. imply that dishonesty may sometimes be morally permissible when its consequences are beneficial.
Passage IV

Senator Support proposed a bill in the Senate that would forbid TV stations from broadcasting commercials directed at children under thirteen years of age. In support of the bill, Support argued:

I feel that advertising aimed at young children takes unfair advantage of their undeveloped reasoning abilities and encourages bad thinking. Commercials aimed at young children should be banned. My bill would do that.

Research has shown that young children are often unable to discriminate good arguments from subtly bad ones. The arguments in TV commercials are, of course, predominantly bad, the main argument being, in essence, “Look at this image. If you like the image, buy this product.” Children like my young son aren’t sophisticated enough to know that this is a bad argument. Advertisers are taking advantage of children’s ignorance, and that is utterly despicable.

Furthermore, TV ads encourage bad thinking habits. As you know, young children are impressionable, but we are showing them bad arguments like those in TV commercials. So they are bound to start thinking badly. A cereal commercial, for instance, will direct children to look at the characters and images associated with the cereal rather than at the ingredients. More generally, commercials encourage children to evaluate a product on the basis of images associated with the product rather than on the basis of the product’s ingredients and utility.

I am sure that Senator Oppose will object to this bill, but I hope you will find her arguments unconvincing.

After Senator Support’s speech, Senator Oppose stood to defend an opposing position:

I can’t approve of Senator Support’s attempt to shield young children from advertising. His bill is vague, poorly supported, and unrealistic.

It is vague because it provides no clear and explicit criteria for distinguishing ads aimed at young children from ads aimed at teenagers. Without any specific criteria, regulators won’t be able to decide what to forbid. Consequently, the bill would be unenforceable.

As if this were not enough, the bill is also poorly supported by evidence and argument. On the one hand, there is no scientific evidence to support the contention that ads encourage bad thinking. Indeed there are no studies which show that commercials have any harmful effects on children. On the other hand, none of Senator Support’s arguments are satisfactory. First, commercials don’t take unfair advantage of children since children can, to a large extent, distinguish good arguments from poor ones. Second, commercials don’t encourage bad thinking because they rarely involve bad arguments. There’s nothing wrong, for example, with, “Here’s an image. If you like the image, buy this product.” I suspect that many senators have acted on the basis of such arguments. So Senator Support’s arguments are not just inconclusive, they’re wrong.

To conclude, I would like to point out some of the implications of the bill that make it politically unrealistic. First, of course, child advertising would stop. But then so would child programming, since commercial stations would have no child-based income. Children would then not know what to do with their time, so parents would become angry with us. For economic reasons, manufacturers and retailers would also be upset with us. Considering that the bill is also vague and poorly supported by evidence or argument, I don’t think it’s worth enduring the anger of so many interests.

25. In his speech, Senator Support’s main conclusion is that:
   A. commercials aimed at young children should be banned.
   B. it is unfair to aim commercials at people who can’t reason well.
   C. commercials with bad arguments encourage children to think badly.
   D. the bill is politically, socially, and economically unrealistic.

26. When Senator Support says (lines 17–19) that taking advantage of ignorance “is utterly despicable,” he is probably:
   F. condemning ignorance.
   G. concluding that his son is ignorant.
   H. concluding that all children are ignorant.
   J. appealing to the emotions of the audience.

27. Suppose Senator Support’s reasons for his belief that advertising has a detrimental effect on children are wrong. Would that show that advertising has no detrimental effects on children?
   A. Yes, because bad reasons often yield incorrect conclusions.
   B. Yes, because advertising has not been proven to have a detrimental effect on children.
   C. No, because good reasons may support contrasting conclusions.
   D. No, because reasons can be wrong when the conclusion is correct.
28. What would Senator Support probably need to assume in order to apply his arguments to the proposal that all commercials should be banned?
   F. If all commercials are banned, then bad arguments will not appear on TV.
   G. Commercials often encourage people to buy luxuries rather than necessities.
   H. Commercials are irritating interruptions in viewing, and they irritate everyone, not just children.
   J. People of all age groups are impressionable and unable to discriminate good arguments from subtly bad ones.

29. According to the passage, which of the following is the main reason why Senator Oppose thinks that the bill would be unenforceable?
   A. The bill is too vague.
   B. Powerful interest groups would be upset.
   C. The bill would, in effect, ban child advertising.
   D. Commercials contain relatively few bad arguments.

30. Senator Oppose says that without child programming, children would not know what to do with their time. Which of the arguments below would probably be the most effective reply to this statement?
   F. At any point in time, every child is doing something, be it eating, sleeping, thinking, or something else. So children would always be doing something with their time, even without TV.
   G. If Senator Oppose is considering teenagers as children, she is wrong. If Oppose is excluding teenagers, she is contradicting herself.
   H. You are assuming that children do not value their time. Based on my experience with children, I know that assumption is false.
   J. In many parts of the world, children still have no television but find things to do with their time. So children can find things to do with their time.

31. In mentioning that no studies show that commercials damage children (lines 49–51), Senator Oppose seems to assume, but does not say, that:
   A. commercials are valuable for purposes of entertainment.
   B. if commercials have known harmful effects, they should be banned.
   C. if commercials have no known harmful effects, they should not be banned.
   D. if commercials are not banned, then they have no known harmful effects.

32. What conclusion follows necessarily from these two premises?
   I. If the bill passes, child advertising will stop.
   II. Once child advertising stops, commercial stations won’t be able to make a profit from child programming.
   F. If the bill passes, commercial stations will not show child programming.
   G. If child advertising stops, it will be because the bill passed.
   H. Passing the bill would be a disaster for child programming.
   J. If the bill passes, then child programming would be unprofitable for commercial stations.
Correct Answers for
Sample Critical Thinking Test Questions

Sample Passage 1
Charitable Donations Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Correct Answer</th>
<th>Content Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Extending an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Extending an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Passage 2
Faculty Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Correct Answer</th>
<th>Content Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Extending an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sample Passage 3**  
Moral Obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Correct Answer</th>
<th>Content Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Extending an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Passage 4**  
Commercials and Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Correct Answer</th>
<th>Content Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Extending an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Analyzing an Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Evaluating an Argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>