



September Sprint for CAT 2025

Class 16

Reading Comprehension



Follow us on



MBA Karo



mbakaro



MBA Karo!



Preparing for MBA exams for 2025-26?



- Recorded concept videos
- Solved questions – basic to advanced
- Topic wise Practice sheets
- Doubt Resolution Group
- Doubt session live classes
- In VA, grammar and vocab also covered
- In LR, OMET topics covered

Price: **15000/-**

Section-wise modules are also available



CAT 2025 Mock Tests

15 Full- Length Mocks
10 VARC Sectionals (Text Solutions)
10 DILR Sectionals (Video Solutions)
10 QA Sectionals (Video Solutions)



⌚ Expires On Nov 30, 2025

₹ 1,500



CAT and OMETs Mock Test Bundle

All Mocks Based on the Latest Exam Pattern

⌚ Expires On Apr 30, 2026

₹ 6,000

CAT 2025: 15 mocks + 10 sectionals each
NMAT 2025: 15 Mocks
SNAP 2025: 20 Mocks
XAT 2026: 5 Mocks
CMAT 2026: 10 Mocks
MAHCET 2026: 10 Mocks
CUET PG 2026: 10 Mocks
MICAT 2025: 5 Mocks
XGMT 2026: 5 Mocks
SRCC GBO 2026: 5 Mocks

NMAT – 15
SNAP – 20
XAT – 10
CMAT – 10
MAHCET – 20
CUET PG – 10
MICAT – 5
XGMT – 5
SRCC GBO - 5

CAT and OMETs Mocks by MBA Karo

September Sprint Schedule

Date	Topic	Date	Topic	Date	Topic
01-Sep	Number System - 1	11-Sep	Games and Tournament	21-Sep	Algebra - 3
02-Sep	Arrangement	12-Sep	Odd One Out	22-Sep	Logical DI
03-Sep	Number System - 2	13-Sep	Chart Based DI - 3	23-Sep	Geometry - 1
04-Sep	Para Completion	14-Sep	Arithmetic - 4	24-Sep	Reading Comprehension - 3
05-Sep	Arithmetic - 1	15-Sep	Venn Diagram	25-Sep	Geometry - 2
06-Sep	Chart Based DI - 1	16-Sep	Reading Comprehension - 2	26-Sep	Quantitative Reasoning
07-Sep	Arithmetic - 2	17-Sep	Algebra - 1	27-Sep	Geometry - 3
08-Sep	Reading Comprehension - 1	18-Sep	Routes and Network	28-Sep	Parajumbles
09-Sep	Chart Based DI - 2	19-Sep	Algebra - 2	29-Sep	Misc. LR topics
10-Sep	Arithmetic - 3	20-Sep	Para Summary	30-Sep	Modern Maths

Pause the video, read the passage, and then answer the questions!





The passage primarily discusses:

- A. The historical rise of the English language.
- B. The benefits of English as a global language.
- C. The negative consequences of English language dominance.
- D. The debate surrounding English as a gift or a weapon.

In 400 years, English went from being a small language spoken in the British Isles to becoming the most dominant language in the world. In the year 1600, at the end of Queen Elizabeth I's reign, English was spoken by 4 million people. By the 2020s, at the end of Queen Elizabeth II's reign, that number had risen to nearly 2 billion. Today, English is the main language in the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; and it's an 'intra-national' language in former British colonies such as India, Singapore, South Africa, and Nigeria. It is Earth's lingua franca.

For some, English is Britain's greatest 'gift' to the world. In an online interview with Conservative Home in May 2022, Suella Braverman, now the UK's Home Secretary, said she was proud of the British Empire for giving its colonies infrastructure, legal systems, civil service, militaries, and, of course, the English language. On the other side of the political spectrum, in 2008 Gordon Brown, then the prime minister, delivered a speech in which he stated that he wanted 'Britain to make a new gift to the world' by supporting anyone outside the UK who wished to learn English. In the same year, The Times announced proposals for a new museum dedicated to the language, to 'celebrate England's most elaborate gift to the world'. The notion of English as a gift from Britain to the planet is so commonplace it's almost unremarkable.

English may have become universal, but not everyone believes it is a gift. Many hold diametrically opposite views. In an article in The Guardian in 2018, journalist Jacob Mikanowski described English as a 'behemoth, bully, loudmouth, thief', highlighting that the dominance of English threatens local cultures and languages. Due to how English continues to gain ground worldwide, many languages are becoming endangered or extinct. This not only impacts relatively small languages like Welsh or Irish, but also larger languages, such as Yoruba in Nigeria, which are pressured by English in business, trade, education, the media, and technology.

For this reason, several scholars in the field of sociolinguistics consider English a killer language and have described it as a kind of monster, like the deadly multi-headed Hydra from Greek mythology. Those who see English from this perspective consider its global roles a form of linguistic imperialism, a system of profound inequality between English and other languages, which are crushed under the might of former colonial power, Britain, and the current world superpower, the US.

The concept of linguistic imperialism is a reminder that the historical root of the dominance of English is four centuries of the British Empire. English has a heavy load on its conscience. Its spread through space and time from the end of the 16th century until the end of the empire in the second half of the 20th century occurred in conjunction with imperial expansion, involving land-grabbing, genocide, slavery, famine, subjugation, looting, and exploitation.



In 400 years, English went from being a small language spoken in the British Isles to becoming the most dominant language in the world. In the year 1600, at the end of Queen Elizabeth I's reign, English was spoken by 4 million people. By the 2020s, at the end of Queen Elizabeth II's reign, that number had risen to nearly 2 billion. Today, English is the main language in the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; and it's an 'intra-national' language in former British colonies such as India, Singapore, South Africa, and Nigeria. It is Earth's lingua franca.

For some, English is Britain's greatest 'gift' to the world. In an online interview with Conservative Home in May 2022, Suella Braverman, now the UK's Home Secretary, said she was proud of the British Empire for giving its colonies infrastructure, legal systems, civil service, militaries, and, of course, the English language. On the other side of the political spectrum, in 2008 Gordon Brown, then the prime minister, delivered a speech in which he stated that he wanted 'Britain to make a new gift to the world' by supporting anyone outside the UK who wished to learn English. In the same year, The Times announced proposals for a new museum dedicated to the language, to 'celebrate England's most elaborate gift to the world'. The notion of English as a gift from Britain to the planet is so commonplace it's almost unremarkable.

English may have become universal, but not everyone believes it is a gift. Many hold diametrically opposite views. In an article in The Guardian in 2018, journalist Jacob Mikanowski described English as a 'behemoth, bully, loudmouth, thief', highlighting that the dominance of English threatens local cultures and languages. Due to how English continues to gain ground worldwide, many languages are becoming endangered or extinct. This not only impacts relatively small languages like Welsh or Irish, but also larger languages, such as Yoruba in Nigeria, which are pressured by English in business, trade, education, the media, and technology.

For this reason, several scholars in the field of sociolinguistics consider English a killer language and have described it as a kind of monster, like the deadly multi-headed Hydra from Greek mythology. Those who see English from this perspective consider its global roles a form of linguistic imperialism, a system of profound inequality between English and other languages, which are crushed under the might of former colonial power, Britain, and the current world superpower, the US.

The concept of linguistic imperialism is a reminder that the historical root of the dominance of English is four centuries of the British Empire. English has a heavy load on its conscience. Its spread through space and time from the end of the 16th century until the end of the empire in the second half of the 20th century occurred in conjunction with imperial expansion, involving land-grabbing, genocide, slavery, famine, subjugation, looting, and exploitation.

The passage mentions the endangerment of smaller languages due to the dominance of English. How does this point MOST WEAKEN the argument of those who view English as a "gift"?

- A. It highlights the potential for cultural homogenization with English dominance.
- B. It raises concerns about the loss of linguistic diversity in the world.
- C. It demonstrates the limitations of English as a language for global communication.
- D. It suggests a lack of interest in learning English among people speaking smaller languages.



In 400 years, English went from being a small language spoken in the British Isles to becoming the most dominant language in the world. In the year 1600, at the end of Queen Elizabeth I's reign, English was spoken by 4 million people. By the 2020s, at the end of Queen Elizabeth II's reign, that number had risen to nearly 2 billion. Today, English is the main language in the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; and it's an 'intra-national' language in former British colonies such as India, Singapore, South Africa, and Nigeria. It is Earth's lingua franca.

For some, English is Britain's greatest 'gift' to the world. In an online interview with Conservative Home in May 2022, Suella Braverman, now the UK's Home Secretary, said she was proud of the British Empire for giving its colonies infrastructure, legal systems, civil service, militaries, and, of course, the English language. On the other side of the political spectrum, in 2008 Gordon Brown, then the prime minister, delivered a speech in which he stated that he wanted 'Britain to make a new gift to the world' by supporting anyone outside the UK who wished to learn English. In the same year, The Times announced proposals for a new museum dedicated to the language, to 'celebrate England's most elaborate gift to the world'. The notion of English as a gift from Britain to the planet is so commonplace it's almost unremarkable.

English may have become universal, but not everyone believes it is a gift. Many hold diametrically opposite views. In an article in The Guardian in 2018, journalist Jacob Mikanowski described English as a 'behemoth, bully, loudmouth, thief', highlighting that the dominance of English threatens local cultures and languages. Due to how English continues to gain ground worldwide, many languages are becoming endangered or extinct. This not only impacts relatively small languages like Welsh or Irish, but also larger languages, such as Yoruba in Nigeria, which are pressured by English in business, trade, education, the media, and technology.

For this reason, several scholars in the field of sociolinguistics consider English a killer language and have described it as a kind of monster, like the deadly multi-headed Hydra from Greek mythology. Those who see English from this perspective consider its global roles a form of linguistic imperialism, a system of profound inequality between English and other languages, which are crushed under the might of former colonial power, Britain, and the current world superpower, the US.

The concept of linguistic imperialism is a reminder that the historical root of the dominance of English is four centuries of the British Empire. English has a heavy load on its conscience. Its spread through space and time from the end of the 16th century until the end of the empire in the second half of the 20th century occurred in conjunction with imperial expansion, involving land-grabbing, genocide, slavery, famine, subjugation, looting, and exploitation.

The author uses the metaphor of a "behemoth" to describe English most likely to convey:

- A. The beauty and elegance of the language.
- B. The rapid growth and expansion of English.
- C. The destructive and domineering nature of English.
- D. The unifying and connecting power of English.



The passage compares English to the Hydra from Greek mythology to highlight:

- A. The threat English poses to linguistic diversity.
- B. The language's adaptability and ability to change.
- C. The complex and multifaceted nature of English.
- D. The historical connection between English and ancient Greece.

In 400 years, English went from being a small language spoken in the British Isles to becoming the most dominant language in the world. In the year 1600, at the end of Queen Elizabeth I's reign, English was spoken by 4 million people. By the 2020s, at the end of Queen Elizabeth II's reign, that number had risen to nearly 2 billion. Today, English is the main language in the United Kingdom, Ireland, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; and it's an 'intra-national' language in former British colonies such as India, Singapore, South Africa, and Nigeria. It is Earth's lingua franca.

For some, English is Britain's greatest 'gift' to the world. In an online interview with Conservative Home in May 2022, Suella Braverman, now the UK's Home Secretary, said she was proud of the British Empire for giving its colonies infrastructure, legal systems, civil service, militaries, and, of course, the English language. On the other side of the political spectrum, in 2008 Gordon Brown, then the prime minister, delivered a speech in which he stated that he wanted 'Britain to make a new gift to the world' by supporting anyone outside the UK who wished to learn English. In the same year, The Times announced proposals for a new museum dedicated to the language, to 'celebrate England's most elaborate gift to the world'. The notion of English as a gift from Britain to the planet is so commonplace it's almost unremarkable.

English may have become universal, but not everyone believes it is a gift. Many hold diametrically opposite views. In an article in The Guardian in 2018, journalist Jacob Mikanowski described English as a 'behemoth, bully, loudmouth, thief', highlighting that the dominance of English threatens local cultures and languages. Due to how English continues to gain ground worldwide, many languages are becoming endangered or extinct. This not only impacts relatively small languages like Welsh or Irish, but also larger languages, such as Yoruba in Nigeria, which are pressured by English in business, trade, education, the media, and technology.

For this reason, several scholars in the field of sociolinguistics consider English a killer language and have described it as a kind of monster, like the deadly multi-headed Hydra from Greek mythology. Those who see English from this perspective consider its global roles a form of linguistic imperialism, a system of profound inequality between English and other languages, which are crushed under the might of former colonial power, Britain, and the current world superpower, the US.

The concept of linguistic imperialism is a reminder that the historical root of the dominance of English is four centuries of the British Empire. English has a heavy load on its conscience. Its spread through space and time from the end of the 16th century until the end of the empire in the second half of the 20th century occurred in conjunction with imperial expansion, involving land-grabbing, genocide, slavery, famine, subjugation, looting, and exploitation.





Like



Comment



Share

SUBSCRIBE 





The author compares the editorial process to artistic creation to highlight the importance of:

- A. Attention to detail
- B. Critical thinking skills
- C. Ability to meet deadlines
- D. Collaboration with others

For 40 years, I was an editor, mostly of magazines, including this one. As an editor and as a reader, I found the story of how creators create irresistible. I liked that these stories had a classic structure to them — each inherently dramatic, starting with nothing and ending with something. When I quit my magazine job, I decided to try my hand as an artist. It wasn't entirely abrupt: In my work, I always found it satisfying telling stories in photographs and graphics and drawings, and in spare moments — a whim at first — I picked up a paintbrush to try making images myself. When I left my job, I began to paint more seriously. That was the beginning of my torment: I just wasn't very good. Decent paintings sometimes emerged, but they seemed almost by accident. And they were accidents I couldn't necessarily re-create. I was conservative — if one part of a painting showed promise, I would protect it and put the rest of the painting at risk. Sometimes I could get something going and then tentatively feel emboldened to try something new and then fall back, and that would scare me — so I would retreat to what I knew, which meant resuming the bad habits. I got frustrated easily and gave up easily, never knowing when to persevere or surrender. You can see that these are all problems more of the head than of the hand. Basically, it all seemed impossible.

When I was at my most exasperated, I found myself asking the same question I had asked as an editor: How does anybody make art? Only now, my professional interest has become personal. The problems I am describing were ones of editorial self-scrutiny. Editing is deliberating — choosing a word or thought, dismissing or advancing, evaluating. It's what I did for my career — and it's also an essential part of artistic decision-making, but it can be brutal. Artists use the phrase often to talk about a stage after the imagination has "vomited" and before the hard-core, skills-based crafting can begin. run amok, as if I had an overeager immune system that was sabotaging me. Then I came across a monograph about the figurative artist Eric Fischl and this passage, in which he describes the making of one of his more famous paintings, called Bad Boy.

Reading this account, I felt some of my torture starting to lift. I appreciated Fischl's willingness to allow me into his mind as he stumbled through the work. His struggle was comforting — and illuminating. It gave me the beginnings of an idea. When artists speak, they generally focus on what their work means. They think up a spiel they can repeat over and over, and I guess it's what most people want to hear. My curiosity is earthbound: Where do they begin, and what do they do next, and when do they know they are finished? And more crucially: What do they do when they lose faith? Do they lose faith?



For 40 years, I was an editor, mostly of magazines, including this one. As an editor and as a reader, I found the story of how creators create irresistible. I liked that these stories had a classic structure to them — each inherently dramatic, starting with nothing and ending with something. When I quit my magazine job, I decided to try my hand as an artist. It wasn't entirely abrupt: In my work, I always found it satisfying telling stories in photographs and graphics and drawings, and in spare moments — a whim at first — I picked up a paintbrush to try making images myself. When I left my job, I began to paint more seriously. That was the beginning of my torment: I just wasn't very good.

Decent paintings sometimes emerged, but they seemed almost by accident. And they were accidents I couldn't necessarily re-create. I was conservative — if one part of a painting showed promise, I would protect it and put the rest of the painting at risk. Sometimes I could get something going and then tentatively feel emboldened to try something new and then fall back, and that would scare me — so I would retreat to what I knew, which meant resuming the bad habits. I got frustrated easily and gave up easily, never knowing when to persevere or surrender. You can see that these are all problems more of the head than of the hand. Basically, it all seemed impossible.

When I was at my most exasperated, I found myself asking the same question I had asked as an editor: How does anybody make art? Only now, my professional interest has become personal. The problems I am describing were ones of editorial self-scrutiny. Editing is deliberating — choosing a word or thought, dismissing or advancing, evaluating. It's what I did for my career — and it's also an essential part of artistic decision-making, but it can be brutal. Artists use the phrase often to talk about a stage after the imagination has "vomited" and before the hard-core, skills-based crafting can begin. run amok, as if I had an overeager immune system that was sabotaging me. Then I came across a monograph about the figurative artist Eric Fischl and this passage, in which he describes the making of one of his more famous paintings, called Bad Boy.

Reading this account, I felt some of my torture starting to lift. I appreciated Fischl's willingness to allow me into his mind as he stumbled through the work. His struggle was comforting — and illuminating. It gave me the beginnings of an idea. When artists speak, they generally focus on what their work means. They think up a spiel they can repeat over and over, and I guess it's what most people want to hear. My curiosity is earthbound: Where do they begin, and what do they do next, and when do they know they are finished? And more crucially: What do they do when they lose faith? Do they lose faith?

What does the author hope to learn from artists discussing their creative process?

- A. The meaning and symbolism behind their work
- B. The specific techniques and tools they use
- C. How they overcome creative roadblocks and self-doubt
- D. The inspiration behind their most famous pieces



For 40 years, I was an editor, mostly of magazines, including this one. As an editor and as a reader, I found the story of how creators create irresistible. I liked that these stories had a classic structure to them — each inherently dramatic, starting with nothing and ending with something. When I quit my magazine job, I decided to try my hand as an artist. It wasn't entirely abrupt: In my work, I always found it satisfying telling stories in photographs and graphics and drawings, and in spare moments — a whim at first — I picked up a paintbrush to try making images myself. When I left my job, I began to paint more seriously. That was the beginning of my torment: I just wasn't very good.

Decent paintings sometimes emerged, but they seemed almost by accident. And they were accidents I couldn't necessarily re-create. I was conservative — if one part of a painting showed promise, I would protect it and put the rest of the painting at risk. Sometimes I could get something going and then tentatively feel emboldened to try something new and then fall back, and that would scare me — so I would retreat to what I knew, which meant resuming the bad habits. I got frustrated easily and gave up easily, never knowing when to persevere or surrender. You can see that these are all problems more of the head than of the hand. Basically, it all seemed impossible.

When I was at my most exasperated, I found myself asking the same question I had asked as an editor: How does anybody make art? Only now, my professional interest has become personal. The problems I am describing were ones of editorial self-scrutiny. Editing is deliberating — choosing a word or thought, dismissing or advancing, evaluating. It's what I did for my career — and it's also an essential part of artistic decision-making, but it can be brutal. Artists use the phrase often to talk about a stage after the imagination has "vomited" and before the hard-core, skills-based crafting can begin. run amok, as if I had an overeager immune system that was sabotaging me. Then I came across a monograph about the figurative artist Eric Fischl and this passage, in which he describes the making of one of his more famous paintings, called Bad Boy.

Reading this account, I felt some of my torture starting to lift. I appreciated Fischl's willingness to allow me into his mind as he stumbled through the work. His struggle was comforting — and illuminating. It gave me the beginnings of an idea. When artists speak, they generally focus on what their work means. They think up a spiel they can repeat over and over, and I guess it's what most people want to hear. My curiosity is earthbound: Where do they begin, and what do they do next, and when do they know they are finished? And more crucially: What do they do when they lose faith? Do they lose faith?

By stating "Artists use the phrase often to talk about a stage after the imagination has "vomited" and before the hard-core, skills-based crafting can begin," the author implies that the initial creative process is

A. A messy and chaotic exploration of ideas and possibilities.

B. A meticulous and controlled exercise in technical execution.

C. A clear and linear progression from concept to finished artwork.

D. A solely intellectual endeavor devoid of emotional investment.



For 40 years, I was an editor, mostly of magazines, including this one. As an editor and as a reader, I found the story of how creators create irresistible. I liked that these stories had a classic structure to them — each inherently dramatic, starting with nothing and ending with something. When I quit my magazine job, I decided to try my hand as an artist. It wasn't entirely abrupt: In my work, I always found it satisfying telling stories in photographs and graphics and drawings, and in spare moments — a whim at first — I picked up a paintbrush to try making images myself. When I left my job, I began to paint more seriously. That was the beginning of my torment: I just wasn't very good.

Decent paintings sometimes emerged, but they seemed almost by accident. And they were accidents I couldn't necessarily re-create. I was conservative — if one part of a painting showed promise, I would protect it and put the rest of the painting at risk. Sometimes I could get something going and then tentatively feel emboldened to try something new and then fall back, and that would scare me — so I would retreat to what I knew, which meant resuming the bad habits. I got frustrated easily and gave up easily, never knowing when to persevere or surrender. You can see that these are all problems more of the head than of the hand. Basically, it all seemed impossible.

When I was at my most exasperated, I found myself asking the same question I had asked as an editor: How does anybody make art? Only now, my professional interest has become personal. The problems I am describing were ones of editorial self-scrutiny. Editing is deliberating — choosing a word or thought, dismissing or advancing, evaluating. It's what I did for my career — and it's also an essential part of artistic decision-making, but it can be brutal. Artists use the phrase often to talk about a stage after the imagination has "vomited" and before the hard-core, skills-based crafting can begin. run amok, as if I had an overeager immune system that was sabotaging me. Then I came across a monograph about the figurative artist Eric Fischl and this passage, in which he describes the making of one of his more famous paintings, called Bad Boy.

Reading this account, I felt some of my torture starting to lift. I appreciated Fischl's willingness to allow me into his mind as he stumbled through the work. His struggle was comforting — and illuminating. It gave me the beginnings of an idea. When artists speak, they generally focus on what their work means. They think up a spiel they can repeat over and over, and I guess it's what most people want to hear. My curiosity is earthbound: Where do they begin, and what do they do next, and when do they know they are finished? And more crucially: What do they do when they lose faith? Do they lose faith?

The author's skepticism towards artists focusing on the meaning of their work suggests a belief that artistic value lies primarily in

- A. The technical mastery and skill displayed in the creation process.
- B. The unique and authentic experience of the artist during creation.
- C. The intellectual complexity and hidden symbolism embedded within.
- D. The emotional impact and personal connection it evokes in the viewer.

Preparing for MBA exams for 2025-26?



- Recorded concept videos
- Solved questions – basic to advanced
- Topic wise Practice sheets
- Doubt Resolution Group
- Doubt session live classes
- In VA, grammar and vocab also covered
- In LR, OMET topics covered

Price: **15000/-**

Section-wise modules are also available



MBA KARO

The primary argument of the passage is that economics should:

- A. Focus more on complex mathematical models for accurate predictions.
- B. Be recognized as a social science, incorporating qualitative research methods.
- C. Abandon the pursuit of "timeless truths" and acknowledge the limitations of its theories.
- D. Prioritize fieldwork and observation over abstract statistical analysis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315



MBA KARO

The passage uses the example of Long-Term Capital Management to illustrate the dangers of:

- A. Relying solely on the expertise of Nobel laureates.
- B. Ignoring the dynamic and unpredictable nature of markets.
- C. Utilizing complex financial products without proper scrutiny.
- D. Basing investment decisions solely on mathematical models.

A Nobel prize in economics implies that the human world operates much like the physical world: that it can be described and understood in neutral terms, and that it lends itself to modelling, like chemical reactions or the movement of the stars. It creates the impression that economists are not in the business of constructing inherently imperfect theories, but of discovering timeless truths.

To illustrate just how dangerous that kind of belief can be, one only need to consider the fate of Long-Term Capital Management, a hedge fund set up by, among others, the economists Myron Scholes and Robert Merton in 1994. With their work on derivatives, Scholes and Merton seemed to have hit on a formula that yielded a safe but lucrative trading strategy. In 1997 they were awarded the Nobel prize. A year later, Long-Term Capital Management lost \$4.6bn in less than four months; a bailout was required to avert the threat to the global financial system. Markets, it seemed, didn't always behave like scientific models.

In the decade that followed, the same over-confidence in the power and wisdom of financial models bred a disastrous culture of complacency, ending in the 2008 crash. Why should bankers ask themselves if a lucrative new complex financial product is safe when the models tell them it is? Why give regulators real power when models can do their work for them?

Many economists seem to have come to think of their field in scientific terms: a body of incrementally growing objective knowledge. Over the past decades, mainstream economics in universities has become increasingly mathematical, focusing on complex statistical analyses and modeling to the detriment of the observation of reality. Consider this throwaway line from the former top regulator and London School of Economics director Howard Davies in his 2010 book *The Financial Crisis: Who Is to Blame?*: "There is a lack of real-life research on trading floors themselves." To which one might say: well, yes, so how about doing something about that? After all, Davies was at the time heading what is probably the most prestigious institution for economics research in Europe, located a stone's throw away from the banks that blew up.

All those banks have "structured products approval committees", where a team of banking staff sits down to decide whether their bank should adopt a particular new complex financial product. If economics were a social science like sociology or anthropology, practitioners would set about interviewing those committee members, scrutinising the meetings' minutes and trying to observe as many meetings as possible. That is how the kind of fieldwork-based, "qualitative" social sciences, which economists like to discard as "soft" and unscientific, operate. It is true that this approach, too, comes with serious methodological caveats, such as verifiability, selection bias or observer bias. The difference is that other social sciences are open about these limitations, arguing that, while human knowledge about humans is fundamentally different from human knowledge about the natural world, those imperfect observations are extremely important to make.



MBA KARO

The passage compares the approach of mainstream economics to sociology and anthropology in order to

- A. Illustrate the value of studying human behavior in economic contexts.
- B. Highlight the importance of historical context in economic analysis.
- C. Demonstrate the superiority of qualitative research methods.
- D. Advocate for increased collaboration between these disciplines.

A Nobel prize in economics implies that the human world operates much like the physical world: that it can be described and understood in neutral terms, and that it lends itself to modelling, like chemical reactions or the movement of the stars. It creates the impression that economists are not in the business of constructing inherently imperfect theories, but of discovering timeless truths.

To illustrate just how dangerous that kind of belief can be, one only need to consider the fate of Long-Term Capital Management, a hedge fund set up by, among others, the economists Myron Scholes and Robert Merton in 1994. With their work on derivatives, Scholes and Merton seemed to have hit on a formula that yielded a safe but lucrative trading strategy. In 1997 they were awarded the Nobel prize. A year later, Long-Term Capital Management lost \$4.6bn in less than four months; a bailout was required to avert the threat to the global financial system. Markets, it seemed, didn't always behave like scientific models.

In the decade that followed, the same over-confidence in the power and wisdom of financial models bred a disastrous culture of complacency, ending in the 2008 crash. Why should bankers ask themselves if a lucrative new complex financial product is safe when the models tell them it is? Why give regulators real power when models can do their work for them?

Many economists seem to have come to think of their field in scientific terms: a body of incrementally growing objective knowledge. Over the past decades, mainstream economics in universities has become increasingly mathematical, focusing on complex statistical analyses and modeling to the detriment of the observation of reality. Consider this throwaway line from the former top regulator and London School of Economics director Howard Davies in his 2010 book *The Financial Crisis: Who Is to Blame?*: "There is a lack of real-life research on trading floors themselves." To which one might say: well, yes, so how about doing something about that? After all, Davies was at the time heading what is probably the most prestigious institution for economics research in Europe, located a stone's throw away from the banks that blew up.

All those banks have "structured products approval committees", where a team of banking staff sits down to decide whether their bank should adopt a particular new complex financial product. If economics were a social science like sociology or anthropology, practitioners would set about interviewing those committee members, scrutinising the meetings' minutes and trying to observe as many meetings as possible. That is how the kind of fieldwork-based, "qualitative" social sciences, which economists like to discard as "soft" and unscientific, operate. It is true that this approach, too, comes with serious methodological caveats, such as verifiability, selection bias or observer bias. The difference is that other social sciences are open about these limitations, arguing that, while human knowledge about humans is fundamentally different from human knowledge about the natural world, those imperfect observations are extremely important to make.



MBA KARO

A Nobel prize in economics implies that the human world operates much like the physical world: that it can be described and understood in neutral terms, and that it lends itself to modelling, like chemical reactions or the movement of the stars. It creates the impression that economists are not in the business of constructing inherently imperfect theories, but of discovering timeless truths.

To illustrate just how dangerous that kind of belief can be, one only need to consider the fate of Long-Term Capital Management, a hedge fund set up by, among others, the economists Myron Scholes and Robert Merton in 1994. With their work on derivatives, Scholes and Merton seemed to have hit on a formula that yielded a safe but lucrative trading strategy. In 1997 they were awarded the Nobel prize. A year later, Long-Term Capital Management lost \$4.6bn in less than four months; a bailout was required to avert the threat to the global financial system. Markets, it seemed, didn't always behave like scientific models.

In the decade that followed, the same over-confidence in the power and wisdom of financial models bred a disastrous culture of complacency, ending in the 2008 crash. Why should bankers ask themselves if a lucrative new complex financial product is safe when the models tell them it is? Why give regulators real power when models can do their work for them?

Many economists seem to have come to think of their field in scientific terms: a body of incrementally growing objective knowledge. Over the past decades, mainstream economics in universities has become increasingly mathematical, focusing on complex statistical analyses and modeling to the detriment of the observation of reality. Consider this throwaway line from the former top regulator and London School of Economics director Howard Davies in his 2010 book *The Financial Crisis: Who Is to Blame?*: "There is a lack of real-life research on trading floors themselves." To which one might say: well, yes, so how about doing something about that? After all, Davies was at the time heading what is probably the most prestigious institution for economics research in Europe, located a stone's throw away from the banks that blew up.

All those banks have "structured products approval committees", where a team of banking staff sits down to decide whether their bank should adopt a particular new complex financial product. If economics were a social science like sociology or anthropology, practitioners would set about interviewing those committee members, scrutinising the meetings' minutes and trying to observe as many meetings as possible. That is how the kind of fieldwork-based, "qualitative" social sciences, which economists like to discard as "soft" and unscientific, operate. It is true that this approach, too, comes with serious methodological caveats, such as verifiability, selection bias or observer bias. The difference is that other social sciences are open about these limitations, arguing that, while human knowledge about humans is fundamentally different from human knowledge about the natural world, those imperfect observations are extremely important to make.

The passage implies a potential consequence of economic models being solely focused on mathematical analysis and prediction. What is the MOST LIKELY consequence of this focus?

- A. Increased government intervention in financial markets.
- B. A disconnect between economic theories and real-world market behavior.
- C. A decline in the overall complexity of financial products.
- D. A renewed interest in economic history and past financial crises.



Like



Comment



Share

SUBSCRIBE 



Get these PDFs on

Our Telegram Group

<https://t.me/MBAKaro>





CAT 2025 Mock Tests

15 Full- Length Mocks
10 VARC Sectionals (Text Solutions)
10 DILR Sectionals (Video Solutions)
10 QA Sectionals (Video Solutions)



⌚ Expires On Nov 30, 2025

₹ 1,500



CAT and OMETs Mock Test Bundle

All Mocks Based on the Latest Exam Pattern

⌚ Expires On Apr 30, 2026

₹ 6,000

CAT 2025: 15 mocks + 10 sectionals each
NMAT 2025: 15 Mocks
SNAP 2025: 20 Mocks
XAT 2026: 5 Mocks
CMAT 2026: 10 Mocks
MAHCET 2026: 10 Mocks
CUET PG 2026: 10 Mocks
MICAT 2025: 5 Mocks
XGMT 2026: 5 Mocks
SRCC GBO 2026: 5 Mocks

NMAT – 15
SNAP – 20
XAT – 10
CMAT – 10
MAHCET – 20
CUET PG – 10
MICAT – 5
XGMT – 5
SRCC GBO - 5

CAT and OMETs Mocks by MBA Karo

Thank
You

