

ANSWER KEY — 22 SEPTEMBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	D	A	C	A	C	A	D	B	D
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
A	C	B	D	C	D	B	A	C	B

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea - RC (animal culture) MED

The final paragraph states the passage's point directly: the whales 'show that the defining mechanism of culture, the transmission of behaviour by social learning within and between populations, is not a human monopoly'. The fourth paragraph adds the necessary qualification that 'We do not know why a strange song should be so infectious' and that several hypotheses 'remain in play'. Option B holds both halves: social transmission is not uniquely human, and the reason for the spread is still open. Option A reverses the author's caution; the label 'misleads if it implies that novelty is valued for its own sake', and the author says the whales 'do not show that animals have art'. Option C contradicts the key evidence: 'nothing in the whales' surroundings changed to prompt the switch'. Option D turns a descriptive detail, that songs moved 'from a large population towards smaller ones', into a thesis about conquest that the passage never advances.

Examiner's note — the trap: A attracts readers who remember the 'revolution' label and the fashion simile; but the author explicitly refuses to infer that whales value novelty or possess art.

Q2 D Inference - RC (necessary condition) HARD

An inference must follow from what the passage says without adding anything. The fourth paragraph states that 'the only credible explanation is that males copy novel songs they hear from others', and the third paragraph describes a new song turning up 'in the next population to the east, and the next'. If one population picks up a song that began in another, and the mechanism is copying what is heard, then at least some whales must at some point hear members of a population other than their own. Option D states exactly this minimum and nothing more. Option A picks one of the open hypotheses, 'female preference', and treats it as established, which the passage expressly declines to do. Option B invents a comparison of song complexity that appears nowhere. Option C overreaches: the passage says the pattern ran from a large population towards smaller ones, not that no song could ever originate in a smaller population.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the trap because 'female preference' is named in the passage; but it is listed among hypotheses that 'remain in play', so it cannot be inferred.

Q3 A Tone / attitude - RC MED

The author's verdict is stated in one sentence: 'The label is apt in one respect and misleading in another.' It is apt 'because nothing in the whales' surroundings changed to prompt the switch', so copying is the only credible explanation. It 'misleads if it implies that novelty is valued for its own sake, as a human audience might prize it'. That is acceptance with a reservation, which is what option A describes: the author endorses what the label says about copying while warning against a motive it may wrongly suggest. Option B is too negative; the author never calls the label publicity and grants that it is apt. Option C is too positive; 'unreserved' is contradicted by the explicit reservation. Option D fails because the author does not merely report the label but judges it, in both directions, in the very next sentence.

Examiner's note — the trap: D can tempt a reader who notices the balanced phrasing; but balance is not neutrality, since the author takes a clear position on each respect.

Q4 C Vocabulary in context HARD

The sentence says that culture 'was reserved, with a certain proprietary firmness, for human beings'. The next sentence sharpens the idea: 'Animals had instincts; people had traditions.' The point is that humans guarded the word as if it were their own possession, refusing to share it with other species. 'Proprietary' here means possessive, behaving like an owner, which is option C. The passage's closing line confirms the sense when it calls culture no longer 'a human monopoly', again the language of ownership. Options A and B take the commercial dictionary sense of 'proprietary', as in proprietary software or a proprietary formula; nothing in the sentence concerns patents, companies or trade secrets. Option D captures the 'firmness' but drops the notion of ownership altogether, reading the word as mere politeness or convention, which is not what 'proprietary' conveys.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the dictionary trap: 'proprietary' most often appears in commercial and legal contexts, but the sentence uses it figuratively for possessiveness.

Q5 A Structure / function of a detail ELITE

The first paragraph says the human-only view 'survived early reports of chimpanzees using tools in locally distinctive ways, partly because such behaviour could always be explained away by differences in habitat'. In other words, the chimpanzee evidence was inconclusive because an environmental explanation was always available. The whale evidence matters precisely because it removes that escape: the fourth paragraph stresses that 'nothing in the whales' surroundings changed to prompt the switch'. So the chimpanzee reference explains why earlier evidence left the question open and sets up why a case without an environmental trigger carries special weight, which is option A. Option B is wrong because the author never calls chimpanzee tool use a 'revolution'. Option C misreads 'explained away': the author reports how sceptics dismissed the data, not that the author agrees tool use is instinctive. Option D invents a thesis about tool use as the proper test.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the trap for readers who take 'explained away by differences in habitat' as the author's own view; it describes the sceptics' manoeuvre that the whale evidence defeats.

Q6 C Main idea - RC (governance) MED

The passage builds towards its final paragraph: 'Where a question is technical ... insulation earns its keep. Where the question is who should bear a cost, the legislature should set the governing principle in advance', and 'Independence ... is a tool to be fitted to particular tasks, not a status to be conferred on institutions.' Option C captures both the distinction between technical and distributive questions and the recommendation to fix independence task by task. Option A contradicts the author's explicit statement, 'None of this is an argument for returning such decisions to ministers wholesale', and overstates the claim of failure. Option B reverses the third paragraph, which argues that review and committees 'check the manner of a decision more than its substance'. Option D contradicts the second paragraph, which calls the credibility argument 'powerful' and says the monetary evidence 'broadly supports it'; the author objects to its extension, not its principle.

Examiner's note — the trap: D attracts readers who sense the author's scepticism; but the author accepts credibility in its proper domain and attacks only its stretch to distributive choices.

Q7 A Inference - author agreement HARD

The third paragraph distinguishes 'the manner of a decision' from 'its substance'. A court can ask whether a regulator 'followed its procedure and considered the relevant factors' but cannot ask whether it 'struck the right balance' between groups of users. The second paragraph identifies who pays for the grid and 'whether rural consumers are subsidised' as distributive choices that insulation 'merely relocates' away from elected officials. Put together, a rural-urban cost-sharing decision could pass every procedural check yet lack democratic warrant, which is option A. Option B misapplies the proposal: the author says credibility works in monetary policy, so there is no suggestion that interest-rate setting needs legislative principles. Option C compares committees with courts, but the author lumps both among channels that check manner more than substance. Option D offers a blame-avoidance motive that the passage never mentions; the stated justification is credibility.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is attractive to readers who generalise the final proposal; but the author exempts monetary policy, where 'the evidence broadly supports' insulation.

Q8 D Tone / attitude - RC MED

The author opens the reply with concession, 'These channels are real', and then limits it: 'but they check the manner of a decision more than its substance.' The rest of the paragraph explains why a court cannot reach substance, since the statute gave the balancing judgment to the regulator 'precisely so that nobody else would make it'. This is a measured response: it accepts that the accountability channels exist and work, while denying that they touch the substance of decisions. Option D states this exactly. Option A is far too hostile; there is no suggestion of deliberate deception. Option B overstates the concession; the author explicitly denies that the channels answer the objection in full. Option C is wrong because accountability is central to the author's argument, and the whole paragraph engages with it rather than setting it aside.

Examiner's note — the trap: B catches readers who stop at 'These channels are real'; the 'but' that follows turns the concession into a limitation.

Q9 B Vocabulary in context (idiom) HARD

To say something 'earns its keep' is to say it is worth what it costs to maintain. The passage has spent two paragraphs setting out what insulation costs: distributive choices are 'relocated' away from elected officials, and the remaining accountability channels reach manner but not substance. The final paragraph then says that where 'a question is technical, such as the cost of capital or the reliability standard for a network, insulation earns its keep'. The sense is that, for technical questions, the benefits of insulation, credibility and a longer view, justify the price paid in reduced democratic accountability. That is option B. Option A takes 'keep' literally as a matter of money and fees, which the passage never discusses. Option C confuses insulation from politics with immunity from courts; judicial review remains available. Option D reads 'keep' as retaining a form, which ignores the idiom entirely.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is the literal-reading trap; the idiom is about justifying a cost, and the cost in this passage is to accountability, not the regulator's budget.

Q10 D Structure / function of an example ELITE

The second paragraph first states the premise of the credibility argument, that it 'matters most where the right policy is reasonably clear', and then introduces the tariff: it 'is not only a technical exercise; it decides who pays for the grid, whether rural consumers are subsidised' and how costs are passed on. The conclusion drawn is 'These are distributive choices, and insulating them from elected officials does not make them neutral. It merely relocates them.' The example therefore exhibits a decision with distributive content that defeats the assumption that insulation leaves a choice neutral, which is option D. Option C is the close trap: it fixes on the 'reasonably clear' clause and claims the author treats unclarity as the only limit, but the author's real objection is distributive, not epistemic. Option B inverts the example's role. Option A invents a performance comparison with central banks.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the elite trap: it quotes a real premise from the paragraph, but the example's work is to show distributive content, and the author never makes unclarity the sole limit.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 A Main conclusion - CR MED

The final paragraph opens with the signal 'The remedy, then', and states it: 'Credits should be issued only after the fact, against the clearing actually observed in matched comparison forests over the same period, and the choice of comparison sites should belong to a body that earns nothing from the volume of credits issued.' Everything before this supports it: the value of a credit depends on an unobservable counterfactual, sellers currently supply it, independent comparisons show inflation, and the defect lies in 'who draws the counterfactual'. Option A restates that remedy. Option B is the conclusion the author expressly rejects: 'That conclusion does not follow, and acting on it would be costly'. Option C proposes a change in who pays verifiers, which the author mentions only as a feature of the present system and never recommends. Option D attributes deliberate dishonesty, which the author disclaims with 'not necessarily through dishonesty'.

Examiner's note — the trap: B tempts readers who absorb the evidence of inflated credits; the author raises that inference only to reject it in the third paragraph.

Q12 C Necessary assumption HARD

The remedy replaces the developer's projected baseline with 'the clearing actually observed in matched comparison forests over the same period'. That substitution works only if what happened in the matched unprotected forests is a fair guide to what would have happened in the protected forest without the project. If comparison forests differed systematically, for example in access or pressure, the new baseline would be as wrong as the old one. Negate option C and the remedy collapses, so C is necessary. Option A is not needed and is in fact contradicted: the author says 'some projects have plainly slowed clearing'. Option B concerns buyer willingness to pay, which the argument, being about accuracy, need not assume. Option D contradicts the passage's account: verifiers check 'whether the chosen method was applied correctly', and the author's complaint is about who chooses the method, not verifiers' expertise.

Examiner's note — the trap: D can look relevant because verification bodies are criticised; but the author's objection is to their limited brief and their payer, not to their competence.

Q13 B Weaken - CR (leakage) HARD

The proposed method measures a project's effect as the difference between clearing in matched comparison forests and clearing in the protected forest. Option B describes leakage: loggers excluded from the protected forest move into nearby unprotected forests, 'the sites likeliest to serve as comparisons'. That would raise clearing in the comparison forests because of the project itself, making the project look more effective than it is and inflating credits, the very defect the remedy was meant to cure. It attacks the method's validity at its core. Option A tends to weaken the diagnosis slightly but concedes only that some developers were accurate, which the author's 'tend to be resolved in the seller's favour' allows. Option C raises a cost of delay, a practical objection that leaves the accuracy of the method untouched. Option D attacks the researchers' funding, which does not show their findings are false.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the attractive practical objection; but slower payment does not make the credits less accurate, while leakage corrupts the measurement itself.

Q14 D Strengthen - CR (isolating the cause) ELITE

The claim to be strengthened is causal and comparative: baselines are inflated because of who draws them, not because forest credits are unworkable in principle. The best support holds the idea of forest credits constant and varies only who sets the baseline. Option D does exactly this: 'Where baselines for similar projects were set by an agency with no stake in credit volumes, they tracked matched forests closely.' Same idea, disinterested setter, accurate result. Option B looks supportive but points towards dishonesty, which the author says is 'not necessarily' the mechanism; it supports a different explanation. Option A, if anything, suggests forest credits may face a structural problem with additionality, which would locate the defect in the idea itself. Option C reports a market reaction to the findings; falling demand says nothing about why baselines were inflated.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the elite trap: it seems to confirm that sellers inflate figures, but it explains inflation by character, whereas the author blames the structure of who decides.

Q15 C Parallel reasoning MED

The author's argument has three moves: a party with an interest in a figure is allowed to estimate it and overstates it; the fault is in who sets the figure, not in the scheme; therefore the figure should be based on what actually happens, assessed after the fact by someone with no stake in its size. Option C matches each move: contractors who 'estimate their own overruns overstate them', so payments

should 'follow costs audited by a flat-fee auditor', a disinterested assessor working from actual figures. Option A abolishes the scheme, the very conclusion the author rejects. Option B addresses harsh marking by taking the higher of two marks, which neither removes an interested estimator nor measures after the fact. Option D replaces actual measurement with an average cap, the opposite of issuing payment against what was actually observed.

Examiner's note — the trap: A shares the topic of self-reported figures but abolishes the scheme, which is the move the author explicitly calls one that 'does not follow'.

Q16 D Main conclusion - CR MED

The last paragraph begins 'The law should therefore', signalling the conclusion: the law 'should therefore stop asking consent to do work it cannot do'; certain uses 'should be prohibited whatever the user has agreed to'; and 'Consent would remain, but only for decisions a person can actually make' Option D restates both parts. Option A is the remedy the author rejects: 'The usual response is to demand better notices ... This misreads the problem.' Option B overreaches; the author keeps consent for some decisions and does not abolish it. Option C misreads the surgery analogy: the author uses it to contrast the two cases, saying it 'conceals more than it reveals', not to claim that surgeons obtain uninformed consent. The premises about unread notices and cumulative harms support D; they are not themselves the conclusion.

Examiner's note — the trap: B catches readers who take the attack on consent as total; the final sentence expressly preserves consent for decisions people can make.

Q17 B Assumption - CR HARD

The author rejects better notices because 'the decisions they ask for cannot be made well by anyone, however clear the prose'. The support offered is that harms 'are cumulative and arise from combination', and that no one can weigh 'the contribution that one disclosure will make to a profile assembled years later'. For this to defeat better drafting, it must be true that the relevant harm depends on future combinations which no present notice could fully describe; otherwise a clearer notice could, in principle, inform the choice. That is option B. Option A concerns whether users would read shorter notices, but the author's point is that even a user who reads cannot decide well, so A is not required. Option C imputes a motive to companies that the argument never relies on. Option D may be needed for the prohibition proposal, but not for dismissing better notices, which is what the stem asks about.

Examiner's note — the trap: A is attractive because the passage cites non-reading; but the author explicitly says the problem survives 'however clear the prose', so reading rates are not the premise.

Q18 A Weaken - CR ELITE

The argument's key premise is that decisions about data 'cannot be made well by anyone', because the harms arise from combination and cannot be weighed at the moment of a tap. Option A shows that when users were offered a different kind of choice, a single standing decision about whether their data may be combined across services, they made it deliberately and kept to it. That is evidence that consent can be restructured to address the very harm the author identifies, combination, so the conclusion that consent must be replaced by prohibition loses force. Option C is the tempting choice: it undermines the contrast with surgery, but the author's case does not rest on surgery being ideal; the analogy is used only to show the data case is worse. Option B favours shorter notices, but user preference does not show better choices would follow. Option D shows voluntary restraint by some firms, which leaves the argument about consent untouched.

Examiner's note — the trap: C is the elite trap: it damages the surgery analogy, but the conclusion rests on the combination premise, which option A attacks directly.

Q19 C Strengthen - CR HARD

The case for prohibition rests on the claim that harm arises from combination, so that 'a year of it, joined to purchase records, can reveal a person's health, faith and associations', and that no one can weigh this 'at the moment of a tap'. Option C supplies evidence for exactly that mechanism: combined location and purchase data have identified medical conditions 'years before the users disclosed them'. This confirms both that the harm is real and that it arises beyond anything the user could have foreseen when consenting, which strengthens the author's specific example of inferring health conditions. Option B weakens the argument, since it suggests reading notices does affect choices. Option A is ambiguous; lower premiums for the healthiest customers say nothing about whether consent can protect users. Option D reports a plain-language reform, the remedy the author dismisses, and its existence does not show that prohibition is needed.

Examiner's note — the trap: B is the reversal trap: it concerns reading notices, which sounds on-topic, but it shows reading matters, which cuts against the author's case.

Q20 B Flaw - false dichotomy HARD

The argument moves from the claim that consent cannot do this work to the proposal that certain uses 'should be prohibited whatever the user has agreed to'. Between those two positions lie many alternatives: purpose limits, duties of care on data holders, independent approval of particular inferences, or liability for harms caused. The author never considers them, so the reasoning treats consent and outright prohibition as the only options for uses that consent cannot legitimise. Option B names this gap. Option A is not a flaw in the text; the passage attributes no financial interest to the authors of the reading studies. Option C describes a straw man, but the author accurately represents the demand for 'shorter, plainer, layered' notices and argues against it on its merits. Option D is tempting because

the author puts 'consents' in inverted commas, but that is deliberate: the author openly contrasts real consent with the tap, so the shift in sense is flagged, not concealed.

Examiner's note — the trap: D is the trap set by the scare quotes around 'consents'; equivocation requires an unnoticed shift, whereas the author makes the contrast explicit.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. 'Proprietary' (figurative sense)? — **Possessive; behaving like an owner of something.**
2. 'Explain away' means? — **To dismiss evidence by offering an alternative explanation for it.**
3. 'Wholesale' (as in 'replaced wholesale')? — **Completely and all at once.**
4. 'Apt' means? — **Fitting; appropriate to the case.**
5. 'Infectious' (of an idea or song)? — **Spreading readily from one person or animal to another.**
6. 'Conformity' means? — **Behaving in line with what others in the group do.**
7. 'In play' (of hypotheses)? — **Still under consideration; not yet ruled out.**
8. 'Monopoly' (figurative)? — **Exclusive possession of something by one party.**
9. What is 'social learning'? — **Acquiring behaviour by observing or copying others.**
10. 'Cultural transmission'? — **Passing behaviour between individuals by learning, not genes.**
11. 'Elaborate' (verb) means? — **To develop in greater detail or complexity.**
12. 'Credibility' (of a policy-maker)? — **The degree to which others believe its commitments will be kept.**
13. What is 'time inconsistency'? — **A plan that looks best today but tempting to abandon later.**
14. 'Distributive' choice? — **A decision about who gains and who bears a cost.**
15. Judicial review checks mainly the ___ of a decision. — **Legality and procedure, not its merits.**
16. 'Substance' vs 'manner' of a decision? — **What was decided vs how it was decided.**
17. 'Earns its keep' means? — **Is worth what it costs to maintain.**
18. 'Confer' means? — **To grant a title, right or status.**
19. What is 'regulatory capture'? — **A regulator coming to serve the industry it regulates.**
20. 'Tenure' (of an official)? — **The fixed term for which an office is held.**
21. 'Democratic warrant'? — **Authority derived from elected, accountable institutions.**
22. What is a 'carbon offset'? — **A credit for emissions avoided elsewhere, used to cancel one's own.**
23. 'Additionality' (carbon credits)? — **The reduction would not have happened without the project.**
24. 'Leakage' (carbon credits)? — **Protection in one place displacing the damage to another.**
25. 'Baseline' (in a project claim)? — **The estimated outcome had the project not existed.**
26. Ex ante vs ex post? — **Estimated in advance vs measured after the event.**
27. 'Disinterested' vs 'uninterested'? — **Impartial, with no stake vs not curious or bored.**
28. 'Discretionary' means? — **Left to the judgment of the decision-maker.**
29. 'Matched comparison' group? — **Similar units that did not receive the intervention.**
30. 'Pedigree' (of an idea)? — **Its history and respectable origins.**
31. 'Enumerate' means? — **To list one by one.**
32. 'Cumulative' means? — **Increasing by successive additions.**
33. 'Toll' (figurative)? — **A price exacted for access or passage.**
34. 'Waive' a right means? — **To give it up voluntarily.**
35. 'Habitable' means? — **Fit to be lived in.**
36. 'Informed consent'? — **Agreement given with an understanding of risks and alternatives.**
37. 'Notice and consent' model? — **Data use made lawful by a notice the user accepts.**
38. False dichotomy flaw? — **Presenting two options as the only ones when others exist.**
39. Genetic / ad hominem flaw? — **Rejecting a claim because of its source rather than its merits.**
40. What do 'scare quotes' signal? — **The writer doubts or distances from the word's usual sense.**
41. Best way to attack an argument by analogy? — **Show the two cases differ in a respect that matters.**
42. RC inference rule? — **Must follow from the text alone; add nothing new.**
43. 'Qualified' (tone) means? — **Accepting with reservations or limits.**
44. Extreme-language trap in RC options? — **Words like 'always', 'every', 'proves' that overstate the text.**
45. 'Concession' in an argument? — **Granting part of an opposing point before limiting it.**
46. 'Humpback whale' song is sung mainly by? — **Males, chiefly in the breeding season.**
47. 'Horizontal transmission' of culture? — **Learning from peers of the same generation, not from parents.**
48. 'Vertical transmission' of culture? — **Passing behaviour from parent to offspring.**
49. 'Anthropomorphism'? — **Attributing human traits to animals or objects.**
50. 'Convergent' vs 'divergent' evolution? — **Unrelated lineages growing alike vs related ones growing apart.**
51. 'Parsimony' in science? — **Prefer the simplest explanation that fits the evidence.**
52. 'Replicate' a finding? — **Obtain the same result in an independent repeat study.**
53. 'Correlation is not causation' - why? — **A third factor, chance or reverse causation may explain the link.**
54. 'Independent regulator' is insulated from? — **Day-to-day political direction by the executive.**
55. 'Accountability' vs 'independence'? — **Answering for decisions vs freedom from direction in making them.**
56. 'Delegated legislation'? — **Rules made by an executive body under power given by a statute.**
57. 'Separation of powers'? — **Division of state power among legislature, executive and judiciary.**
58. 'Fixed tenure' protects an official from? — **Removal at the government's pleasure.**
59. 'Legitimacy' (of an institution)? — **Acceptance of its authority as rightful.**
60. 'Technocracy'? — **Rule or decision-making by technical experts.**
61. 'Revolving door' (regulation)? — **Movement of staff between regulator and the regulated industry.**
62. 'Sunset clause'? — **A provision that makes a law lapse after a set date unless renewed.**
63. 'Afforestation' vs 'reforestation'? — **Planting where no forest stood vs replanting cleared forest.**

64. 'Carbon sink'? — **Anything that absorbs more carbon than it releases.**

65. 'Permanence' (carbon credits)? — **Whether the stored carbon stays locked away over time.**

66. 'Verification' (carbon credits)? — **Independent checking that claimed reductions really occurred.**

67. 'Greenwashing'? — **Presenting an activity as more environmentally sound than it is.**

68. 'Counterfactual baseline'? — **What would have happened without the project.**

69. 'Polluter pays' principle? — **The party causing pollution bears the cost of remedying it.**

70. 'Precautionary principle'? — **Lack of full scientific certainty is no reason to postpone protective measures.**

71. Right to privacy was held a fundamental right in? — **K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India (2017).**

72. 'Data minimisation'? — **Collect only the personal data needed for the stated purpose.**

73. 'Purpose limitation'? — **Use data only for the purpose for which it was collected.**

74. 'Opt-in' vs 'opt-out' consent? — **Active agreement required vs agreement assumed unless refused.**

75. 'Consent fatigue'? — **Users clicking 'agree' reflexively because requests are too frequent.**

76. 'Asymmetry of information'? — **One party to a deal knows much more than the other.**

77. 'Paternalism'? — **Restricting a person's choices for that person's own good.**

78. 'Fiduciary' duty? — **A duty to act in another's interest, not one's own.**

79. Main-point question: what to look for? — **The claim the whole passage is built to support.**

80. Author's-purpose question tests? — **Why the author wrote, not what the passage says.**

81. 'Function' question in RC? — **Asks what role a sentence or paragraph plays in the argument.**

82. Strengtheners in CR? — **A fact that makes the conclusion more likely to be true.**

83. 'Sufficient assumption'? — **A premise that, if added, guarantees the conclusion.**

84. 'Circular reasoning'? — **The conclusion is assumed in the premises.**

85. 'Hasty generalisation'? — **A broad conclusion drawn from too few or unrepresentative cases.**

86. 'Slippery slope' flaw? — **Assuming one step must lead to an extreme chain of consequences.**

87. 'Appeal to authority' flaw? — **Relying on an authority outside their field of expertise.**

88. 'Tu quoque'? — **Rejecting a claim because the arguer is also guilty of it.**

89. 'Nuanced' (tone)? — **Sensitive to fine distinctions; not one-sided.**