

## ECAT Pre General Science English Online Test

Sr	Questions	Answers Choice
1	<p>Arrowheads, which are ancient hunting tools, are often themselves 'hunted' for their interesting value both as artifacts and as art. Some of the oldest arrowheads in the United States date back 12,000 years. They are not very difficult to find. You need only to walk with downcast eyes in a field that has been recently tilled for the spring planting season, and you might find one.</p> <p>Arrowheads are tiny stones or pieces of wood, bone, or metal which have been sharpened in order to create a tipped weapon used in hunting. The material is honed to an edge, usually in a triangular fashion, and is brought to a deadly tip. On the edge opposite the tip is a flared tail. Though designs vary depending on the region, purpose, and era of the arrowhead's origin, the tails serve the same purpose. The tail of the arrowhead is meant to be strapped onto a shaft, which is a straight wooden piece such as a spear or an arrow. When combined, the arrowhead point and the shaft become a lethal projectile weapon to be thrown by arm or shot with a bow at prey.</p> <p>Indian arrowheads are important artifacts that give archeologists (scientists who study past human societies) clues about the lives of Native Americans. By analyzing an arrowhead's shape, they can determine the advancement of tool technologies among certain Native American groups. By determining the origin of the arrowhead material (bone, rock, wood, or metal), they can trace the patterns of travel and trade of the hunters. By examine the location of the arrowheads, archeologists can map out hunting grounds and other social patterns.</p> <p>Arrowheads are commonly found along riverbanks or near creek beds because animals drawn to natural water sources to sustain life were regularly found drinking along the banks. For this reason, riverbeds were a prime hunting ground for the Native Americans. Now, dry and active riverbeds are prime hunting grounds for arrowhead collectors.</p> <p>Indian arrowheads are tiny pieces of history that fit in the palm of your hand. They are diary entries in the life of a hunter. They are museum pieces that hide in the dirt. They are symbolic of the eternal struggle between life and death.</p> <p>Which of the following best summarizes the main idea of paragraph 3?</p>	<p>A. Archeologists can determine many things about Native American societies simply by looking at an arrowhead</p> <p>B. Archeologists are scientists who study a range of events that have already occurred</p> <p>C. Arrowheads represent the only way to determine how Native Americans lived in the past</p> <p>D. Archeologists know so much about ancient societies because they have conducted extensive research about them</p>
2	<p>Arrowheads, which are ancient hunting tools, are often themselves 'hunted' for their interesting value both as artifacts and as art. Some of the oldest arrowheads in the United States date back 12,000 years. They are not very difficult to find. You need only to walk with downcast eyes in a field that has been recently tilled for the spring planting season, and you might find one.</p> <p>Arrowheads are tiny stones or pieces of wood, bone, or metal which have been sharpened in order to create a tipped weapon used in hunting. The material is honed to an edge, usually in a triangular fashion, and is brought to a deadly tip. On the edge opposite the tip is a flared tail. Though designs vary depending on the region, purpose, and era of the arrowhead's origin, the tails serve the same purpose. The tail of the arrowhead is meant to be strapped onto a shaft, which is a straight wooden piece such as a spear or an arrow. When combined, the arrowhead point and the shaft become a lethal projectile weapon to be thrown by arm or shot with a bow at prey.</p> <p>Indian arrowheads are important artifacts that give archeologists (scientists who study past human societies) clues about the lives of Native Americans. By analyzing an arrowhead's shape, they can determine the advancement of tool technologies among certain Native American groups. By determining the origin of the arrowhead material (bone, rock, wood, or metal), they can trace the patterns of travel and trade of the hunters. By examine the location of the arrowheads, archeologists can map out hunting grounds and other social patterns.</p> <p>Arrowheads are commonly found along riverbanks or near creek beds because animals drawn to natural water sources to sustain life were regularly found drinking</p>	<p>A. Shaped like a triangle</p> <p>B. No longer in use</p> <p>C. Unsophisticated in form</p> <p>D. Designed to be thrown</p>

along the banks. For this reason, riverbeds were a prime hunting ground for the Native Americans. Now, dry and active riverbeds are prime hunting grounds for arrowhead collectors.

Indian arrowheads are tiny pieces of history that fit in the palm of your hand. They are diary entries in the life of a hunter. They are museum pieces that hide in the dirt. They are symbolic of the eternal struggle between life and death.

As used in paragraph 2, which is the best definition for projectile?

Arrowheads, which are ancient hunting tools, are often themselves 'hunted' for their interesting value both as artifacts and as art. Some of the oldest arrowheads in the United States date back 12,000 years. They are not very difficult to find. You need only to walk with downcast eyes in a field that has been recently tilled for the spring planting season, and you might find one.

Arrowheads are tiny stones or pieces of wood, bone, or metal which have been sharpened in order to create a tipped weapon used in hunting. The material is honed to an edge, usually in a triangular fashion, and is brought to a deadly tip. On the edge opposite the tip is a flared tail. Though designs vary depending on the region, purpose, and era of the arrowhead's origin, the tails serve the same purpose. The tail of the arrowhead is meant to be strapped onto a shaft, which is a straight wooden piece such as a spear or an arrow. When combined, the arrowhead point and the shaft become a lethal projectile weapon to be thrown by arm or shot with a bow at prey.

3

Indian arrowheads are important artifacts that give archeologists (scientists who study past human societies) clues about the lives of Native Americans. By analyzing an arrowhead's shape, they can determine the advancement of tool technologies among certain Native American groups. By determining the origin of the arrowhead material (bone, rock, wood, or metal), they can trace the patterns of travel and trade of the hunters. By examine the location of the arrowheads, archeologists can map out hunting grounds and other social patterns.

- A. Flattened
- B. Chopped
- C. Dulled
- D. Baked

Arrowheads are commonly found along riverbanks or near creek beds because animals drawn to natural water sources to sustain life were regularly found drinking along the banks. For this reason, riverbeds were a prime hunting ground for the Native Americans. Now, dry and active riverbeds are prime hunting grounds for arrowhead collectors.

Indian arrowheads are tiny pieces of history that fit in the palm of your hand. They are diary entries in the life of a hunter. They are museum pieces that hide in the dirt. They are symbolic of the eternal struggle between life and death.

As it is used in paragraph 2, which is the best antonym for honed

Arrowheads, which are ancient hunting tools, are often themselves 'hunted' for their interesting value both as artifacts and as art. Some of the oldest arrowheads in the United States date back 12,000 years. They are not very difficult to find. You need only to walk with downcast eyes in a field that has been recently tilled for the spring planting season, and you might find one.

Arrowheads are tiny stones or pieces of wood, bone, or metal which have been sharpened in order to create a tipped weapon used in hunting. The material is honed to an edge, usually in a triangular fashion, and is brought to a deadly tip. On the edge opposite the tip is a flared tail. Though designs vary depending on the region, purpose, and era of the arrowhead's origin, the tails serve the same purpose. The tail of the arrowhead is meant to be strapped onto a shaft, which is a straight wooden piece such as a spear or an arrow. When combined, the arrowhead point and the shaft become a lethal projectile weapon to be thrown by arm or shot with a bow at prey.

4

Indian arrowheads are important artifacts that give archeologists (scientists who study past human societies) clues about the lives of Native Americans. By analyzing an arrowhead's shape, they can determine the advancement of tool technologies among certain Native American groups. By determining the origin of the arrowhead material (bone, rock, wood, or metal), they can trace the patterns of travel and trade of the hunters. By examine the location of the arrowheads, archeologists can map out hunting grounds and other social patterns.

- A. Wood
- B. Glass
- C. Bone
- D. Stone

Arrowheads are commonly found along riverbanks or near creek beds because animals drawn to natural water sources to sustain life were regularly found drinking along the banks. For this reason, riverbeds were a prime hunting ground for the Native Americans. Now, dry and active riverbeds are prime hunting grounds for arrowhead collectors.

arrowhead collectors.

Indian arrowheads are tiny pieces of history that fit in the palm of your hand. They are diary entries in the life of a hunter. They are museum pieces that hide in the dirt. They are symbolic of the eternal struggle between life and death.

According to the passage which of the following is not a material from which arrowheads were made?

I am writing in response to response to the article "Protecting our public spaces" in issue 14, published this spring in it, the author claims that "all graffiti is public spaces." I would like to point out that many people believe that graffiti is an art form that can benefit our public spaces just as much as sculpture, fountains, or other, more accepted art forms.

People who object to graffiti usually do so more because of where it is, not what it is. They argue, as your author does, that posting graffiti in public places constitutes an illegal act of property damage. But the location of such graffiti should not prevent the images themselves from being considered genuine art.

I would argue that graffiti is the ultimate public art form. Spray paint is a medium unlike any other. Though graffiti, the entire world has become a canvas. No one has to pay admission or travel to a museum to see this kind of art. The artists usually do not receive payment for their efforts. These works of art dotting the urban landscape are available, free of charge, to everyone who passes by.

5

To be clear, I do not consider random words or names sprayed on stop signs to be art. Plenty of graffiti is just vandalism, pure and simple. However, there is also graffiti that is breathtaking in its intricate detail, its realism, or its creativity. It takes great talent to create such involved designs with spray paint.

Are these creators not artists just because they use a can of spray paint instead of a paintbrush, or because they cover the side of a building rather than a canvas?

To declare that all graffiti is vandalism, and nothing more, is an overly simplistic statement that I find out of place in such a thoughtful publication as your magazine. Furthermore, graffiti is not going anywhere, so might as well find a way to live with it and enjoy its benefits. One option could be to make a percentage of public space, such as walls or benches in parks, open to graffiti artists. By doing this, the public might feel like part owners of these works of art, rather than just the victims of a crime.

The writer concludes this passage by

- A. Criticizing the magazine
- B. Offering a solution
- C. Restating his position
- D. Identifying the benefits of graffiti

I am writing in response to response to the article "Protecting our public spaces" in issue 14, published this spring in it, the author claims that "all graffiti is public spaces." I would like to point out that many people believe that graffiti is an art form that can benefit our public spaces just as much as sculpture, fountains, or other, more accepted art forms.

People who object to graffiti usually do so more because of where it is, not what it is. They argue, as your author does, that posting graffiti in public places constitutes an illegal act of property damage. But the location of such graffiti should not prevent the images themselves from being considered genuine art.

I would argue that graffiti is the ultimate public art form. Spray paint is a medium unlike any other. Though graffiti, the entire world has become a canvas. No one has to pay admission or travel to a museum to see this kind of art. The artists usually do not receive payment for their efforts. These works of art dotting the urban landscape are available, free of charge, to everyone who passes by.

6

To be clear, I do not consider random words or names sprayed on stop signs to be art. Plenty of graffiti is just vandalism, pure and simple. However, there is also graffiti that is breathtaking in its intricate detail, its realism, or its creativity. It takes great talent to create such involved designs with spray paint.

Are these creators not artists just because they use a can of spray paint instead of a paintbrush, or because they cover the side of a building rather than a canvas?

To declare that all graffiti is vandalism, and nothing more, is an overly simplistic statement that I find out of place in such a thoughtful publication as your magazine. Furthermore, graffiti is not going anywhere, so might as well find a way to live with it and enjoy its benefits. One option could be to make a percentage of public space, such as walls or benches in parks, open to graffiti artists. By doing this, the public

- A. Agree with the author of "Protect Our Public Spaces"
- B. Clarify the limits of his position
- C. Support his overall argument
- D. Summarize the counterargument to his own position

might feel like part owners of these works of art, rather than just the victims of a crime.

In paragraph 4, the writer states, "Plenty of graffiti is just vandalism, pure and simple." He most likely makes this statement in order to

I am writing in response to response to the article "Protecting our public spaces" in issue 14, published this spring in it, the author claims that "all graffiti is public spaces." I would like to point out that many people believe that graffiti is an art from that can benefit our public spaces just as much as sculpture, fountains, or other, more accepted art forms.

People who object to graffiti usually do so more because of where it is, not what it is. They argue, as your author does, that posting graffiti in public places constitutes an illegal act of property damage. But the location of such graffiti should not prevent the images themselves from being considered genuine art.

I would argue that graffiti is the ultimate public art form. Spray paint is a medium unlike any other. Though graffiti, the entire world has become a canvas. No one has to pay admission or travel to a museum to see this kind of art. The artists usually do not receive payment for their efforts. These works of art dotting the urban landscape are available, free of charge, to everyone who passes by.

- 7 To be clear, I do not consider random words or names sprayed on stop signs to be art. Plenty of graffiti is just vandalism, pure and simple. However, there is also graffiti that is breathtaking in its intricate detail, its realism, or its creativity. It takes great talent to create such involved designs with spray paint.

Are these creators not artists just because they use a can of spray paint instead of a paintbrush, or because they cover the side of a building rather than a canvas?

To declare that all graffiti is vandalism, and nothing more, is an overly simplistic statement that I find out of place in such a thoughtful publication as your magazine. Furthermore, graffiti is not going anywhere, so might as well find a way to live with it and enjoy its benefits. One option could be to make a percentage of public space, such as walls or benches in parks, open to graffiti artists. By doing this, the public might feel like part owners of these works of art, rather than just the victims of a crime.

Which sentence from the passage best illustrates the writer's feeling about the graffiti art?

A. I would like to point out that many people believe that graffiti is an art form that can benefit our public spaces just as much as sculpture, fountains, or other, more accepted art forms

B. People who object to graffiti usually do so more because of where it is, not what it is.

C. Spray paint is a medium unlike any other

D. To declare that all graffiti is vandalism, and not find out of place in such thoughtful publication

I am writing in response to response to the article "Protecting our public spaces" in issue 14, published this spring in it, the author claims that "all graffiti is public spaces." I would like to point out that many people believe that graffiti is an art from that can benefit our public spaces just as much as sculpture, fountains, or other, more accepted art forms.

People who object to graffiti usually do so more because of where it is, not what it is. They argue, as your author does, that posting graffiti in public places constitutes an illegal act of property damage. But the location of such graffiti should not prevent the images themselves from being considered genuine art.

I would argue that graffiti is the ultimate public art form. Spray paint is a medium unlike any other. Though graffiti, the entire world has become a canvas. No one has to pay admission or travel to a museum to see this kind of art. The artists usually do not receive payment for their efforts. These works of art dotting the urban landscape are available, free of charge, to everyone who passes by.

- 8 To be clear, I do not consider random words or names sprayed on stop signs to be art. Plenty of graffiti is just vandalism, pure and simple. However, there is also graffiti that is breathtaking in its intricate detail, its realism, or its creativity. It takes great talent to create such involved designs with spray paint.

Are these creators not artists just because they use a can of spray paint instead of a paintbrush, or because they cover the side of a building rather than a canvas?

To declare that all graffiti is vandalism, and nothing more, is an overly simplistic statement that I find out of place in such a thoughtful publication as your magazine. Furthermore, graffiti is not going anywhere, so might as well find a way to live with it and enjoy its benefits. One option could be to make a percentage of public space, such as walls or benches in parks, open to graffiti artists. By doing this, the public might feel like part owners of these works of art, rather than just the victims of a crime.

A. Everyone was amazed to see the hot air balloon finally swell with air and lift off over the trees

B. On the enormous billboard, a painted can of soda stood nearly 12 feet high

C. The photograph was so sharply focused that you could see the individual eyelashes on the subject's faces

D. The maze had many different paths that curled around each other in a complicated pattern

Based on its use in paragraph 4, which of the following accurately describes something that is intricate?

I am writing in response to response to the article "Protecting our public spaces" in issue 14, published this spring in it, the author claims that "all graffiti is public spaces." I would like to point out that many people believe that graffiti is an art from that can benefit our public spaces just as much as sculpture, fountains, or other, more accepted art forms.

People who object to graffiti usually do so more because of where it is, not what it is. They argue, as your author does, that posting graffiti in public places constitutes an illegal act of property damage. But the location of such graffiti should not prevent the images themselves from being considered genuine art.

I would argue that graffiti is the ultimate public art form. Spray paint is a medium unlike any other. Though graffiti, the entire world has become a canvas. No one has to pay admission or travel to a museum to see this kind of art. The artists usually do not receive payment for their efforts. These works of art dotting the urban landscape are available, free of charge, to everyone who passes by.

9

To be clear, I do not consider random words or names sprayed on stop signs to be art. Plenty of graffiti is just vandalism, pure and simple. However, there is also graffiti that is breathtaking in its intricate detail, its realism, or its creativity. It takes great talent to create such involved designs with spray paint.

Are these creators not artists just because they use a can of spray paint instead of a paintbrush, or because they cover the side of a building rather than a canvas?

To declare that all graffiti is vandalism, and nothing more, is an overly simplistic statement that I find out of place in such a thoughtful publication as your magazine. Furthermore, graffiti is not going anywhere, so might as well find a way to live with it and enjoy its benefits. One option could be to make a percentage of public space, such as walls or benches in parks, open to graffiti artists. By doing this, the public might feel like part owners of these works of art, rather than just the victims of a crime.

According to the writer, random words sprayed on stop signs are not

- A. Vandalism
- B. Art
- C. Illegal
- D. Creative

I am writing in response to response to the article "Protecting our public spaces" in issue 14, published this spring in it, the author claims that "all graffiti is public spaces." I would like to point out that many people believe that graffiti is an art from that can benefit our public spaces just as much as sculpture, fountains, or other, more accepted art forms.

People who object to graffiti usually do so more because of where it is, not what it is. They argue, as your author does, that posting graffiti in public places constitutes an illegal act of property damage. But the location of such graffiti should not prevent the images themselves from being considered genuine art.

I would argue that graffiti is the ultimate public art form. Spray paint is a medium unlike any other. Though graffiti, the entire world has become a canvas. No one has to pay admission or travel to a museum to see this kind of art. The artists usually do not receive payment for their efforts. These works of art dotting the urban landscape are available, free of charge, to everyone who passes by.

10

To be clear, I do not consider random words or names sprayed on stop signs to be art. Plenty of graffiti is just vandalism, pure and simple. However, there is also graffiti that is breathtaking in its intricate detail, its realism, or its creativity. It takes great talent to create such involved designs with spray paint.

Are these creators not artists just because they use a can of spray paint instead of a paintbrush, or because they cover the side of a building rather than a canvas?

To declare that all graffiti is vandalism, and nothing more, is an overly simplistic statement that I find out of place in such a thoughtful publication as your magazine. Furthermore, graffiti is not going anywhere, so might as well find a way to live with it and enjoy its benefits. One option could be to make a percentage of public space, such as walls or benches in parks, open to graffiti artists. By doing this, the public might feel like part owners of these works of art, rather than just the victims of a crime.

According to the writer, random words sprayed on stop signs are not

- A. Vandalism
- B. Art
- C. Illegal
- D. Creative