

CLAT Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 2

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 state of Anverra spends heavily each year importing coal to run its power stations, and its electricity bills are among the highest in the region. An energy analyst, Priya Deshmukh, has put a proposal to the state assembly. At present, she notes, very few households install rooftop solar panels, chiefly because the upfront cost of a system runs to tens of thousands of rupees, far more than an average family can spare in a single payment. Deshmukh argues that if the state paid a subsidy covering half of that upfront cost, many more families would find solar affordable and would install it. As more homes generate their own power, she reasons, the state would burn less imported



coal, household bills would fall, and the subsidy would in time pay for itself through lower fuel imports. She therefore urges the assembly to fund a generous household solar subsidy.

Members of the assembly's budget committee are cautious. They observe that in a neighbouring state a similar subsidy was taken up mostly by wealthier households who could have afforded panels anyway, so much of the money simply rewarded purchases that would have happened without it. They add that a solar panel produces little on cloudy days and nothing at night, so subsidised homes would still draw heavily on the coal-fired grid after dark. The upfront cost, moreover, is only part of the barrier: many homes are rented, and tenants have no reason to pay for panels that stay with the landlord's roof.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of Deshmukh's argument?
- (A) The upfront cost of a rooftop solar system is beyond most families' reach in a single payment.
 - (B) Anverra spends heavily importing coal and has some of the highest electricity bills in the region.
 - (C) The state assembly should fund a generous household solar subsidy.
 - (D) A subsidised solar panel produces nothing at night.
- Q2.** Deshmukh's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) Solar panels never need any maintenance once they are installed.
 - (B) Cutting the upfront cost will in fact lead many families who would not otherwise install solar to do so.
 - (C) Coal is the only fuel that Anverra's power stations are able to burn.
 - (D) Every family in Anverra would rather have solar power than grid power.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen Deshmukh's argument?
- (A) Many families in Anverra say they admire the appearance of rooftop solar panels.
 - (B) Solar technology has been commercially available for several decades.
 - (C) The assembly has subsidised farm equipment on earlier occasions.



(D) In a comparable state, a half-cost solar subsidy prompted large numbers of previously non-solar families to install panels, and that state's coal imports fell sharply.

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

(A) Most of the subsidy would be claimed by well-off households that would have installed solar panels even without any subsidy.

(B) Some families enjoy the independence of generating their own electricity.

(C) A few assembly members personally dislike government subsidies of any kind.

(D) Solar panels are manufactured in several different countries.

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

(A) The subsidy will completely end Anverra's need to import any coal.

(B) No family in Anverra can currently afford a solar panel of any kind.

(C) Even homes fitted with subsidised panels would still rely on the coal-fired grid after dark.

(D) The assembly has already agreed to fund the proposed subsidy.

Q6. In the argument, the statement that the upfront cost of a solar system is far more than an average family can spare in a single payment serves as:

(A) a premise explaining why few families install solar now, which supports the case for a subsidy.

(B) the main conclusion that the rest of the argument is meant to prove.

(C) an objection to the subsidy that Deshmukh goes on to reject.

(D) an unrelated remark included only as background colour.

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.



The Fenwick school district measures its schools mainly through an annual standardised test in reading and mathematics. A board member, Alan Rowe, wants the district to go further and test pupils three times a year across a wider range of subjects. He points out that since the annual test was introduced, average reading scores across the district have risen steadily. Frequent testing, he argues, keeps teachers focused on results and lets the district spot struggling pupils early. If one annual test has already lifted reading scores, he reasons, testing more often and in more subjects would lift achievement further still. He therefore recommends that the district expand standardised testing to three sittings a year covering reading, mathematics, science and history.

Several teachers object. They note that the rise in reading scores began the same year the district hired a large number of new reading specialists and cut class sizes, changes that could by themselves explain the improvement. They warn that tripling the number of tests would consume weeks of teaching time and push teachers to drill pupils narrowly for the exams rather than teach the subjects in depth. Some parents add that the youngest pupils already find the single annual test stressful, and that more frequent testing might harm rather than help their learning.

Q7. What is the main conclusion Alan Rowe draws?

- (A) Average reading scores across the district have risen steadily.
- (B) The district should expand standardised testing to three sittings a year covering four subjects.
- (C) The youngest pupils already find the single annual test stressful.
- (D) The district recently hired a large number of new reading specialists.

Q8. Rowe's argument assumes which of the following?

- (A) Teachers enjoy administering standardised tests to their pupils.
- (B) Science and history are easier to test than reading and mathematics.
- (C) Parents take no interest in their children's test results.
- (D) The rise in reading scores was produced by the testing itself, not by the other changes made in the same year.

Q9. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen Rowe's conclusion?

- (A) Standardised tests can be marked quickly and cheaply by machine.



- (B) Rowe has served on the school board for many years.
- (C) A comparable district that added more frequent testing, without hiring new staff or cutting class sizes, saw achievement rise across all the tested subjects.
- (D) Most pupils say they prefer shorter tests to longer ones.

Q10. Which of the following, if true, would most weaken Rowe's conclusion?

- (A) The rise in reading scores can be fully explained by the new reading specialists and the smaller class sizes introduced in the same year, not by the testing.
- (B) A few pupils in the district have changed schools during the year.
- (C) Standardised testing is also used in many other school districts.
- (D) The district's history syllabus is longer than its science syllabus.

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

- (A) Standardised testing always lowers the quality of teaching.
- (B) The district's reading scores will certainly fall if testing is expanded.
- (C) Frequent testing is the only way to spot struggling pupils early.
- (D) If the new specialists and smaller classes caused the reading gains, expanding testing need not raise achievement further.

Q12. Rowe's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:

- (A) assumes that pupils dislike being tested more than once a year.
- (B) treats the rise in scores that merely followed the annual test as though the test must have caused it, ignoring other changes made at the same time.
- (C) relies on figures that the passage says were invented.
- (D) assumes that no pupil has ever failed a standardised test.

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.



Teachers at Brookhill College complain that students find it harder than ever to concentrate on a long reading or a full lecture. A commentator, Dev Malhotra, blames social media. He notes that the same years in which students' attention spans seem to have shortened are the years in which the average student has come to spend several hours a day on social-media apps. These apps, he observes, are built around very short clips and a constant stream of new posts, training users to switch focus every few seconds. Because heavy social-media use has grown alongside falling attention spans, Malhotra concludes that the apps are the cause, and he urges the college to bar students from using social media anywhere on campus.

Others are doubtful. They point out that the students who struggle most to concentrate are often the same ones who sleep poorly and juggle long hours at part-time jobs, pressures that could wear down anyone's focus regardless of social media. They note, too, that some heavy users of these apps concentrate perfectly well on their studies. And a campus ban, they argue, would be easy to evade using mobile data and hard to enforce, so even if the apps did harm focus, the proposed rule might change very little.

- Q13.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of Malhotra's argument?
- (A) The college should bar students from using social media anywhere on campus.
 - (B) Social-media apps are built around short clips and a constant stream of new posts.
 - (C) Students today spend several hours a day on social media.
 - (D) Some heavy users of social media concentrate perfectly well on their studies.
- Q14.** Malhotra's argument assumes that:
- (A) every student at the college uses social media every single day.
 - (B) social-media companies deliberately set out to harm students.
 - (C) the decline in attention spans was caused by social-media use rather than by other pressures on students.
 - (D) reading long texts is the most important skill a college can teach.
- Q15.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen Malhotra's argument?



- (A) Many students say they would find a campus ban on social media annoying.
- (B) Social-media apps have grown more popular with each passing year.
- (C) Malhotra has taught at the college for more than two decades.
- (D) In a controlled study, students who stopped using social media for a term improved their concentration, while similar students who kept using it did not.

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

- (A) A few teachers at the college also use social media in their spare time.
- (B) The students who concentrate worst are mainly those who sleep badly and work long part-time hours, strains that could reduce anyone's focus.
- (C) Social-media apps are used by students in many colleges around the world.
- (D) Some lectures at the college run for longer than a single hour.

Q17. Which of the following is best supported by the passage?

- (A) If poor sleep and long working hours explain the weak concentration, a social-media ban need not restore students' focus.
- (B) Social media has no effect at all on anyone's concentration.
- (C) Students who use social media can never concentrate on their studies.
- (D) The college will certainly improve its results by banning social media.

Q18. Which of the following arguments is most similar in its reasoning to Malhotra's argument?

- (A) Every book in the library has a catalogue number, so this particular book will have one too.



- (B) This tonic eased my cough and my cousin's, so it must be a dependable remedy for coughs.
- (C) Offices with more houseplants tend to report happier staff, so adding houseplants to an office will make its staff happier.
- (D) The last three trains on this line ran late, so the next train will probably run late as well.

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 coastal town of Marisint has a litter problem: thin single-use plastic bags blow into the harbour and tangle in the nets of local fishermen. A councillor, Nadia Fontaine, proposes that all shops in the town be forbidden from handing out single-use plastic bags. Such bags, she argues, are used for a few minutes and then thrown away, yet they last for decades in the sea and are a visible part of the town's litter. If shops stopped giving them out, she reasons, shoppers would bring reusable bags instead, the flow of plastic into the harbour would dry up, and the town's beaches and waters would grow cleaner. She therefore urges the council to pass the ban.

Shopkeepers and some residents raise doubts. In a nearby town that banned these bags, they note, shoppers largely switched to thicker "reusable" plastic bags that are handed out just as freely, so the total weight of plastic sold actually rose. They add that surveys of the harbour's litter found that most of it comes not from shopping bags at all but from discarded fishing gear and drink bottles washed in on the tide. A ban on shop bags, they argue, would inconvenience shoppers while leaving the main sources of the litter untouched.

Q19. What is the main conclusion of Fontaine's argument?

- (A) Single-use plastic bags can last for decades in the sea.
- (B) The council should forbid all shops in the town from handing out single-use plastic bags.
- (C) Most of the harbour's litter comes from discarded fishing gear.
- (D) Shoppers would bring reusable bags if shops stopped giving out plastic ones.

Q20. Fontaine's argument assumes that:



- (A) every shopper in the town currently uses single-use plastic bags.
- (B) reusable bags are cheaper to produce than single-use plastic ones.
- (C) fishermen are the only people troubled by the town's litter.
- (D) removing single-use shop bags will actually reduce the total plastic reaching the harbour, rather than being offset by other bags.

Q21. Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen Fontaine's argument?

- (A) In a comparable coastal town, a ban on single-use shop bags was followed by a sharp fall in the plastic found in its harbour, with no rise in other bag use.
- (B) Many shoppers say they already own at least one reusable bag.
- (C) Plastic bags are produced in several different colours and sizes.
- (D) The council has banned other items in the town in the past.

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

- (A) A few shops in the town have already stopped offering plastic bags.
- (B) Some shoppers would find carrying reusable bags mildly inconvenient.
- (C) Surveys show that most of the harbour's litter comes from discarded fishing gear and drink bottles, not from shopping bags.
- (D) Plastic bags used in the town are manufactured elsewhere.

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

- (A) The harbour will become completely free of litter once the ban is passed.
- (B) No shopper in the town owns a reusable bag of any kind.
- (C) Discarded fishing gear is the only kind of litter found in the sea.
- (D) If most of the harbour's litter is not from shopping bags, banning those bags need not make the harbour much cleaner.



- Q24.** Fontaine's reasoning is most open to the objection that it:
- (A) assumes that plastic bags are the cheapest option available to the town's shops.
 - (B) assumes that removing single-use shop bags would clean the harbour, overlooking that these bags may be a minor source and that shoppers may switch to equally polluting substitutes.
 - (C) relies on litter figures that the passage says were invented.
 - (D) assumes that no shopper has ever reused a single-use plastic bag.



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Deshmukh offers several facts (costly coal imports, high bills, unaffordable upfront cost) as reasons. These reasons all build towards one recommendation. That recommendation is that the assembly should fund a generous household solar subsidy. Everything else in her paragraph is offered to support this call to act.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The high upfront cost is a supporting fact, not the point being argued for.
- Option B: The coal and bills point is background evidence, not the conclusion.
- Option D: The night-time point is raised by the critics, not Deshmukh's conclusion.

Final Answer: The recommendation to fund the subsidy is the conclusion \Rightarrow

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

Q2.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument runs: subsidy cuts the upfront cost, lower cost means many more families install solar, more solar means less coal and lower bills. The first link is that cutting the cost will actually cause many new installations. If the families who installed were ones who would have installed anyway, the subsidy would add nothing. So the argument must assume that cutting the cost brings in families who would not otherwise have installed.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need panels to be maintenance-free.
- Option C: Whether coal is the only usable fuel is irrelevant to the uptake chain.



- Option D: It needs many more families to install, not every family to prefer solar.

Final Answer: The cost-cut-causes-new-installs link is the needed assumption ⇒

B

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

Q3.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the argument for the subsidy.

Reasoning: The weak point is whether a subsidy really brings in new solar homes and cuts coal use. Evidence that this has happened elsewhere would directly support that chain. Option D reports that a comparable state's half-cost subsidy drew in many previously non-solar families and cut its coal imports. This is real evidence that the subsidy works as Deshmukh claims, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Admiring the look of panels does not show families will install them.
- Option B: How long the technology has existed says nothing about subsidy uptake.
- Option C: Past farm subsidies are a different case and prove nothing about solar uptake.

Final Answer: Evidence the subsidy drew new installs and cut coal elsewhere strengthens it ⇒ **D**

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

Q4.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes the subsidy causes many extra installations and eventually pays for itself. Option A says most of the money would go to well-off families who would have installed panels anyway. If that happened, the subsidy would fund purchases that needed no help and add few new solar homes. That breaks the link between the subsidy and the extra solar it is supposed to create, so



it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: A few enthusiasts do not show the subsidy adds new installations overall.
- Option C: Members disliking subsidies is a political point, not evidence about the effect.
- Option D: Where panels are made does not touch whether the subsidy raises uptake.

Final Answer: Most of the money rewarding purchases that would happen anyway defeats it ⇒

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

Q5.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The critics note that a solar panel produces little on cloudy days and nothing at night. It follows that a home relying on such panels still needs another source of power after dark. The only other source described is the coal-fired grid. So even subsidised homes would still draw on the coal-fired grid after dark, which is option C.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Completely end” is far stronger than anything the passage claims.
- Option B: The passage says few families install panels, not that none could ever afford one.
- Option D: Nothing says the assembly has already agreed to fund the subsidy.

Final Answer: Subsidised homes still rely on the coal grid at night ⇒

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



Q6.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The statement that the upfront cost is far more than a family can spare explains why so few install solar now. Deshmukh uses this to argue that a subsidy, by cutting that cost, would raise uptake. A claim offered to support the recommendation is a premise. So the statement functions as a premise supporting the case for a subsidy.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The main conclusion is the call for a subsidy, not this cost claim.
- Option C: It is asserted as true and relied upon, not raised as an objection to reject.
- Option D: It is central to the reasoning, not mere background colour.

Final Answer: It supports the recommendation, so it is a premise \Rightarrow **A**

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

Q7.

Solution

What is asked: Rowe's main conclusion.

Reasoning: Rowe cites rising reading scores and the benefits of testing as his reasons. He uses them to press for a specific change. That change is to expand standardised testing to three sittings a year across four subjects. The rest of his case is evidence leading to this recommendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Rising reading scores are his evidence, not his conclusion.
- Option C: The stress on young pupils is a point made by parents, not Rowe.
- Option D: The hiring of specialists is raised by the critics, not Rowe's conclusion.

Final Answer: The call to expand testing is the conclusion \Rightarrow **B**

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



Q8.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Rowe moves from "scores rose after the annual test began" to "the test raised the scores". That step works only if the test, and not the other changes of that year, produced the rise. So he must assume the rise came from the testing itself rather than from the new specialists and smaller classes. Option D states exactly this needed assumption.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Whether teachers enjoy testing is irrelevant to his claim.
- Option B: Ease of testing subjects is not something his argument needs.
- Option C: Parents' interest in results has no bearing on the causal claim.

Final Answer: He assumes testing, not the other changes, caused the rise ⇒ D

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

Q9.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens Rowe's conclusion.

Reasoning: His claim is stronger if more frequent testing, by itself, raises achievement. Option C describes a comparable district that added frequent testing while making no other change. Because staffing and class sizes stayed the same, any rise there points to the testing as the cause. This supports Rowe's causal claim, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Fast marking is a convenience, not evidence that testing raises achievement.
- Option B: Rowe's long service does not show his plan would work.
- Option D: A preference for shorter tests says nothing about achievement.

Final Answer: A like district that only added testing and improved strengthens it ⇒ C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q9](#)



Q10.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most weakens Rowe's conclusion.

Reasoning: Rowe credits the testing with the rise in reading scores. Option A offers a rival cause: the new reading specialists and smaller classes brought in the same year. If those changes fully explain the rise, the testing did not cause it, and more testing need not raise achievement. This rival explanation undercuts his causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: A few pupils changing schools is minor and does not explain the district-wide rise.
- Option C: Testing being common elsewhere does not bear on the cause here.
- Option D: The length of a syllabus is irrelevant to the causal claim.

Final Answer: Specialists and smaller classes offer a rival cause ⇒

Answer: (A) [Go Back to Q10](#)

Q11.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The passage sets Rowe's causal claim against a rival cause raised by teachers. If the new specialists and smaller classes caused the reading gains, the testing did not. In that case, adding more tests would not touch the real cause of the improvement. So expanding testing need not raise achievement further, which is option D.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Always lowers quality" is far too strong and unsupported.
- Option B: "Scores will certainly fall" is an overstatement the passage does not back.
- Option C: The passage does not say testing is the only way to spot struggling pupils.

Final Answer: If other changes caused the gains, more testing need not help ⇒

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



Q12.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Rowe sees that scores rose after the annual test began and concludes the test caused the rise. Treating “after this” as “because of this” is the post hoc error. Since new specialists and smaller classes arrived in the same year, the timing alone does not prove cause. Option B names exactly this flaw.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not rest on whether pupils dislike testing.
- Option C: The passage does not say the figures were invented; they are treated as real.
- Option D: The argument does not assume no pupil has ever failed a test.

Final Answer: It confuses “after” with “because of” ⇒

[Go Back to Q12](#)

Q13.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Malhotra points to the overlap between heavy app use and shrinking attention as his reason. He uses it to press for a specific action. That action is to bar students from using social media anywhere on campus. This recommendation is what his argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: How the apps are built is a supporting observation, not the conclusion.
- Option C: Hours spent on apps is a premise, not the point argued for.
- Option D: The point about untroubled heavy users is made by the critics, not Malhotra.

Final Answer: The call to ban campus social media is the conclusion ⇒

[Go Back to Q13](#)



Q14.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the argument depends on.

Reasoning: Malhotra moves from “app use rose while attention fell” to “the apps caused the fall”. That step works only if nothing else explains the drop in attention. So he must assume social media, not other pressures on students, caused the decline. Option C states exactly this needed assumption.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need every student to use the apps daily.
- Option B: It does not depend on any deliberate intent by the companies.
- Option D: Whether reading is the most important skill is beside the point.

Final Answer: He assumes the apps, not other pressures, caused the decline ⇒

C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q14](#)

Q15.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens Malhotra’s argument.

Reasoning: His claim is stronger if cutting social media actually improves concentration. Option D describes a controlled study where students who stopped using the apps improved while similar students who did not stayed the same. Holding the two groups alike and changing only app use isolates the apps as the cause. This directly supports his causal claim, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Students finding a ban annoying says nothing about whether apps harm focus.
- Option B: Growing popularity does not show the apps cause poor concentration.
- Option C: Malhotra’s long teaching career does not support the causal claim.

Final Answer: A controlled study isolating the apps strengthens it ⇒ D

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



Q16.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Malhotra blames social media for students' weak concentration. Option B offers a rival cause: those who focus worst are mainly the ones sleeping badly and working long hours. Such strains could reduce anyone's focus, whether or not they use social media. This rival explanation undercuts his causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few teachers using the apps is irrelevant to students' focus.
- Option C: Apps being used elsewhere does not bear on the cause here.
- Option D: The length of lectures does not address what harms concentration.

Final Answer: Poor sleep and long work hours offer a rival cause \Rightarrow **B**

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

Q17.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The critics point to poor sleep and long working hours as pressures that could explain the weak focus. If those pressures are the real cause, then removing social media would leave them untouched. So a social-media ban need not restore students' concentration. Option A states exactly this cautious, supported conditional.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: "No effect at all" overstates the case; the passage does not deny any effect.
- Option C: "Can never concentrate" is contradicted by the untroubled heavy users mentioned.
- Option D: "Will certainly improve results" is far stronger than the passage warrants.

Final Answer: If other pressures explain it, a ban need not restore focus \Rightarrow **A**

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



Q18.

Solution

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

Reasoning: His reasoning is: two things move together (app use and falling attention), so one causes the other, ignoring other differences between the students. Option C has the same shape: houseplants and happy staff go together, so adding houseplants will make staff happier. Both leap from a correlation to a causal remedy, overlooking confounding factors. So option C 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 generalises from a couple of successes; it is weak induction, not the confounded-correlation pattern.
- Option D: This is prediction from past cases, not a correlation-to-cause leap.

Final Answer: The houseplants-and-happiness argument matches the pattern ⇒

C

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

Q19.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Fontaine cites the harm of plastic bags in the harbour as her reason. She uses it to urge a specific action. That action is to forbid all shops from handing out single-use plastic bags. This recommendation is what her argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: How long bags last is a supporting fact, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The point about fishing gear is made by the critics, not Fontaine.
- Option D: That shoppers would switch to reusable bags is a premise in her chain, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The call to ban shop bags is the conclusion ⇒ **B**

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



Q20.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption on which the argument depends.

Reasoning: Fontaine's chain is: ban shop bags, so plastic stops flowing into the harbour, so the waters grow cleaner. This works only if removing shop bags truly cuts the total plastic reaching the harbour. If shoppers simply switched to other bags that reach the sea just as much, the ban would not reduce the plastic. So the argument assumes the ban actually lowers total plastic rather than being offset, which is option D.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need every shopper to use plastic bags now.
- Option B: The relative cost of reusable bags is not something the argument needs.
- Option C: It does not depend on fishermen being the only people troubled.

Final Answer: It assumes the ban really cuts total harbour plastic \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q20](#)

Q21.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The doubt is whether banning shop bags actually cuts the plastic in the harbour. Option A reports that a comparable town's ban was followed by a sharp fall in harbour plastic, with no rise in other bag use. That is direct evidence that the ban reduces harbour plastic and is not simply offset by substitutes. So it strengthens Fontaine's argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Owning a reusable bag does not show the ban cleans the harbour.
- Option C: The colours and sizes of bags are irrelevant to the effect of a ban.
- Option D: Past bans on other items do not show this ban would cut harbour plastic.

Final Answer: A like town whose ban cut harbour plastic strengthens it \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q21](#)



Q22.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Fontaine assumes that banning shop bags will noticeably clean the harbour. Option C says surveys found most of the harbour's litter comes from fishing gear and drink bottles, not shopping bags. If shop bags are only a small part of the litter, removing them would leave most of the problem untouched. That undercuts the claim that the ban will clean the harbour, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few shops already dropping bags does not show the ban would fail.
- Option B: Mild inconvenience to shoppers does not touch whether the harbour gets cleaner.
- Option D: Where the bags are made is irrelevant to the effect of a ban.

Final Answer: Most litter being other sources defeats the aim \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q22](#)

Q23.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The critics report that most of the harbour's litter comes from sources other than shopping bags. If that is so, removing shop bags addresses only a small share of the litter. So banning those bags need not make the harbour much cleaner. Option D states exactly this supported conditional.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Completely free of litter" is far stronger than the passage allows.
- Option B: The passage does not say no shopper owns a reusable bag.
- Option C: "The only kind of litter" overstates the case; bottles and bags are mentioned too.

Final Answer: If most litter is not shop bags, a ban need not clean the harbour \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q23](#)



Q24.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Fontaine assumes that taking away single-use shop bags will clean the harbour. But the passage shows these bags may be only a minor source, and that shoppers may switch to thicker bags that pollute just as much. Her argument overlooks both possibilities, treating one visible source as if removing it would solve the whole problem. Option B names exactly this objection.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not rest on plastic bags being the cheapest option.
- Option C: The passage treats the litter surveys as genuine, not invented.
- Option D: It does not assume that no shopper has ever reused a bag.

Final Answer: It overlooks minor sourcing and equally polluting substitutes ⇒ **B**

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



Answer Key

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

