

CLAT Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 10

Duration: 24 Minutes

Maximum Marks: 24

Instructions

- This paper contains **24** Multiple Choice Questions (Single Correct Answer), modelled on the Logical Reasoning section of **CLAT** (Common Law Admission Test).
- Each correct answer carries **+1 mark**. There is a **negative marking of 0.25 marks** for every incorrect answer; unattempted questions carry no penalty.
- The paper has **four passages**, each presenting a short argument and followed by **six** questions. Answer **only** on the basis of the reasoning in the passage; do not use any outside information or opinion of your own.
- CLAT is an offline pen-and-paper (OMR) test with no sectional time limit; attempt this practice paper in one timed sitting of about **24 minutes**.
- Use of mobile phones, calculators, dictionaries, or electronic gadgets is strictly prohibited.

Passage I

Directions (Q1–Q6): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

The district of Ashcombe has seen a wave of factory automation over the past few years, and several employers have replaced routine jobs with machines. Over the same period, the number of residents relying on short-term food aid has risen sharply. A policy writer notes that many of those affected are willing to work but cannot find steady employment, and that the patchwork of existing benefits is confusing, slow to reach people, and easy to fall through.

The writer proposes a bold answer. Ashcombe, she argues, should pay every adult resident a fixed monthly sum, a universal basic income, regardless of whether they have



a job. Because the payment would arrive automatically and go to everyone, no needy resident could be missed, and people would have a secure floor beneath them while they retrain or look for new work. She therefore urges the district council to replace its tangle of benefits with a single universal basic income for all adults. She adds that the scheme would also cut the paperwork the benefits office now handles, though she treats this saving as a pleasant extra rather than the main reason for the change. Others in Ashcombe are cautious. They observe that a payment large enough to live on, handed to every adult whether rich or poor, would cost far more than the present system, and they question where the money would come from.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the writer's argument?
- (A) Automation has replaced many routine jobs in Ashcombe's factories.
 - (B) The universal basic income would cut the paperwork the benefits office now handles.
 - (C) The district council should replace its tangle of benefits with a single universal basic income for all adults.
 - (D) The number of residents relying on short-term food aid has risen sharply.
- Q2.** The writer's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) A fixed sum paid to every adult can be set high enough to serve as the secure floor she describes.
 - (B) Every adult in Ashcombe currently receives some form of benefit.
 - (C) No resident of Ashcombe would ever stop looking for work once the payment began.
 - (D) The benefits office employs more staff than any other council department.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the writer's argument?
- (A) Many Ashcombe residents say the current benefits forms are hard to fill in.



- (B) The council has managed to raise local taxes without much protest in the past.
- (C) Some of the automated factories still employ a handful of workers.
- (D) In a comparable district that replaced its benefits with a universal basic income, hardship fell and no eligible resident was left unaided.

Q4. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the writer's argument?

- (A) Some residents who lost factory jobs have already found new work elsewhere.
- (B) Spreading the same budget across every adult, rich and poor alike, would leave each poor resident with less support than the present targeted benefits provide.
- (C) A few council members personally dislike the idea of universal payments.
- (D) The benefits office is housed in an old and cramped building.

Q5. Which of the following is best supported by the passage?

- (A) If the universal payment were too small to live on, the writer's case that it provides a secure floor would be weakened.
- (B) Automation will soon disappear from Ashcombe's factories altogether.
- (C) The current benefits already reach every needy resident without fail.
- (D) The council has already agreed to introduce the payment.

Q6. The writer's reasoning is most open to the objection that it:

- (A) assumes that automation will continue at the same pace forever.
- (B) relies on figures about food aid that the passage says were invented.
- (C) concludes that no resident should ever be required to work.
- (D) treats the fact that the payment reaches everyone as enough to justify replacing the whole system, without showing the money would stretch to give each needy person as much support as before.



Passage II

Directions (Q7–Q12): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

For years, researchers have tested how the mind ages, and one finding is often repeated: adults who speak two languages fluently tend to score better on tasks that measure memory and the ability to switch attention between jobs than adults who speak only one. In some studies, the signs of ordinary mental decline appear a few years later in bilingual people than in others.

A member of the Brindley school board points to these findings. Learning a second language, he argues, sharpens the mind. If speaking two languages keeps the memory sharp and the attention flexible, then teaching every child a second language would strengthen their thinking in the same way. He therefore proposes that the board make a second language a compulsory subject for all pupils from an early age, so that every child gains these mental benefits. He mentions, too, that pupils would be able to speak to more people when they travel, though he calls this a minor bonus next to the boost to their thinking.

Other board members are not so sure. They point out that the adults in the studies were not chosen at random. People who become fluent in a second language, they note, often differ from others in ways that could explain their sharper minds: many spent longer in education, took up music and other demanding hobbies, or grew up in homes full of books and conversation. Any of these, the critics suggest, might account for both the language and the stronger memory, without the one causing the other.

Q7. What is the main conclusion the board member draws?

- (A) Adults who speak two languages tend to score better on memory tests.
- (B) The board should make a second language a compulsory subject for all pupils from an early age.
- (C) Pupils who learn a second language will be able to speak to more people when they travel.
- (D) Signs of mental decline appear a few years later in some bilingual adults.

Q8. The board member's argument assumes which of the following?

- (A) Every pupil at Brindley wants to learn a second language.



- (B) A second language is easier to learn in childhood than in adulthood.
- (C) It is speaking a second language, rather than some other feature of the bilingual adults, that produces their sharper minds.
- (D) The board can afford to hire enough new language teachers.

Q9. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the board member's argument?

- (A) In a study where children were randomly assigned either to learn a second language or not, those who learned one later scored higher on memory and attention tests.
- (B) Many pupils say they would enjoy learning a second language.
- (C) Brindley's neighbouring district also teaches second languages.
- (D) Several famous writers have been fluent in several languages.

Q10. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the board member's argument?

- (A) Some pupils at Brindley already speak a second language at home.
- (B) Learning a language well takes several years of regular practice.
- (C) The board member does not himself speak a second language.
- (D) When bilingual and monolingual adults were matched for years of education and for hobbies like music, the gap in their memory scores vanished.

Q11. Which of the following is best supported by the passage as a whole?

- (A) Learning a second language always guarantees a sharper memory.
- (B) If the bilingual adults' sharper minds are due to their extra education and hobbies rather than the language, then making children learn a language need not sharpen their thinking.
- (C) Monolingual adults never perform well on memory tests.
- (D) The board has already voted to make a second language compulsory.



- Q12.** In the argument, the statement that pupils would be able to speak to more people when they travel serves as:
- (A) a subsidiary benefit that the speaker treats as minor, not the main ground for his proposal.
 - (B) the main conclusion that the rest of the argument is meant to support.
 - (C) an objection raised by the other board members.
 - (D) the chief evidence that speaking two languages sharpens the mind.

Passage III

Directions (Q13–Q18): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

The town of Harnwell draws its water from a single reservoir that has run low in recent dry summers. Looking for a way to cut demand, the water authority studied its own records and found a striking pattern. Households that are billed by the litre, through a water meter, use noticeably less water each month than households that pay a flat annual charge no matter how much they use. In the driest month of last year, metered homes used almost a quarter less water than unmetered ones.

An official at the authority draws a firm lesson. Since metered households use less water, he argues, fitting a meter to every home and charging each of them by the litre would bring the town's water use down. He recommends that the authority install meters in all remaining homes and switch the whole town to charging by the litre, so that the reservoir is no longer drained so quickly. He remarks that the change would also make each family's bill match what it actually uses, though he presents this fairness as a secondary point.

Residents' groups are doubtful. They point out that the homes already on meters were not a random selection. Meters, they note, were first offered to households that asked for them, and the families who volunteered were mostly small households, or people already keen to save water and money. Larger families, and those less careful about waste, mostly stayed on the flat charge. The lower usage in metered homes, the groups suggest, may simply reflect who chose to have a meter in the first place, rather than any effect of the meter itself.

- Q13.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the official's argument?
- (A) Metered households use noticeably less water than unmetered ones.
 - (B) The change would make each family's bill match what it actually uses.



- (C) The authority should install meters in all remaining homes and charge the whole town by the litre.
- (D) Harnwell's reservoir has run low in recent dry summers.

Q14. The official's argument assumes that:

- (A) every household in Harnwell wants a water meter.
- (B) fitting a meter to a home causes that household to use less water, rather than the lower use merely reflecting which households chose meters.
- (C) the reservoir is the only source of water available to the town.
- (D) water meters are cheaper to install than they are to maintain.

Q15. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the official's argument?

- (A) Residents say that metered bills are easier to understand than flat charges.
- (B) The reservoir is fed only by rainfall in the surrounding hills.
- (C) Some households own large gardens that need regular watering.
- (D) When meters were fitted to a randomly chosen set of ordinary homes, those homes used markedly less water than they had before the meters were installed.

Q16. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the official's argument?

- (A) The lower usage of metered homes is fully explained by their being small, water-conscious households that chose meters, not by the meters themselves.
- (B) A few metered households use more water than the town average.
- (C) Installing a meter takes a plumber about an hour per home.
- (D) The reservoir also loses some water to evaporation in hot weather.



- Q17.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage?
- (A) Metered homes will always use less water than unmetered ones in every town.
 - (B) Harnwell's reservoir will never run low again once meters are fitted.
 - (C) If the lower usage reflects which households chose meters rather than the meters themselves, fitting meters to every home might not cut the town's water use.
 - (D) Water meters have no effect whatever on anyone's water use.
- Q18.** Which of the following arguments is most similar in its reasoning to the official's argument?
- (A) Every book on this shelf is a novel, so this book, taken from the shelf, is a novel.
 - (B) The sun has risen every morning so far, so it will very probably rise tomorrow.
 - (C) This tonic cured my cold and my cousin's cold, so it is a reliable cure for colds.
 - (D) People who join the town choir are healthier than those who do not, so signing everyone up for the choir would make the town healthier.

Passage IV

Directions (Q19–Q24): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

The grasslands around Sable River are home to elephants, big cats and rare birds, and like many wild places they are expensive to protect. Rangers must be paid, fences mended and poachers driven off, and the money for all this is hard to find. Supporters of wildlife tourism point to an encouraging fact. Across the region, the reserves that draw the largest numbers of paying safari visitors also tend to have the healthiest animal populations and the best-funded teams of rangers.

A tour operator builds a case on this. Since the reserves that attract the most tourists have the most thriving wildlife, he argues, opening more of the region's wild land to safari lodges and visitors is the surest way to protect its animals. The fees that tourists pay, he says, would fund the rangers and fences that wildlife needs, and so he urges the regional authority to license new lodges and safari routes across as much of the wild



land as possible. He notes in passing that the lodges would also create jobs for local people, but treats this as a welcome extra rather than his main reason.

Conservation scientists are wary. They observe that the reserves crowded with tourists are also, for the most part, the ones that were already the richest in wildlife and the best organised, which is precisely why tourists chose them. Elsewhere, they warn, heavy tourist traffic can do harm: vehicles crowding around animals disturb their hunting and breeding, and hastily built lodges can eat into the very habitat the animals depend on. The link between visitors and thriving wildlife, they suggest, may run the other way, or may not hold at all where tourism is forced on fragile land.

- Q19.** What is the main conclusion of the tour operator's argument?
- (A) Reserves with the most safari visitors tend to have the healthiest animal populations.
 - (B) The regional authority should license new lodges and safari routes across as much of the wild land as possible.
 - (C) Safari lodges would create jobs for local people.
 - (D) Protecting wild land is expensive because rangers and fences cost money.
- Q20.** The tour operator's argument assumes that:
- (A) every local resident supports the building of new safari lodges.
 - (B) safari visitors prefer staying in lodges to camping in the open.
 - (C) it is the tourist traffic that produces the thriving wildlife, rather than thriving wildlife being what draws the tourists.
 - (D) the regional authority owns all the wild land in the region.
- Q21.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the tour operator's argument?
- (A) Several reserves that were newly opened to safari tourism used the visitor fees to hire rangers, and their wildlife populations grew in the years that followed.
 - (B) Safari tourists often say that seeing elephants is what they enjoy most.



- (C) Some lodges are far more expensive to stay in than others.
- (D) The region is home to several bird species found nowhere else on earth.

Q22. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the tour operator's argument?

- (A) A few tourists litter or ignore the rangers' instructions.
- (B) When safari tourism was pushed into previously quiet reserves, the crowds of vehicles and hastily built lodges disturbed the animals so much that their numbers fell.
- (C) Some reserves charge higher entry fees than others.
- (D) A number of tourists visit the region only during the cooler months.

Q23. Which of the following is best supported by the passage as a whole?

- (A) Safari tourism will soon be banned across the whole region.
- (B) No reserve can ever be protected unless tourists visit it.
- (C) Local people never gain any benefit from safari lodges.
- (D) If thriving wildlife is what draws the tourists rather than the other way round, opening new land to tourism need not protect its animals.

Q24. The tour operator's reasoning is most open to the objection that it:

- (A) denies that protecting wildlife costs any money at all.
- (B) assumes that no tourist has ever visited a struggling reserve.
- (C) treats the tourists as the cause of the thriving wildlife, when thriving wildlife may instead be what attracts the tourists.
- (D) relies on visitor numbers that the passage says were invented.



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion, that is, the single claim the whole argument is put forward to support.

Reasoning: The writer gives several facts (automation, rising food aid, a confusing benefits system) as reasons. These reasons all build towards one recommendation. That recommendation is that the council should replace its benefits with a universal basic income for all adults. Everything else in the passage is offered to support this call to act.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is a background fact about automation, not the point being argued for.
- Option B: The paperwork saving is expressly called a pleasant extra, not the main aim.
- Option D: The rise in food aid is supporting evidence, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The recommendation to adopt a universal basic income is the conclusion ⇒

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q1](#)

Q2.

Solution

What is asked: the unstated assumption the argument needs in order to work.

Reasoning: The writer promises that the payment would give people “a secure floor beneath them”. A payment can only be a secure floor if it is large enough to actually live on. If the fixed sum were tiny, it would not provide the security she claims. So the argument must assume the sum can be set high enough to serve as that floor.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The argument does not need everyone to already receive a benefit; it says some fall through.
- Option C: The case does not require that no one ever stops job-hunting; she speaks of support while people retrain.



- Option D: The size of the benefits office staff is irrelevant to the health of the argument.

Final Answer: A payment large enough to be a floor is the needed assumption ⇒

A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q2](#)

Q3.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the argument for a universal basic income.

Reasoning: The doubt is whether a universal payment would really reduce hardship better than the present system. Evidence that it has done so elsewhere would directly support the recommendation. Option D reports a comparable district where a basic income cut hardship and missed no eligible resident. This is real evidence that the scheme works as the writer claims, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Hard-to-fill forms are a minor complaint, not evidence the new scheme works.
- Option B: Past tax rises show money can be raised, not that the basic income reduces hardship.
- Option C: A few workers remaining says nothing about whether the payment helps the needy.

Final Answer: Evidence the scheme cut hardship elsewhere strengthens it ⇒ D

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q3](#)

Q4.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the argument.

Reasoning: The writer's aim is to give needy residents a secure floor of support. Option B says that spreading the same budget across everyone, rich and poor, would leave each poor resident with less than the present targeted benefits give. If the poorest end up worse off, the scheme defeats its own purpose. That directly



undercuts the case for replacing benefits with a universal payment, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few people finding new work does not show the scheme fails the needy.
- Option C: Council members' personal dislike is a political point, not evidence about the effect.
- Option D: The state of the office building is irrelevant to whether the scheme helps people.

Final Answer: Leaving the poor worse off defeats the aim \Rightarrow **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q4](#)

Q5.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage.

Reasoning: The writer's case rests on the payment being a secure floor people can live on. It follows that if the payment were too small to live on, that case would be undermined. Option A states exactly this conditional, which the argument's own structure supports. So A is the best-supported statement.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Nothing says automation will soon disappear; the passage suggests the opposite.
- Option C: The passage says the present benefits are easy to fall through, not that they reach everyone.
- Option D: There is no sign the council has already agreed to the payment.

Final Answer: The conditional about a too-small payment is supported \Rightarrow **A**

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q5](#)



Q6.

Solution

What is asked: the flaw the reasoning is most open to.

Reasoning: The writer's key move is that a payment to everyone automatically misses no needy resident. From "it reaches everyone" she jumps to "it is the best replacement for the whole system". But reaching everyone does not show the money will stretch to give each needy person as much support as before. Spreading a fixed budget over the rich as well as the poor could thin the help each needy person receives, which she never addresses.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not depend on automation lasting forever.
- Option B: The passage treats the food-aid figures as genuine, not invented.
- Option C: She never concludes that no one should be required to work.

Final Answer: It treats "reaches everyone" as enough, ignoring whether the money stretches ⇒

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q6](#)

Q7.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion the board member draws.

Reasoning: The board member cites the studies on bilingual adults as his reason. He uses them to urge a specific action. That action is to make a second language a compulsory subject for all pupils from an early age. This recommendation is what his argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The test scores of bilingual adults are a premise, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The travel benefit is expressly called a minor bonus, not the main point.
- Option D: Later mental decline is background evidence, not the point argued for.

Final Answer: The call for compulsory second-language lessons is the conclusion ⇒



Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q7](#)

Q8.

Solution

What is asked: the assumption on which the board member's argument depends.

Reasoning: He moves from "bilingual adults have sharper minds" to "learning a language sharpens the mind". That step works only if the language, and not some other feature of those adults, is what sharpens them. The critics point out other possible causes such as extra education and demanding hobbies. So his argument must assume it is the language itself, not those other features, that produces the sharper minds.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Whether pupils want to learn is irrelevant to the claim about mental benefit.
- Option B: Ease of learning in childhood is not something his causal claim needs.
- Option D: Affordability of teachers is a practical detail, not the core assumption.

Final Answer: He assumes the language, not other features, causes the sharper minds ⇒ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q8](#)

Q9.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the board member's argument.

Reasoning: His claim is stronger if learning a language, by itself, improves thinking. Option A describes a study where children were randomly assigned to learn a language or not. Random assignment removes the other differences the critics worry about, so any later gain must come from the language. The children who learned one scored higher, which directly supports his causal claim.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Pupils enjoying lessons says nothing about a boost to thinking.
- Option C: What a neighbouring district does is irrelevant to the causal claim.



- Option D: A few multilingual writers are an anecdote, not evidence that the language caused their ability.

Final Answer: A randomised study isolating the language strengthens it ⇒

Answer: [Go Back to Q9](#)

Q10.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the board member's argument.

Reasoning: He blames the second language for the bilingual adults' sharper minds. Option D says that once bilingual and monolingual adults were matched for education and hobbies, the memory gap vanished. If the gap disappears when those other factors are held equal, then the language was not what produced it. That removes the basis for his causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Some pupils already being bilingual does not bear on whether the language sharpens minds.
- Option B: The time a language takes to learn is a cost, not evidence against the benefit.
- Option C: The member's own languages are irrelevant to the cause of the effect.

Final Answer: The gap vanishing when other factors are matched undercuts the cause ⇒

Answer: [Go Back to Q10](#)

Q11.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage as a whole.

Reasoning: The passage sets the member's causal claim against rival causes raised by the critics. If the sharper minds are really due to extra education and demanding hobbies, then the language is not doing the work. In that case making children learn a language need not sharpen their thinking. Option B draws exactly this supported conclusion.

Why the other options are wrong:



- Option A: “Always guarantees” is far too strong and unsupported.
- Option C: “Never perform well” overstates the case; monolingual adults simply score a little lower on average.
- Option D: Nothing says the board has already voted on the matter.

Final Answer: If other factors explain the gap, teaching a language need not sharpen minds ⇒ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q11](#)

Q12.

Solution

What is asked: the role played by one particular statement in the argument.

Reasoning: The statement that pupils could speak to more people when they travel is a further point in the language’s favour. The member explicitly calls it a minor bonus next to the boost to thinking. So it is a small side benefit, not the ground on which his proposal rests. A claim offered as a lesser, secondary advantage plays the role of a subsidiary benefit.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The main conclusion is the call for compulsory lessons, not this travel point.
- Option C: It is the member’s own point, not an objection from the other board members.
- Option D: It is about travel, not evidence that the language sharpens the mind.

Final Answer: It is a minor side benefit, not the main ground ⇒ **A**

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q12](#)

Q13.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion of the official’s argument.

Reasoning: The official cites the pattern that metered homes use less water as his reason. He uses it to urge a specific action. That action is to install meters in all remaining homes and charge the whole town by the litre. This recommendation is what his argument is meant to establish.



Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The lower usage of metered homes is his premise, not the conclusion.
- Option B: The fairer bills point is expressly called a secondary point.
- Option D: The low reservoir is background that sets up the problem, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The plan to meter every home is the conclusion \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q13](#)

Q14.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the official's plan depends on.

Reasoning: The official expects that fitting meters to all homes will cut the town's water use. That expectation works only if the meter itself makes a household use less. The residents' groups warn that the low usage may just reflect which households chose meters. So his argument must assume the meter causes the lower use, rather than the lower use reflecting self-selection, which is option B.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The plan does not require every household to want a meter.
- Option C: Whether the reservoir is the only source does not bear on whether meters cut use.
- Option D: Relative install and upkeep costs are irrelevant to the causal claim.

Final Answer: He assumes the meter, not self-selection, causes lower use \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q14](#)

Q15.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the official's argument.

Reasoning: The doubt is whether the meter itself cuts water use or whether careful households simply chose meters. Option D describes meters fitted to a randomly chosen set of ordinary homes. Random choice removes the self-selection worry, so any drop must come from the meter. Those homes then used markedly



less than before, which directly supports his causal claim.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Easier-to-read bills say nothing about how much water is used.
- Option B: How the reservoir is fed is irrelevant to whether meters cut demand.
- Option C: Some homes having thirsty gardens does not show the meter cuts use.

Final Answer: Meters cutting use in randomly chosen homes strengthens it ⇒ **D**

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q15](#)

Q16.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the official's argument.

Reasoning: The argument leaps from “metered homes use less” to “meters make homes use less”. Option A says the lower usage is fully explained by those homes being small, water-conscious households that chose meters. If who chose the meter, not the meter, explains the low usage, then fitting meters to everyone need not cut use. That removes the basis for the plan, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: A few heavy users do not overturn the general pattern the official relies on.
- Option C: The time to install a meter is a practical detail, not a challenge to the effect.
- Option D: Evaporation from the reservoir is a separate loss, not about household behaviour.

Final Answer: Self-selection, not the meter, explaining the low use undercuts it ⇒ **A**

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q16](#)



Q17.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage.

Reasoning: The residents' groups point out that the metered homes were self-selected, mostly small and water-conscious. If their low usage reflects who they are rather than the meter, the correlation does not prove the meter works. Then fitting meters to every home, including larger and less careful ones, might not cut the town's water use. Option C states precisely this cautious, supported conditional.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Always, in every town" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option B: "Never run low again" is an overstatement the passage does not back.
- Option D: "No effect whatever" overstates the case; the passage does not deny meters any effect.

Final Answer: Metering everyone might not cut use if self-selection explains the pattern ⇒

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q17](#)

Q18.

Solution

What is asked: the argument whose reasoning most closely parallels the official's.

Reasoning: His reasoning is: a group that chose something (meters) shows a good result (low use), so forcing that thing on everyone will produce the result, ignoring who chose it. Option D has the same shape: choir members are healthier, so signing everyone up would make the town healthier. Both leap from a correlation among self-selected people to a policy imposed on all, overlooking that the healthy (or thrifty) chose it in the first place. So option D is the closest parallel.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This applies a known general rule to a case; the reasoning is valid, not the flawed pattern.
- Option B: This is prediction from many past cases, not a self-selected-correlation leap.
- Option C: This generalises from two successes; it is weak induction, not the



self-selection pattern.

Final Answer: The choir argument matches the self-selection pattern \Rightarrow **D**

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q18](#)

Q19.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion of the tour operator's argument.

Reasoning: The operator starts from the fact that reserves with the most tourists have the most thriving wildlife. He turns this into a recommendation for the authority. His recommendation is to license new lodges and safari routes across as much wild land as possible. That call to act is the conclusion his argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The link between visitors and healthy wildlife is his premise, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The jobs point is expressly treated as a welcome extra, not the main reason.
- Option D: The cost of protection is background, not the point argued for.

Final Answer: The call to license new lodges is the conclusion \Rightarrow **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q19](#)

Q20.

Solution

What is asked: the assumption behind the operator's argument.

Reasoning: He infers that adding tourism to new land will make its wildlife thrive. That works only if tourism is what produces thriving wildlife. But the scientists note the link may run the other way: thriving wildlife is what drew the tourists. So his argument must assume the tourism produces the thriving wildlife, not the reverse, which is option C.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The plan does not need every local resident's support.
- Option B: Where tourists prefer to sleep is irrelevant to the conservation



claim.

- Option D: Who owns the land does not bear on whether tourism protects wildlife.

Final Answer: He assumes tourism causes the thriving wildlife, not the reverse ⇒

C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q20](#)

Q21.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the operator's argument.

Reasoning: His claim is stronger if opening land to tourism actually causes wildlife to recover. Option A describes reserves newly opened to tourism that spent the fees on rangers and then saw their wildlife grow. Here tourism came first and the wildlife improved afterwards, which points to tourism as the cause. This directly supports his causal claim, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: What tourists most enjoy seeing says nothing about conservation.
- Option C: Differences in lodge prices are irrelevant to whether tourism protects wildlife.
- Option D: Rare birds make the region special but do not show tourism causes thriving wildlife.

Final Answer: Wildlife recovering after tourism was introduced strengthens it ⇒

A

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q21](#)

Q22.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens the operator's argument.

Reasoning: His plan is to protect wildlife by pushing tourism onto more wild land. Option B says that when tourism was pushed into previously quiet reserves, the crowds and new lodges disturbed the animals so much that their numbers fell. If expanding tourism actually harms wildlife where it is forced on, the plan defeats its own goal. That directly attacks the recommendation, so it most weakens the



argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few careless tourists are a minor issue, not evidence the plan harms wildlife overall.
- Option C: Differences in entry fees are beside the point about conservation.
- Option D: The season tourists visit in does not bear on whether tourism protects animals.

Final Answer: Expanded tourism cutting animal numbers defeats the aim ⇒ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q22](#)

Q23.

Solution

What is asked: the statement best supported by the passage as a whole.

Reasoning: The scientists warn that thriving wildlife may be what drew the tourists, not the other way round. If the healthy reserves attracted the tourists rather than tourism making them healthy, the correlation does not prove tourism protects animals. Then opening new land to tourism need not protect its wildlife, and may even harm it. Option D states this supported conditional exactly.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage does not predict a ban on tourism.
- Option B: “No reserve can ever” be protected without tourists is far too absolute.
- Option C: The passage says lodges would create local jobs, so “never benefit” is unsupported.

Final Answer: If wildlife draws the tourists, new tourism need not protect animals ⇒ **D**

Answer: (D) [Go Back to Q23](#)



Q24.

Solution

What is asked: the objection the reasoning is most open to.

Reasoning: The operator sees that reserves with many tourists have thriving wildlife and concludes tourism makes wildlife thrive. But the healthy, well-run reserves may simply be the ones that attracted the tourists in the first place. Treating the tourists as the cause, when the thriving wildlife may be what attracts them, reverses cause and effect. Option C names exactly this objection.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument accepts that protection costs money; it does not deny it.
- Option B: It never assumes no tourist has visited a struggling reserve.
- Option D: The passage treats the visitor numbers as genuine, not invented.

Final Answer: It may reverse cause and effect between tourism and thriving wildlife ⇒

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q24](#)



Answer Key

Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans	Q	Ans
1	C	2	A	3	D	4	B	5	A
6	D	7	B	8	C	9	A	10	D
11	B	12	A	13	C	14	B	15	D
16	A	17	C	18	D	19	B	20	C
21	A	22	B	23	D	24	C		

