

Although
Even though
Though

new

in fact/reality

still
nevertheless
nonetheless

recently

has suggested
have

1. **While** playing computer games **is sometimes seen as** a solitary pursuit, **a study at** Brigham Young University **shows that it actually enhances** social connections.
2. **Studying** the effect of multiplayer online games on marriages, **researchers found that** in the 76% of the cases where the couple played together, games actually aided the relationship.
3. **In other words**, couples that gamed together stayed together.
4. Games **may have** other effects on us **too. / as well**
5. The famous psychologist, Philip Zimbardo, recently spoke out on the subject.
6. **In his 1971 Stanford Prison Experiment** **in which** volunteers were randomly assigned the roles of prisoner or guard, he showed that human behaviour is **heavily** influenced by environmental and social pressures.
7. **More recently**, Zimbardo **even suggested** that **exposing** children **to morally ambiguous situations** in games **could be useful** in helping them **develop** their own moral compass.
8. One possibility **is to explore** virtual worlds **through** computer games that could enable people to experience and understand **concepts that they would otherwise find difficult to imagine.**
9. Games about society, **populated by** real people and **open to all**, **could help test** how different cultural backgrounds could be brought together in peace

develop an allergy / disease: hastalı a yakalanmak
= contract
get infected by

1. Bilgisayar oyunları oynamak bazen tek başına yapılan bir uğraş **olarak görüle de**, Brigham Young Üniversitesi'nde yapılan bir araştırma bunun **aslında** sosyal bağlantıları **geliştirdiğini gösteriyor.**
2. Çok oyunculu çevrimiçi oyunların evlilikler üzerindeki etkisini **inceleyen araştırmacılar**, çiftlerin birlikte oynadığı durumların %76'sında oyunların aslında ilişkiye **yardımcı** olduğunu ortaya koydu.
3. **Başka bir deyişle**, birlikte oyun oynayan çiftler beraber olmaya devam ettiler.
4. Oyunların üzerimizde başka etkileri **de olabilir.**
5. Ünlü psikolog Philip Zimbardo geçtiğimiz günlerde konuyla ilgili açıklamalarda bulundu.
6. **Gönüllülere rastgele mahkûm veya gardiyan rollerinin verildiği 1971 Stanford Hapishanesi Deneyinde** insan davranışının çevresel ve sosyal baskılardan **büyük ölçüde** etkilendiğini gösterdi.
7. Daha yakın zamanlarda Zimbardo, çocukları oyunlarda ahlaki açıdan belirsiz **durumlara maruz bırakmanın**, onların kendi ahlaki pusulalarını **geliştirmelerine yardımcı olabileceğini bile öne sürdü.**
8. **Olasılıklardan biri**, insanların **başka türlü hayal etmesi zor olacak kavramları** deneyimlemelerini ve anlamalarını sağlayabilecek bilgisayar oyunları **yoluyla sanal dünyaları keşfetmektir.**
9. Gerçek insanlardan **oluşan, herkese açık** ve toplumla ilgili oyunlar, farklı kültürel geçmişlerin barış içinde nasıl bir araya getirilebileceğini **test etmeye yardımcı olabilir.**

While **playing computer games** is sometimes seen as a solitary pursuit, a study at Brigham Young University shows that it actually **enhances** social connections. Studying the effect of multiplayer online games on marriages, researchers found that in the 76% of the cases where the couple played together, **games actually aided the relationship**. In other words, couples that gamed together stayed together. Games may have other effects on us too. The famous psychologist, Philip Zimbardo, recently spoke out on the subject. In his 1971 Stanford Prison Experiment, in which volunteers were randomly assigned the roles of prisoner or guard, he showed that human behaviour is heavily influenced by environmental and social pressures. More recently, Zimbardo even suggested that exposing children to morally ambiguous situations in games could be useful in **helping them develop** their own moral compass. One possibility is to explore virtual worlds through **computer games that could enable people to experience and understand** concepts that they would otherwise find difficult to imagine. **Games** about society, populated by real people and open to all, **could help** test how different cultural backgrounds could be brought together in peace.

165. The author's **attitude** towards **computer games** is ---

- A) satirizing **ele tirel**
B) disrespectful **saygısız**
✓ C) favouring **destekleyen = appreciating takdir eden**
D) pessimistic **karamsar**
E) tolerant **ho görülü**

3'

While playing computer games is sometimes seen as a solitary pursuit, a study at Brigham Young University shows that it actually enhances social connections. Studying the effect of multiplayer online games on marriages, researchers found that in the 76% of the cases where the couple played together, games actually aided the relationship. In other words, couples that gamed together stayed together. Games may have other effects on us too. The famous psychologist, Philip Zimbardo, recently spoke out on the subject. In his 1971 Stanford Prison Experiment, in which volunteers were randomly assigned the roles of prisoner or guard, he showed that human behaviour is heavily influenced by environmental and social pressures. More recently, Zimbardo even suggested that exposing children to morally ambiguous situations in games could be useful in helping them develop their own moral compass. One possibility is to explore virtual worlds through computer games that could enable people to experience and understand concepts that they would otherwise find difficult to imagine. Games about society, populated by real people and open to all, could help test how different cultural backgrounds could be brought together in peace.

166. It is stated in the passage that computer games ----.

- A) enhance the feeling of loneliness if they involve more than one player all the time
- B) provide opportunities for people to meet unaccustomed ideas and worlds
- C) lead to role conflicts among those who come from different cultural backgrounds
- D) contributes little to strengthening the relationships of married couples
- E) may include harmful features that trigger aggressive behaviour among children

While playing computer games is sometimes seen as a solitary pursuit, a study at Brigham Young University shows that it actually enhances social connections. Studying the effect of multiplayer online games on marriages, researchers found that in the 76% of the cases where the couple played together, games actually aided the relationship. In other words, couples that gamed together stayed together. Games may have other effects on us too. The famous psychologist, Philip **Zimbardo**, recently spoke out on the subject. In his 1971 Stanford Prison Experiment, in which volunteers were randomly assigned the roles of prisoner or guard, **he showed that human behaviour is heavily influenced by environmental and social pressures**. More recently, **Zimbardo** even suggested that **exposing children to morally ambiguous situations in games could be useful in helping them develop their own moral compass**. One possibility is to explore virtual worlds through computer games that could enable people to experience and understand concepts that they would otherwise find difficult to imagine. Games about society, populated by real people and open to all, could help test how different cultural backgrounds could be brought together in peace.

167. According to the passage, Zimbardo believes that ---

- A) computer games **may actually help young people** make more **conscious decisions** on **moral issues** +
- B) his experiment **refutes** the findings of the study conducted at Brigham Young University
- C) having children face ambiguous situations in computer games can cause psychological problems
- D) computer games populated by real people may not present the actual state of a society
- E) environmental pressures **are greater** on those who play computer games

young: genç / küçük / yavru

Although

While playing computer games is sometimes seen as a solitary pursuit, a study at Brigham Young University shows that it actually enhances social connections. Studying the effect of multiplayer online games on marriages, researchers found that in the 76% of the cases where the couple played together, games actually aided the relationship. In other words, couples that gamed together stayed together. Games may have other effects on us too. The famous psychologist, Philip Zimbardo, recently spoke out on the subject. In his 1971 Stanford Prison Experiment, in which volunteers were randomly assigned the roles of prisoner or guard, he showed that human behaviour is heavily influenced by environmental and social pressures. More recently, Zimbardo even suggested that exposing children to morally ambiguous situations in games could be useful in helping them develop their own moral compass. One possibility is to explore virtual worlds through computer games that could enable people to experience and understand concepts that they would otherwise find difficult to imagine. Games about society, populated by real people and open to all, could help test how different cultural backgrounds could be brought together in peace.

168. One can infer from the passage that ----.

- A) computer games are destructive to the relationships of younger people
- B) the risks associated with playing computer games outweigh the benefits a ır basmak/gelmek = outnumber / exceed / surpass
- C) we have reached the limits of what can be achieved with computer games
- D) computer games are capable of bringing in several unexpected benefits
- E) social pressures force people to avoid playing computer games

1. Many athletes credit drugs with improving their performance, but some of them may want to thank their brain instead. (of drugs)
2. Mounting evidence suggests that the boost from human growth hormone (HGH), an increasingly popular doping drug, might be caused by the placebo effect.
3. In a new double-blind trial funded by the World Anti-Doping Agency, in which neither researchers nor participants knew who was receiving HGH and who was taking a placebo, the researchers asked participants to guess whether or not they were on the real drug.
4. Then they examined the results of the group who guessed that they were getting HGH when, in fact, they had received a placebo.
5. That group improved at four fitness tests measuring strength, endurance, power and sprint capacity.
6. The study participants who guessed correctly that they were taking a placebo did not improve, according to preliminary results presented at the Society for Endocrinology meeting in June 2011.
7. "The finding really shows the power of the mind" said Ken Ho, an endocrinologist at the Garvan Institute in Sydney, Australia, who led the study.
8. She maintains that many athletes are reaping the benefits of the placebo effect, without knowing whether what they are taking is beneficial or not.

1. Pek çok sporcu, ilaçların performanslarını iyileştirdiğini kabul eder, ancak bazıları bunun yerine beyinlerine teşekkür etmek isteyebilir.
2. Artan kanıtlar, giderek daha popüler bir doping ilacı olan insan büyüme hormonundan (HGH) gelen enerji artışının placebo etkisinden kaynaklanabileceğini gösteriyor.
3. Dünya Anti-Doping Ajansı tarafından finanse edilen ve ne araştırmacıların ne de katılımcıların kimin HGH aldığını ve kimin placebo aldığını bilmediği yeni bir çift kör denemede, araştırmacılar katılımcılardan gerçek ilacı kullanıp kullanmadıklarını tahmin etmelerini istedi.
4. Daha sonra, aslında bir placebo almalarına rağmen HGH aldıklarını düşünen grubun sonuçlarını incelediler.
5. Bu grup, kuvvet, dayanıklılık, güç ve kısa koşu kapasitesini ölçen dört kondisyon testinde gelişme kaydetti.
6. Haziran 2011'deki Endokrinoloji Derneği toplantısında sunulan ön sonuçlara göre, placebo aldıklarını doğru tahmin eden çalışma katılımcıları iyileşmedi.
7. Çalışmayı yöneten Avustralya, Sidney'deki Garvan Enstitüsü'nden endokrinolog Ken Ho, "Bulgu gerçekten de zihnin gücünü gösteriyor" dedi.
8. Pek çok sporcunun, aldıkları şeyin yararlı olup olmadığını bilmeden placebo etkisinin faydalarını gördüklerini de sözlerine ekledi.

As you sow, so you shall reap.
ne ekersen onu biçersin

Many athletes credit drugs with improving their performance, but some of them may want to thank their brain instead.

Mounting evidence suggests that the boost from human growth hormone (HGH), an increasingly popular doping drug, might be caused by the placebo effect. In a new double-blind trial funded by the World Anti-Doping Agency, in which neither researchers nor participants knew who was receiving HGH and who was taking a placebo, the researchers asked participants to guess whether or not they were on the real drug. Then they examined the results of the group who guessed that they were getting HGH when, in fact, they had received a placebo. That group improved at four fitness tests measuring strength, endurance, power and sprint capacity. The study participants who guessed correctly that they were taking a placebo did not improve, according to preliminary results presented at the Society for Endocrinology meeting in June 2011. "The finding really shows the power of the mind" said Ken Ho, an endocrinologist at the Garvan Institute in Sydney, Australia, who led the study. She maintains that many athletes are reaping the benefits of the placebo effect, without knowing whether what they are taking is beneficial or not.

197. It is clearly stated in the passage that the support given by certain drugs ----.

- A) is largely accepted for its positive contribution to performance
- B) has been proven by many studies around the world
- C) has led authorities to take the necessary measures against these drugs
- D) has been openly disputed by most of the athletes
- E) results in the improved performances of all the athletes who take them

angora

angora

angora

angora

angora
in Englishangora
in English

Many athletes credit drugs with improving their performance, but some of them may want to thank their brain instead. Mounting evidence suggests that the boost from human growth hormone (HGH), an increasingly popular doping drug, might be caused by the placebo effect. In a new double-blind trial funded by the World Anti-Doping Agency, in which neither researchers nor participants knew who was receiving HGH and who was taking a placebo, the researchers asked participants to guess whether or not they were on the real drug. Then they examined the results of the group who guessed that they were getting HGH when, in fact, they had received a placebo. That group improved at four fitness tests measuring strength, endurance, power and sprint capacity. The study participants who guessed correctly that they were taking a placebo did not improve according to preliminary results presented at the Society for Endocrinology meeting in June 2011. "The finding really shows the power of the mind" said Ken Ho, an endocrinologist at the Garvan Institute in Sydney, Australia, who led the study. She maintains that many athletes are reaping the benefits of the placebo effect, without knowing whether what they are taking is beneficial or not.

198. According to the results of the study funded by the World Anti-Doping Agency, ----.

- A) the study participants were all aware they were given a placebo
- B) those who knew that they were given real drugs failed to show improvement in fitness tests
- C) the athletes who did not know they were given a placebo did well on fitness tests
- D) the preliminary findings showed the increased popularity of drugs
- E) the effects of HGH are incompatible with those found in other studies

Many athletes credit drugs with improving their performance, but some of them may want to thank their brain instead. Mounting evidence suggests that the boost from human growth hormone (HGH), an increasingly popular doping drug, might be caused by the placebo effect. In a new double-blind trial funded by the World Anti-Doping Agency, in which neither researchers nor participants knew who was receiving HGH and who was taking a placebo, the researchers asked participants to guess whether or not they were on the real drug. Then they examined the results of the group who guessed that they were getting HGH when, in fact, they had received a placebo. That group improved at four fitness tests measuring strength, endurance, power and sprint capacity. The study participants who guessed correctly that they were taking a placebo did not improve, according to preliminary results presented at the Society for Endocrinology meeting in June 2011. "The finding really shows the power of the mind" said Ken Ho, an endocrinologist at the Garvan Institute in Sydney, Australia, who led the study. She maintains that many athletes are reaping the benefits of the placebo effect, without knowing whether what they are taking is beneficial or not.

199. It is understood from the passage that the placebo effect

....

- A) is highly esteemed among those who are interested in athletics
- B) can play a significant role in improving the performances of athletes
- C) has been monitored in the participating groups that consist of people taking doping drugs
- D) was also tested in other branches of sports where competition exists
- E) was very high in the studies where participants were informed in advance

Many athletes credit drugs with improving their performance, but some of them may want to thank their brain instead.

Mounting evidence suggests that the boost from human growth hormone (HGH), an increasingly popular doping drug, might be caused by the placebo effect. In a new double-blind trial funded by the World Anti-Doping Agency, in which neither researchers nor participants knew who was receiving HGH and who was taking a placebo, the researchers asked participants to guess whether or not they were on the real drug. Then they examined the results of the group who guessed that they were getting HGH when, in fact, they had received a placebo. That group improved at four fitness tests measuring strength, endurance, power and sprint capacity. The study participants who guessed correctly that they were taking a placebo did not improve, according to preliminary results presented at the Society for Endocrinology meeting in June 2011. "The finding really shows the power of the mind" said Ken Ho, an endocrinologist at the Garvan Institute in Sydney, Australia, who led the study. She maintains that many athletes are reaping the benefits of the placebo effect, without knowing whether what they are taking is beneficial or not.

200. It can be inferred from the passage that ----.

- A) external interventions may have negative impacts on one's performance
- B) every athlete should be involved in a study to increase his or her performance
- C) success lies in the power of one's mind no matter which treatment he or she is exposed to
- D) the World Anti-Doping Agency should be much more careful about the use of drugs in sports
- E) much more research should be done on the placebo effect among athletes

1. Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is diagnosed in 2 to 5 percent of children between the ages of 6 and 16; approximately 80 percent are boys.
2. The typical symptoms of distractibility, hyperactivity and agitation occur at all ages, even in adults who have the condition, but with considerable disparity.
3. Children often seem forgetful or impatient, tend to disturb others and have a hard time observing limits.
4. Poor impulse control manifests itself in rash decision-making, irrational actions and rapid mood swings.
5. The child acts before thinking.
6. And yet, ADHD children often behave perfectly normally in new situations, particularly in those of short duration that involve direct contact with individuals or are pleasurable or exciting, like watching TV or playing games.
7. Precursor behaviours such as a difficult temperament or sleep and appetite disorders have often been found in children younger than 3 who were later detected to have ADHD, but no definite diagnosis can be made in those first three years.
8. Physical restlessness often diminishes in teenagers, but attention failure continues and can often become associated with aggressive or anti-social behaviour and emotional problems, as well as a tendency towards drug abuse.

büyük farklılık
ile birlikte

observe:
1. gözlem
yapmak
2. gözetmek, uymak
riayet etmek

1. Dikkat Eksikliği Hiperaktivite Bozukluğu (DEHB), 6 ila 16 yaş arasındaki çocukların yüzde 2 ila 5'inde teşhis edilir; yaklaşık yüzde 80'i erkektir.
2. Dikkat dağınıklığı, hiperaktivite ve ajitasyonun tipik semptomları her yaşta, hatta bu duruma sahip yetişkinlerde bile görülür, ancak önemli ölçüde dengesizlik vardır.
3. Çocuklar genellikle unutkan veya sabırsız görünürler, başkalarını rahatsız etme eğilimindedirler ve sınırları uymakta zorlanırlar.
4. Zayıf dürtü kontrolü, aceleci karar verme, irrasyonel eylemler ve hızlı ruh hali değişimlerinde kendini gösterir.
5. Çocuk düşünmeden önce hareket eder.
6. Yine de, DEHB çocukları yeni durumlarda, özellikle de televizyon seyretmek ya da oyun oynamak gibi bireylerle doğrudan teması içeren ya da zevkli ya da heyecan verici kısa süreli durumlarda, genellikle mükemmel bir şekilde normal davranırlar.
7. Daha sonra DEHB olduğu saptanan 3 yaşından küçük çocuklarda zor mizaç ya da uyku ve iştah bozuklukları gibi öncül davranışlara sıklıkla rastlanır, ancak bu ilk üç yılda kesin tanı konulamaz.
8. Ergenlerde fiziksel huzursuzluk genellikle azalır, ancak dikkat eksikliği devam eder ve sıklıkla agresif veya anti-sosyal davranış ve duygusal sorunların yanı sıra uyuşturucu kullanımına eğilimle ilişkilendirilebilir.

e itsizlik
farklılık

show

4

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is diagnosed in 2 to 5 percent of children between the ages of 6 and 16; approximately 80 percent are boys. The typical symptoms of distractibility, hyperactivity and agitation occur at all ages, even in adults who have the condition, but with considerable disparity. Children often seem forgetful or impatient, tend to disturb others and have a hard time observing limits. Poor impulse control manifests itself in rash decision-making, irrational actions and rapid mood swings. The child acts before thinking. And yet, ADHD children often behave perfectly normally in new situations, particularly in those of short duration that involve direct contact with individuals or are pleasurable or exciting, like watching TV or playing games. Precursor behaviours such as a difficult temperament or sleep and appetite disorders have often been found in children younger than 3 who were later detected to have ADHD, but no definite diagnosis can be made in those first three years. Physical restlessness often diminishes in teenagers, but attention failure continues and can often become associated with aggressive or anti-social behaviour and emotional problems, as well as a tendency towards drug abuse.

201. According to the statistics on ADHD, ----.

- copy-paste mistake
- A) 80 percent of boys are diagnosed in the very early years of childhood
- B) typical symptoms in children are easier to be diagnosed than in adults
- C) adults with ADHD reflect typical symptoms in higher percentages
- D) appetite disorders are more common than sleep disorders in people with ADHD
- E) boys are more prone to ADHD compared to girls

vulnerable
susceptible
open to
tend to*
savunmasız, açık, meyilli, yatkın

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is diagnosed in 2 to 5 percent of children between the ages of 6 and 16; approximately 80 percent are boys. The typical symptoms of distractibility, hyperactivity and agitation occur at all ages, even in adults who have the condition, but with considerable disparity. Children often seem forgetful or impatient, tend to disturb others and have a hard time observing limits. Poor impulse control manifests itself in rash decision-making, irrational actions and rapid mood swings. The child acts before thinking. And yet, ADHD children often behave perfectly normally in new situations, particularly in those of short duration that involve direct contact with individuals or are pleasurable or exciting, like watching TV or playing games. Precursor behaviours such as a difficult temperament or sleep and appetite disorders have often been found in children younger than 3 who were later detected to have ADHD, but no definite diagnosis can be made in those first three years. Physical restlessness often diminishes in teenagers, but attention failure continues and can often become associated with aggressive or anti-social behaviour and emotional problems, as well as a tendency towards drug abuse.

202. It is stated in the passage that children with ADHD have a hard time ----. = have difficulty in controlling

- A) showing perfectly normal actions and behaviours in familiar situations
- B) controlling themselves, their actions and their mood + x
- C) resisting the desire to watch TV or play games most of the time
- D) interacting with strangers in new situations as they feel lonely
- E) making carefully-thought decisions in situations requiring much physical effort

2

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is diagnosed in 2 to 5 percent of children between the ages of 6 and 16; approximately 80 percent are boys. The typical symptoms of distractibility, hyperactivity and agitation occur at all ages, even in adults who have the condition, but with considerable disparity. Children often seem forgetful or impatient, tend to disturb others and have a hard time observing limits. Poor impulse control manifests itself in rash decision-making, irrational actions and rapid mood swings. The child acts before thinking. And yet, ADHD children often behave perfectly normally in new situations, particularly in those of short duration that involve direct contact with individuals or are pleasurable or exciting, like watching TV or playing games. Precursor behaviours such as a difficult temperament or sleep and appetite disorders have often been found in children younger than 3 who were later detected to have ADHD, but **no definite diagnosis can be made in those first three years.**

Physical restlessness often diminishes in teenagers, but attention failure continues and can often become associated with aggressive or anti-social behaviour and emotional problems, as well as a tendency towards drug abuse.

203. According to the passage, ADHD can be diagnosed more accurately ----.

detect / identify / spot

- A) after the child reaches the age of 3
- B) if physical restlessness observed in children becomes unbearable
- C) when parents notice aggressive actions
- D) once precursor behaviours have begun to threaten other children
- E) providing that the symptoms are still traceable in adulthood

not / no / never

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is diagnosed in 2 to 5 percent of children between the ages of 6 and 16; approximately 80 percent are boys. The typical symptoms of distractibility, hyperactivity and agitation occur at all ages, even in adults who have the condition, but with considerable disparity. Children often seem forgetful or impatient, tend to disturb others and have a hard time observing limits. Poor impulse control manifests itself in rash decision-making, irrational actions and rapid mood swings. The child acts before thinking. And yet, ADHD children often behave perfectly normally in new situations, particularly in those of short duration that involve direct contact with individuals or are pleasurable or exciting, like watching TV or playing games. Precursor behaviours such as a difficult temperament or sleep and appetite disorders have often been found in children younger than 3 who were later detected to have ADHD, but no definite diagnosis can be made in those first three years. Physical restlessness often diminishes in teenagers, but attention failure continues and can often become associated with aggressive or anti-social behaviour and emotional problems, as well as a tendency towards drug abuse.

on/at par with:
e it
even, equal

parity: eşitlik
dis/parity:
esitsizlik

ferk

204 It can be inferred from the passage that the symptoms of ADHD ----.

- A) might be quite different for girls or boys of different ages
- B) are difficult to diagnose even through advanced treatment methods
- C) vary in prominence and variety over the course of a lifetime
- D) such as rash decision-making and rapid mood changes stem from genetic history
- E) are more salient than others especially among teenagers who experience less parental intervention

vary
- range
different

- fiil So
dyk
- 2014 was a **landmark** year for drug **development**.
 - The US Food and Drug **Administration** **approved** 41 new pharmaceuticals, **the most** since 1996.
 - Each of these will **hopefully** **make** the world a better place, **alleviating** distress and preventing premature deaths. reduce / diminish / decrease
 - But **developing** drugs is **incredibly expensive** – and **increasingly so**.
 - The **cost** of bringing a new compound to the market is **now around** \$2.5 billion, **twice as much** in real terms **as** it was a decade ago.
 - One of the costliest parts is **recruiting** and **retaining** **volunteers** to test the drug in a **clinical trial**.
 - Around three quarters** of trials are **delayed** by problems with this **process**.
 - Most trials over-recruit by **up to 50 percent** to **compensate**, but the **drop-out** is still **so high that** **only 1 in 20** volunteers **end up** generating useful data.
 - The result:** **wasted time, effort and money**. That is **not** for **lack of** patient willingness.
 - In 2013, the UK's House of Commons **found** that people **want to volunteer** but **do not know how**.
 - Yet, **volunteers** can be **brought on board** and kept there by **making more effort to inform** and **help them to choose** which trial they would like to enter.
 - The problems with volunteer recruitment **were identified** a decade ago **but** have not been **eradicated**.
 - It is high time** they were.
 - It is in everyone's interest** to **get rid of** this unnecessary waste.

- 2014, ilaç **geliştirme** çalışmaları için bir **dönüm noktasıydı**.
 - ABD Gıda ve ilaç **İdaresi**, **41** yeni ilacı **onayladı**, 1996'dan beri ulaşılan **en çok sayı**.
 - Bunların her biri, **umut edilir** ki dünyayı daha iyi bir yer haline getirecek, sıkıntıları **hafifletecek** ve **erken ölümleri** önleyecektir.
 - Ancak **ilaç geliştirme** **inanılmaz derecede** pahalı ve giderek **daha da pahalaniyor**.
 - Piyasaya yeni bir bileşik getirmenin **maliyeti** şu anda **yaklaşık 2,5 milyar dolar**, yani on yıl öncesine **göre reel** olarak **iki kat daha fazla**.
 - En maliyetli kısımlardan biri, ilacı bir **kliniç deneyde** test etmek için **gönüllüleri işe almak** ve **elde tutmaktır**.
 - Denemelerin yaklaşık dörtte üçü** bu süreçle ilgili sorunlar nedeniyle erteleniyor.
 - Çoğu deneme, **telafi etmek için yüzde 50'ye kadar** fazla işe alım yapıyor, ancak gönüllülükten **ayrılma o kadar yüksek ki, 20 gönüllüden yalnızca 1'i yararlı veriler üretiyor**.
 - Sonuç: **Boşa harcanan zaman, çaba ve para**. Bu hasta istekliliğinin olmamasından kaynaklanıyor.
 - 2013 yılında Birleşik Krallık Avam Kamarası, insanların gönüllü olmak istediğini ancak nasıl yapılacağını bilmediğini tespit etti.
 - Yine de gönüllüler, bilgi vermek ve hangi davaya girmek istediklerini seçmelerine yardımcı olmak için daha fazla çaba sarf edilerek katılmaları sağlanabilir ve orada **tutulabilir**.
 - Gönüllü alımıyla ilgili sorunlar on yıl önce tespit **edilmesine rağmen ortadan kaldırılamadı**.
 - Artık ortadan kaldırılmalarının **zamanı gelmişti**.
 - Bu gereksiz ısraftan **kurtulmak herkesin çıkarıdır**.
- di
çok
but

2014 was a landmark year for drug development. The US Food and Drug Administration approved 41 new pharmaceuticals, the most since 1996. Each of these will hopefully makethe world a better place, alleviating distress and preventing premature deaths. But developing drugs is incredibly expensive – and increasingly so. The cost of bringing a new compound to the market is now around \$2.5 billion, twice as much in real terms as it was a decade ago. One of the costliest parts is recruiting and retaining volunteers to test the drug in a clinical trial. Around three quarters of trials are delayed by problems with this process. **Most trials over-recruit by up to 50 percent to compensate, but the drop-out is stil so high that only 1 in 20 volunteers end up generating useful data.** The result: wasted time, effort and money. That is not for lack of patient willingness. In 2013, the UK's House of Commons found that people want to volunteer but do not know how. Yet, volunteers can be brought on board and kept there by making more effort to inform and help them to choose which trial they would like to enter. The problems with volunteer recruitment were identified a decade ago but have not been eradicated. It is high time they were. It is in everyone's interest to get rid of this unnecessary waste.

47. It is understood from the passage that **many participants in clinical trials** ----.

- A) think that their time and effort will be wasted
- B) are recruited again when a clinical trial ultimately fails
- C) have to comply with strict regulations in order to take part in these trials
- D) are well informed about the processes and procedures in these trials
- E) fail to contribute to the production of reliable data on drugs

19/20

5%
= 1/20

1/20

cannot do not

çözülmüş

angora
inJilize

angora

angora

angora
inJilize

2014 was a landmark year for drug development. The US Food and Drug Administration approved 41 new pharmaceuticals, the most since 1996. Each of these will hopefully makethe world a better place, alleviating distress and preventing premature deaths. But developing drugs is incredibly expensive – and increasingly so. The cost of bringing a new compound to the market is now around \$2.5 billion, twice as much in real terms as it was a decade ago. One of the costliest parts is recruiting and retaining volunteers to test the drug in a clinical trial. Around three quarters of trials are delayed by problems with this process. Most trials over-recruit by up to 50 percent to compensate, but the drop-out is stil so high that only 1 in 20 volunteers end up generating useful data. The result: wasted time, effort and money. That is not for lack of patient willingness. In 2013, the UK's House of Commons found that people want to volunteer but do not know how. Yet, volunteers can be brought on board and kept there by making more effort to inform and help them to choose which trial they would like to enter. The problems with volunteer recruitment were identified a decade ago but have not been eradicated. It is high time they were. It is in everyone's interest to get rid of this unnecessary waste.

48. One can conclude from the passage that the problems of volunteer recruitment --.

- A) have been solved using a strategy called 'over-recruitment'
- B) show many differences in each clinical trial
- C) are to be solved soon by making up for waste of time in clinical trials
- D) can be reduced by providing people with more guidance on volunteering
- E) have changed a lot in time with respect to their basic characteristics

2014 was a landmark year for drug development. The US Food and Drug Administration approved 41 new pharmaceuticals, the most since 1996. Each of these will hopefully makethe world a better place, alleviating distress and preventing premature deaths. But developing drugs is incredibly expensive – and increasingly so. The cost of bringing a new compound to the market is now around \$2.5 billion, twice as much in real terms as it was a decade ago.

One of the costliest parts is recruiting and retaining volunteers to test the drug in a clinical trial. Around three quarters of trials are delayed by problems with this process. Most trials over-recruit by up to 50 percent to compensate, but the drop-out is stil so high that only 1 in 20 volunteers end up generating useful data. The result: wasted time, effort and money. That is not for lack of patient willingness. In 2013, the UK's House of Commons found that people want to volunteer but do not know how. Yet, volunteers can be brought on board and kept there by making more effort to inform and help them to choose which trial they would like to enter. The problems with volunteer recruitment were identified a decade ago but have not been eradicated. It is high time they were. It is in everyone's interest to get rid of this unnecessary waste.

49. What is the **primary purpose of the author?**

- A) To highlight the number of the drugs introduced to the market in 2014
- B) To explain reasons why developing drugs has become too expensive in recent years
- C) To elaborate on the role that the US Food and Drug Administration plays in developing drugs
- D) To inform readers about some important problems confronted in clinical trials of drugs
- E) To emphasise the health benefits that 41 new pharmaceuticals are expected to yield

2014 was a landmark year for drug development. The US Food and Drug Administration approved 41 new pharmaceuticals, the most since 1996. Each of these will hopefully makethe world a better place, alleviating distress and preventing premature deaths. But developing drugs is incredibly expensive – and increasingly so. The cost of bringing a new compound to the market is now around \$2,5 billion, twice as much in real terms as it was a decade ago. One of the costliest parts is recruiting and retaining volunteers to test the drug in a clinical trial. Around three quarters of trials are delayed by problems with this process. Most trials over-recruit by up to 50 percent to compensate, but the drop-out is stil so high that only 1 in 20 volunteers end up generating useful data. The result: wasted time, effort and money. That is not for lack of patient willingness. In 2013, the UK's House of Commons found that people want to volunteer but do not know how. Yet, volunteers can be brought on board and kept there by making more effort to inform and help them to choose which trial they would like to enter. The problems with volunteer recruitment were identified a decade ago but have not been eradicated. It is high time they were. It is in everyone's interest to get rid of this unnecessary waste.

50. Which could be the best title for this passage?

- A) The Activities of the US Food and Drug Administration
B) A Variety of Methods of Volunteer Recruitment in Drug Trials
C) Time to Take Voluntary Participation in Drug Trials Seriously
D) The Huge Expense of Drug Development
E) How to Participate in Clinical Trials of Drugs

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fasting could boost your brainpower. 2. A stomach hormone that stimulates appetite seems to promote the growth of new brain cells and protect them from the effects of ageing – and may explain why some people say that fasting makes them feel sharper. 3. Ghrelin is known as the hunger hormone, as it is made by the stomach when it gets empty. 4. If we go a few hours without food, its levels rise in our blood. 5. But there is also evidence that ghrelin can enhance cognition. 6. Animals fed reduced-calorie diets have better mental abilities. 7. Injecting ghrelin into mice improves their performance in learning and memory tests, and seems to boost the number of connections in their brains. 8. Now Jeffrey Davies at Swansea University, UK, and his team have found further evidence that ghrelin can stimulate brain cells to divide and multiply, a process called neurogenesis. 9. When they added the hormone to mouse brain cells grown in a dish, it switched on a gene known to trigger neurogenesis. 10. "If the same happens in animals, this could be how ghrelin affects memory," says Davies, whose work was presented at the British Neuroscience Association conference in 2017. 11. The work may have implications for treating neurodegenerative conditions. 12. Davies's team have found that ghrelin, or chemicals that act the same way, could help treat some conditions like Parkinson's disease. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oruç tutmak beyin gücünüzü artırabilir. 2. İştahı uyaran bir mide hormonu, yeni beyin hücrelerinin büyümesini teşvik ediyor ve onları yaşlanmanın etkilerinden koruyor gibi görünüyor - ve bazı insanların neden oruç tutmanın kendilerini daha zinde hissettirdiğini söylemesini açıklayabilir. 3. Ghrelin, açlık hormonu olarak bilinir ve mide boşaldığında üretilir. 4. Birkaç saat yemek yemeden kalırsak, kanımızdaki seviyesi yükselir. 5. Ancak grelin'in bilişsel durumu geliştirebileceğine dair kanıtlar da var. 6. Düşük kalorili diyetlerle beslenen hayvanlar daha iyi zihinsel yeteneklere sahiptir. 7. Farelere ghrelin enjekte etmek, öğrenme ve hafıza testlerindeki performanslarını artırıyor ve beyinlerindeki bağlantı sayısını artırıyor gibi görünüyor. 8. İngiltere'deki Swansea Üniversitesi'nden Jeffrey Davies ve ekibi, grelin'in beyin hücrelerini nörojenez adı verilen bir süreçle bölünmeye ve çoğalmaya teşvik edebildiğine dair daha fazla kanıt buldu. 9. Bir laboratuvar kabında yetiştirilen fare beyin hücrelerine bu hormonu eklediklerinde, nörojenez tetiklediği bilinen bir geni çalıştırdılar. 10. Çalışması 2017'de British Neuroscience Association konferansında sunulan Davies, "Aynı hayvanlarda olursa, grelin hafızayı bu şekilde etkileyebilir" diyor. 11. Çalışmanın nörodejeneratif koşulların tedavisi için etkileri olabilir. 12. Davies'in ekibi, grelin veya aynı şekilde hareket eden kimyasalların Parkinson hastalığı gibi bazı durumların tedavisine yardımcı olabileceğini buldu. |
|--|--|

Fasting could boost your brainpower. A stomach hormone that stimulates appetite seems to promote the growth of new brain cells and protect them from the effects of ageing – and may explain why some people say that fasting makes them feel sharper. Ghrelin is known as the hunger hormone, as it is made by the stomach when it gets empty. If we go a few hours without food, its levels rise in our blood. But there is also evidence that ghrelin can enhance cognition. Animals fed reduced-calorie diets have better mental abilities. Injecting ghrelin into mice improves their performance in learning and memory tests, and seems to boost the number of connections in their brains. Now Jeffrey Davies at Swansea University, UK, and his team have found further evidence that ghrelin can stimulate brain cells to divide and multiply, a process called neurogenesis. When they added the hormone to mouse brain cells grown in a dish, it **switched on** a gene known to trigger neurogenesis. “If the same happens in animals, this could be how ghrelin affects memory,” says Davies, whose work was presented at the British Neuroscience Association conference in 2017. The work may have implications for treating neurodegenerative conditions. Davies’s team have found that ghrelin, or chemicals that act the same way, could help treat some conditions like Parkinson’s disease.

51. According to the passage, the hormone ghrelin ---
-

- A) is called the hunger hormone because it prevents one from feeling hungry for long hours
- B) is produced by the body in higher amounts when there are more brain cell connections in the brain
- C) slows down the neurogenesis process when produced in considerably low amounts
- D) plays a role in a number of functions from the production of new brain cells to enhanced mental abilities
- E) affects our appetite in a negative way and causes us to consume more food than we actually need

Fasting could boost your brainpower. A stomach hormone that stimulates appetite seems to promote the growth of new brain cells and protect them from the effects of ageing – and may explain why some people say that fasting makes them feel sharper. Ghrelin is known as the hunger hormone, as it is made by the stomach when it gets empty. If we go a few hours without food, its levels rise in our blood. But there is also evidence that ghrelin can enhance cognition. Animals fed reduced-calorie diets have better mental abilities. Injecting ghrelin into mice improves their performance in learning and memory tests, and seems to boost the number of connections in their brains. Now Jeffrey Davies at Swansea University, UK, and his team have found further evidence that ghrelin can stimulate brain cells to divide and multiply, a process called neurogenesis. When they added the hormone to mouse brain cells grown in a dish, it **switched on** a gene known to trigger neurogenesis. “If the same happens in animals, this could be how ghrelin affects memory,” says Davies, whose work was presented at the British Neuroscience Association conference in 2017. The work may have implications for treating neurodegenerative conditions. Davies’s team have found that ghrelin, or chemicals that act the same way, could help treat some conditions like Parkinson’s disease.

52. According to the passage, Jeffrey Davies ----.

- A) ended up working on the neurogenesis process by chance when he was working on Parkinson’s disease
- B) discovered that ghrelin contributes to neurogenesis, which might be the reason why it improves memory
- C) presented his study at the British Neuroscience Association conference in order to increase awareness of Parkinson’s disease
- D) thinks that more research on ghrelin is needed in order to understand its effects on Parkinson’s disease
- E) believes that ghrelin affects memory in mice differently from humans

Fasting could boost your brainpower. A stomach hormone that stimulates appetite seems to promote the growth of new brain cells and protect them from the effects of ageing – and may explain why some people say that fasting makes them feel sharper. Ghrelin is known as the hunger hormone, as it is made by the stomach when it gets empty. If we go a few hours without food, its levels rise in our blood. But there is also evidence that ghrelin can enhance cognition. Animals fed reduced-calorie diets have better mental abilities. Injecting ghrelin into mice improves their performance in learning and memory tests, and seems to boost the number of connections in their brains. Now Jeffrey Davies at Swansea University, UK, and his team have found further evidence that ghrelin can stimulate brain cells to divide and multiply, a process called neurogenesis. When they added the hormone to mouse brain cells grown in a dish, it **switched on** a gene known to trigger neurogenesis. “If the same happens in animals, this could be how ghrelin affects memory,” says Davies, whose work was presented at the British Neuroscience Association conference in 2017. The work may have implications for treating neurodegenerative conditions. Davies’s team have found that ghrelin, or chemicals that act the same way, could help treat some conditions like Parkinson’s disease.

53. The underlined phrase in the passage 'switched on' is closest in meaning to.----

- A) protected
- B) covered
- C) maintained
- D) transferred
- E) activated

Fasting could boost your brainpower. A stomach hormone that stimulates appetite seems to promote the growth of new brain cells and protect them from the effects of ageing – and may explain why some people say that fasting makes them feel sharper. Ghrelin is known as the hunger hormone, as it is made by the stomach when it gets empty. If we go a few hours without food, its levels rise in our blood. But there is also evidence that ghrelin can enhance cognition. Animals fed reduced-calorie diets have better mental abilities. Injecting ghrelin into mice improves their performance in learning and memory tests, and seems to boost the number of connections in their brains. Now Jeffrey Davies at Swansea University, UK, and his team have found further evidence that ghrelin can stimulate brain cells to divide and multiply, a process called neurogenesis. When they added the hormone to mouse brain cells grown in a dish, it **switched on** a gene known to trigger neurogenesis. “If the same happens in animals, this could be how ghrelin affects memory,” says Davies, whose work was presented at the British Neuroscience Association conference in 2017. The work may have implications for treating neurodegenerative conditions. Davies’s team have found that ghrelin, or chemicals that act the same way, could help treat some conditions like Parkinson’s disease.

54. What is the primary purpose of the author?

- A) To describe how the neurogenesis process takes place in human brain
- B) To highlight that the brain can gain substantial benefits from increased levels of ghrelin
- C) To discuss whether ghrelin could be used as a treatment for Parkinson’s disease
- D) To emphasise the importance of Davies’ study on mice and their mental abilities
- E) To draw particular attention to the 2017 conference held by the British Neuroscience Association

1. We are born to judge others by how they look: our brains come hardwired with a specific face-processing area, and even shortly after birth, babies would rather look at a human face than anything else.
2. Within their first year, they become more discerning, and are more likely to attend to friendly-looking faces than those who look serious.
3. By the time we reach adulthood, we develop a great number of stereotypes and become snap-judgement specialists, jumping to conclusions about a person's character and status after seeing his or her face for just a tenth of a second.
4. And we ignore considered assessments of others in favour of simple cognitive shortcuts.
5. For example, we judge a baby-faced - individual as more trustworthy, associate a chiselled jaw with dominance, or refer to a person with a big nose as a curious one.
6. Unfair or unethical, it may be, but it makes good evolutionary sense.
7. Ours is an ultra-social species, so being able to quickly assess whether someone is friend or foe and whether they have the power to help or hurt us is important survival information.
8. But there is a problem.
9. As psychologist Alexander Todorov of Princeton University points out, **more often than not**, our first impressions are wrong; that is, relying on our shortcuts may not always produce good results.
10. It is not clear why, but he suggests that we meet many more strangers than our prehistoric ancestors would have, and this may play a role.

1. Başkalarını nasıl gördüklerine göre yargılamak için doğarız: beynimiz belirli bir yüz işleme alanıyla donatılmıştır ve doğumdan kısa bir süre sonra bile bebekler her şeyden çok insan yüzüne bakmayı tercih ederler.
2. İlk yıllarında, daha ayırt edici hale gelirler ve ciddi duran yüzlerdense samimi duran yüzlere bakma eğilimleri daha yüksektir.
3. Yetişkinliğe ulaştığımızda, çok sayıda klişe geliştirir ve saniyenin onda biri kadar bir süre yüzünü gördükten sonra bir kişinin karakteri ve durumu hakkında hemen sonuçlara varan ani karar verme uzmanları haline geliriz.
4. Ve basit bilişsel kısa yollar lehine başkalarının dikkate alınan değerlendirmelerini görmezden geliyoruz.
5. Örneğin, bebek yüzlü bir bireyi daha güvenilir olarak değerlendiririz, yontulmuş bir çeneyi baskınlıkla ilişkilendiririz veya büyük burunlu bir kişiyi meraklı biri olarak adlandırırız.
6. Haksız veya etik dışı olabilir, ancak evrimsel açıdan mantıklıdır.
7. Biz ultra sosyal bir türüz, bu nedenle birinin dost mu yoksa düşman mı olduğunu ve bize yardım etme veya bize zarar verme gücüne sahip olup olmadığını hızlı bir şekilde değerlendirebilmek, hayatta kalmak için önemli bilgilerdir.
8. Ama bir problem var.
9. Princeton Üniversitesi'nden psikolog Alexander Todorov'un işaret ettiği gibi, **çoğu zaman** ilk izlenimlerimiz yanlıştır; yani kestirme yollarımıza güvenmek her zaman iyi sonuçlar vermeyebilir.
10. Nedeni açıkça belli değil, ancak tarih öncesi atalarımızın karşılaştığından çok daha fazla yabancıyla tanışmamız burada bir rol oynayabilir.

We are born to judge others by how they look: our brains come hardwired with a specific face-processing area, and even shortly after birth, babies would rather look at a human face than anything else. Within their first year, they become more discerning, and are more likely to attend to friendly-looking faces than those who look serious. By the time we reach adulthood, we develop a great number of stereotypes and become snap-judgement specialists, jumping to conclusions about a person's character and status after seeing his or her face for just a tenth of a second. And we ignore considered assessments of others in favour of simple cognitive shortcuts. For example, we judge a baby-faced individual as more trustworthy, associate a chiselled jaw with dominance, or refer to a person with a big nose as a curious one. Unfair or unethical, it may be, but it makes good evolutionary sense. Ours is an ultra-social species, so being able to quickly assess whether someone is friend or foe and whether they have the power to help or hurt us is important survival information. But there is a problem. As psychologist Alexander Todorov of Princeton University points out, more often than not, our first impressions are wrong; that is, relying on our shortcuts may not always produce good results. It is not clear why, but he suggests that we meet many more strangers than our prehistoric ancestors would have, and this may play a role.

43. Which could be inferred from the passage about our face-based judgements?

- A) Babies cannot make judgements concerning human faces because they are not yet capable of discriminating between different faces.
- B) We begin to make assumptions about a person's character or status after we have seen his or her face several times.
- C) We are innately predisposed to form an idea about a person just by looking at his or her face.
- D) The face-processing area in our brains functions more effectively during infancy than it does in our adult years.
- E) Regardless of how they look, all human faces can attract babies' attention within their first year.

We are born to judge others by how they look: our brains come hardwired with a specific face-processing area, and even shortly after birth, babies would rather look at a human face than anything else. Within their first year, they become more discerning, and are more likely to attend to friendly-looking faces than those who look serious. By the time we reach adulthood, we develop a great number of stereotypes and become snap-judgement specialists, jumping to conclusions about a person's character and status after seeing his or her face for just a tenth of a second. And we ignore considered assessments of others in favour of simple cognitive shortcuts. For example, we judge a baby-faced individual as more trustworthy, associate a chiselled jaw with dominance, or refer to a person with a big nose as a curious one. Unfair or unethical, it may be, but it makes good evolutionary sense. Ours is an ultra-social species, so being able to quickly assess whether someone is friend or foe and whether they have the power to help or hurt us is important survival information. But there is a problem. As psychologist Alexander Todorov of Princeton University points out, more often than not, our first impressions are wrong; that is, relying on our shortcuts may not always produce good results. It is not clear why, but he suggests that we meet many more strangers than our prehistoric ancestors would have, and this may play a role.

44. One can understand from the passage that our shortcuts ----.

- A) become less helpful in adulthood as we tend to ignore them
- B) are generally accompanied by careful assessments of others
- C) produce more beneficial results than they did in prehistoric times
- D) might be considered morally unacceptable although they can provide help in our social lives
- E) are unreliable because each person can interpret such traits as trustworthiness differently

We are born to judge others by how they look: our brains come hardwired with a specific face-processing area, and even shortly after birth, babies would rather look at a human face than anything else. Within their first year, they become more discerning, and are more likely to attend to friendly-looking faces than those who look serious. By the time we reach adulthood, we develop a great number of stereotypes and become snap-judgement specialists, jumping to conclusions about a person's character and status after seeing his or her face for just a tenth of a second. And we ignore considered assessments of others in favour of simple cognitive shortcuts. For example, we judge a baby-faced individual as more trustworthy, associate a chiselled jaw with dominance, or refer to a person with a big nose as a curious one. Unfair or unethical, it may be, but it makes good evolutionary sense. Ours is an ultra-social species, so being able to quickly assess whether someone is friend or foe and whether they have the power to help or hurt us is important survival information. But there is a problem. As psychologist Alexander Todorov of Princeton University points out, more often than not, our first impressions are wrong; that is, relying on our shortcuts may not always produce good results. It is not clear why, but he suggests that we meet many more strangers than our prehistoric ancestors would have, and this may play a role.

45. How does Todorov explain why our shortcuts sometimes do not provide help?

- A) He states that our shortcuts lead us to make very quick assessments of others, and therefore our first impressions are usually wrong.
- B) He believes that unlike our prehistoric ancestors, we do not live in a hazardous world, so we do not need to develop shortcuts to survive.
- C) He thinks that we encounter so many faces in our modern world that our shortcuts may not guide us accurately.
- D) He claims that we live in a more complex world, which requires us to rely on detailed assessments rather than simple shortcuts.
- E) He puts forward that our shortcuts are mostly based on people's facial characteristics, so they cannot provide precise information.

We are born to judge others by how they look: our brains come hardwired with a specific face-processing area, and even shortly after birth, babies would rather look at a human face than anything else. Within their first year, they become more discerning, and are more likely to attend to friendly-looking faces than those who look serious. By the time we reach adulthood, we develop a great number of stereotypes and become snap-judgement specialists, jumping to conclusions about a person's character and status after seeing his or her face for just a tenth of a second. And we ignore considered assessments of others in favour of simple cognitive shortcuts. For example, we judge a baby-faced individual as more trustworthy, associate a chiselled jaw with dominance, or refer to a person with a big nose as a curious one. Unfair or unethical, it may be, but it makes good evolutionary sense. Ours is an ultra-social species, so being able to quickly assess whether someone is friend or foe and whether they have the power to help or hurt us is important survival information. But there is a problem. As psychologist Alexander Todorov of Princeton University points out, more often than not, our first impressions are wrong; that is, relying on our shortcuts may not always produce good results. It is not clear why, but he suggests that we meet many more strangers than our prehistoric ancestors would have, and this may play a role.

46. Which could be the best title for this passage?

- A) Learning Survival Information from Our Ancestors
- B) Major Drawbacks of Our Cognitive Shortcuts
- C) How to Reject Unethical Stereotypes
- D) Transferring Our Cognitive Shortcuts into Adulthood
- E) Our Strong Tendency to Stereotype People