

CLAT Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 3

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.

For the past several years, the cost of rent, food, and transport in Brindle has climbed faster than the pay of the city's lowest-paid workers. A cashier or a cleaner earning the current minimum wage, campaigners point out, can work a full week and still not cover a family's basic monthly costs. Many such workers take on a second job in the evenings, or slip into debt, simply to keep up with the bills.

A labour campaigner argues that the city should act. The minimum wage in Brindle, she says, has not kept pace with the cost of living, and the workers who earn it are being squeezed harder every year. Raising the minimum wage sharply, she argues, would put



more money in these workers' pockets, lift many families above the poverty line, and let people afford the essentials they now go without. She therefore urges the city council to raise the minimum wage substantially. She adds that better-paid workers would also spend more in local shops, though she treats this wider boost to the local economy as a welcome bonus rather than her main reason for acting.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the campaigner's argument?
- (A) A full-time worker on the current minimum wage cannot cover a family's basic monthly costs.
 - (B) Better-paid workers would spend more money in the city's local shops.
 - (C) The city council should raise the minimum wage substantially.
 - (D) The cost of living in Brindle has risen for several years running.
- Q2.** The campaigner's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) Every business in Brindle can easily afford to pay a much higher wage.
 - (B) Raising the minimum wage will not lead employers to cut so many jobs or hours that low-paid workers end up worse off.
 - (C) The minimum wage is the only thing that affects a family's standard of living.
 - (D) Local shopkeepers welcome the campaigner's proposal.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the campaigner's argument?
- (A) In several comparable cities that raised their minimum wage sharply, the take-home pay of low-wage workers rose and there was no rise in unemployment.
 - (B) Many minimum-wage workers in Brindle say they find their jobs tiring.



- (C) Brindle has raised local taxes on businesses in the past.
- (D) The campaigner has studied economics for many years.

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

- (A) A few minimum-wage workers in Brindle are teenagers living with well-off parents.
- (B) Some council members have said they dislike interfering in wages.
- (C) Working out the new wage would create extra paperwork for employers.
- (D) After the last increase, many employers cut workers' hours so sharply that the total take-home pay of low-wage workers actually fell.

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

- (A) Poverty in Brindle will disappear completely once the wage is raised.
- (B) The council has already agreed to raise the minimum wage.
- (C) If a higher minimum wage led employers to cut enough jobs to leave low-paid workers worse off, the campaigner's case would be weakened.
- (D) The minimum wage is the only cause of poverty anywhere in the city.

Q6. In the argument, the statement that raising the minimum wage would lift many families above the poverty line serves as:

- (A) the main conclusion that the rest of the passage is meant to prove.
- (B) a premise supporting the recommendation that the council raise the minimum wage.
- (C) an objection that the campaigner goes on to reject.
- (D) an unrelated fact included only for 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 Harnwell district has seen three outbreaks of measles in its primary schools over the past two years, after nearly a decade with almost none. Health records show that the share of children arriving at school with the standard measles vaccination has slipped well below the level doctors say is needed to stop the disease spreading from one child to another.

A district health officer argues for a firm response. Measles, he notes, spreads easily and can make young children seriously ill, and the vaccine against it is both safe and highly effective. When enough children in a school are vaccinated, he explains, the disease cannot get a foothold and outbreaks stop. He therefore recommends that the district make the measles vaccine compulsory for entry to any public school: no child would be enrolled without it. Such a rule, he argues, would push the vaccination rate back above the safe level and bring the outbreaks to an end.

Some parents and teachers, however, have raised doubts. They warn that a strict no-vaccine-no-entry rule might simply drive some families to withdraw their children from public school altogether, or to press for medical and personal exemptions, so that the number of unvaccinated children living in the community does not actually fall.

- Q7.** What is the main conclusion the health officer draws?
- (A) Measles spreads easily and can make young children seriously ill.
 - (B) The measles vaccine is both safe and highly effective.
 - (C) Vaccination rates in the district have fallen in recent years.
 - (D) The district should make the measles vaccine compulsory for entry to any public school.
- Q8.** The health officer's argument assumes which of the following?
- (A) Making the vaccine compulsory for school entry will actually raise the number of children who are vaccinated.
 - (B) Parents who refuse vaccines are careless about their children's health.
 - (C) Measles is the only disease that ever spreads in schools.
 - (D) Private schools will adopt exactly the same rule as public schools.
- Q9.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the health officer's conclusion?
- (A) The vaccine used in the district is manufactured locally.



- (B) A neighbouring district that made the vaccine compulsory for school entry saw its vaccination rate climb back above the safe level and its outbreaks stop.
- (C) Many parents in Harnwell say they trust their family doctor.
- (D) Measles vaccines have been in use for many decades.

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

- (A) A small number of children cannot take the vaccine for genuine medical reasons.
- (B) The vaccine occasionally causes a mild fever for a day.
- (C) When a similar district brought in a compulsory-vaccine rule, so many parents withdrew their children or obtained exemptions that the number of unvaccinated children in the area did not fall.
- (D) Some teachers in the district have themselves been vaccinated.

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

- (A) If a compulsory rule led enough families to withdraw their children or claim exemptions, it might fail to raise the overall vaccination rate.
- (B) Measles will never again appear in the district once the rule is passed.
- (C) Vaccinating children is the only way a school can ever stay safe.
- (D) The district's parents are certain to accept the new rule without complaint.

Q12. The health officer's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:

- (A) assumes the vaccine works, although the passage says it does not.
- (B) relies on outbreak figures that the passage says were invented.
- (C) treats the rise in outbreaks as though it had happened before the vaccination rate fell.



- (D) takes for granted that a compulsory rule will raise vaccination rates, without considering that families might evade it.

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.

Across the country, city air is thick with exhaust from petrol and diesel cars, and doctors link this pollution to breathing problems and other illness. Electric vehicles, which run on batteries and have no exhaust pipe, release no fumes as they are driven.

A newspaper columnist draws a firm conclusion from this. Because electric cars give off no exhaust on the road, he writes, replacing the country's petrol and diesel cars with electric ones would clear the fumes from city streets and cut the nation's air pollution. He therefore urges the government to spend heavily on subsidies and charging points so that drivers switch to electric vehicles as quickly as possible. The more petrol cars we replace, he argues, the cleaner the country's air will become.

Other writers are not so sure. They point out that an electric car has to be charged, and the electricity to charge it has to be generated somewhere. In this country, they note, most electricity is still produced by burning coal and gas in power stations, which themselves pour large quantities of pollution into the air. If millions of drivers plugged in electric cars, far more electricity would have to be generated, and the power stations would burn far more fuel to supply it. The pollution, they warn, would not vanish; it would simply move from the car's exhaust pipe to the power station's chimney.

Q13. Which of the following is the main conclusion of the columnist's argument?

- (A) Electric cars give off no exhaust while they are being driven.
- (B) The government should spend heavily to get drivers to switch to electric vehicles.
- (C) Most of the country's electricity is generated by burning coal and gas.
- (D) Exhaust from petrol and diesel cars is linked to illness.

Q14. The columnist's argument assumes that:

- (A) electric cars are cheaper to run than petrol cars.
- (B) every driver in the country can afford an electric car.



- (C) generating the electricity to charge the electric cars will not itself produce as much pollution as the cars save.
- (D) petrol cars will soon stop being manufactured.

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

- (A) Electric cars are quieter than petrol cars on the road.
- (B) Many drivers say they would happily switch to an electric car.
- (C) Electric cars have fewer moving parts and need less repair.
- (D) In a comparable country that shifted most of its cars to electric power, total measured air pollution, counting emissions from its power stations, fell markedly.

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

- (A) In this country, charging millions of electric cars would force coal-burning power stations to release just as much pollution as the petrol cars would have saved.
- (B) Electric cars are more expensive to buy than petrol cars.
- (C) Building charging points along every road would take several years.
- (D) Some drivers prefer the sound of a petrol engine.

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

- (A) Electric cars will never reduce pollution under any circumstances.
- (B) The country will soon run out of coal to burn.
- (C) Petrol cars produce no pollution at all.
- (D) If the electricity to charge electric cars is made by burning coal, switching to them may move pollution rather than remove it.

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



- (A) A factory that pipes its waste out to a river downstream has taken the waste off its own land, so it has reduced the total amount of waste in the region.
- (B) Every bus seen on this route so far has been late, so the next bus will probably be late too.
- (C) This tonic cured my cough and my cousin's cough, so it is a dependable cure for coughs.
- (D) All the offices in this building close at six, so this particular office will close at six.

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 great public museums of Casterly hold world-famous collections, yet on any ordinary weekday their halls are far from full. At present every visitor must buy a ticket, and for a family a single day at the museum can cost a fair sum.

A cultural policy writer argues that this should change. The ticket price, she says, is a barrier that keeps many people away, above all families on low incomes for whom the cost of tickets for several children is simply too much. Remove that barrier, she argues, and the museums would open up to the whole city. She therefore urges the government to abolish entry charges and make all public museums free, so that the people who now stay away, especially poorer families and those who have never been, would finally come through the doors. Museums, she concludes, belong to everyone and should be free for everyone to enjoy.

Not everyone is convinced. Some point out that when a large city museum abroad dropped its entry charge, the extra visitors it drew were mostly tourists and regular museum-goers who would gladly have paid. Surveys there suggested that the people who rarely visit museums stayed away not because of the ticket price but because museums simply did not interest them, and a free ticket did nothing to change that.

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

- (A) The museums of Casterly are far from full on ordinary weekdays.
- (B) A family's single day at the museum can cost a fair sum.
- (C) The government should abolish entry charges and make all public museums free.



(D) The public museums of Casterly hold world-famous collections.

Q20. The writer's argument assumes that:

- (A) museums earn no money from anything except entry tickets.
- (B) the people who now stay away do so mainly because of the ticket price, not because museums do not interest them.
- (C) every family in Casterly would like to visit a museum every week.
- (D) museums abroad are run in exactly the same way as those in Casterly.

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

- (A) The museums of Casterly are among the oldest in the country.
- (B) Some wealthy visitors would happily pay far more than the current ticket price.
- (C) The museum cafés would sell more food if more visitors came.
- (D) When a comparable city made its museums free, visits by low-income families who had never been before rose sharply.

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

- (A) A few of Casterly's museums are located far from the city centre.
- (B) Surveys show that people who rarely visit museums stay away because museums do not interest them, not because of the price; and where entry was made free, the extra visitors were mostly tourists and regulars who would have paid anyway.
- (C) Keeping a museum open costs money whether or not entry is charged.
- (D) Some people prefer to look at art in books rather than in a museum.

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



- (A) If people who rarely visit museums stay away mainly because they are not interested rather than because of the price, making entry free need not bring them in.
- (B) No poor family in Casterly has ever visited a museum.
- (C) Free museums will always be more crowded than paid ones in every city.
- (D) The government has already decided to keep charging for entry.

Q24. In the argument, the statement that the ticket price is a barrier keeping many people away serves as:

- (A) an objection that the writer goes on to reject.
- (B) the main conclusion that the passage is meant to establish.
- (C) a premise supporting the recommendation that the museums be made free.
- (D) an unrelated remark included only for background colour.



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 campaigner gives several facts (rising costs, a squeezed wage, workers in debt) as reasons. These reasons all build towards one recommendation. That recommendation is that the council should raise the minimum wage substantially. Everything else in the passage is offered to support this call to act.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is a supporting fact about how far the wage falls short, not the point being argued for.
- Option B: The extra spending in local shops is expressly called a bonus, not the main aim.
- Option D: The rise in living costs is background evidence, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The recommendation to raise the wage is the conclusion ⇒

[Go Back to Q1](#)

Q2.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument runs: a higher wage puts more money in low-paid workers' pockets and lifts families out of poverty. This works only if raising the wage really leaves those workers better off overall. If employers responded by cutting enough jobs or hours, workers could end up worse off, not better. So the argument must assume the raise will not trigger job or hour cuts that leave workers worse off.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need *every* business to pay the higher wage *easily*; that is far stronger than required.
- Option C: It need not claim the wage is the *only* thing affecting living standards.
- Option D: Whether shopkeepers welcome the plan is irrelevant to whether



workers gain.

Final Answer: It assumes the raise will not leave workers worse off ⇒ **B**

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

Q3.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The weak point is whether a higher wage really leaves low-paid workers better off without costing jobs. Evidence that this has happened elsewhere would directly support that link. Option A reports that in comparable cities a sharp rise lifted take-home pay with no rise in unemployment. This is real evidence that the policy works as the campaigner claims, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Workers finding their jobs tiring says nothing about whether a raise helps them.
- Option C: Past business taxes are a different matter and do not show the raise will help.
- Option D: The campaigner's own study is a credential, not evidence the policy works.

Final Answer: Evidence the raise helped workers elsewhere strengthens it ⇒ **A**

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

Q4.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes that raising the wage leaves low-paid workers with more money in hand. Option D says that after the last increase, employers cut hours so sharply that total take-home pay actually fell. If a raise leads to lower take-home pay, it defeats the campaigner's whole aim of helping workers. That breaks the link between the raise and the goal, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:



- Option A: A few well-off teenagers do not undo the general case for helping low-paid families.
- Option B: Council members disliking wage rules is a political point, not evidence about the effect.
- Option C: Extra paperwork is a minor inconvenience, not a blow to the health of workers' finances.

Final Answer: A raise that cut take-home pay defeats the aim ⇒

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

Q5.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The campaigner's whole case rests on the raise leaving low-paid workers better off. It follows that if the raise instead cost so many jobs that workers ended up worse off, that case would be undermined. Option C states exactly this conditional, which the argument's own structure supports. So C is the best-supported statement.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Disappear completely" is far stronger than anything the passage claims.
- Option B: Nothing says the council has already agreed to the raise.
- Option D: The passage never says the wage is the only cause of poverty.

Final Answer: The conditional about workers ending up worse off is supported ⇒

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 raising the wage would lift many families above the poverty line is a reason offered. It is used to support the final recommendation that the council raise the minimum wage. A claim offered in support of the conclusion is a premise. So the statement functions as a premise for the recom-



mendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The main conclusion is the call to raise the wage, not this 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 **B**

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

Q7.

Solution

What is asked: the officer's main conclusion.

Reasoning: The officer notes falling vaccination rates and rising outbreaks, then makes a recommendation. The recommendation is the point his case is meant to establish. That recommendation is that the vaccine should be made compulsory for entry to any public school. The rest is evidence and explanation leading to it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: That measles is dangerous is a supporting fact, not the conclusion.
- Option B: That the vaccine is safe and effective is another premise.
- Option C: The fall in vaccination rates is background evidence, not the recommendation.

Final Answer: The call for a compulsory rule is the conclusion \Rightarrow **D**

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

Q8.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The officer's plan works only if a compulsory rule actually increases how many children are vaccinated. He moves straight from "make the vaccine compulsory for entry" to "the vaccination rate will rise". That step needs the rule to raise the number vaccinated rather than merely change who attends school. So he must assume the rule will actually raise the number of children vaccinated.



Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The argument does not need parents who refuse to be careless; that is a judgement it never relies on.
- Option C: It need not claim measles is the *only* disease that spreads in schools.
- Option D: It does not depend on private schools adopting the same rule.

Final Answer: He assumes the rule will raise vaccination numbers \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q8](#)

Q9.

Solution

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

Reasoning: His conclusion is stronger if a compulsory rule is shown to raise vaccination rates and end outbreaks in practice. Option B reports exactly that from a neighbouring district: the rate climbed back above the safe level and outbreaks stopped. A real case where the same rule produced the intended effect supports his claim directly. So option B strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Where the vaccine is made has no bearing on whether the rule works.
- Option C: Parents trusting their doctor does not show a compulsory rule raises coverage.
- Option D: The vaccine's long history supports its safety, not the effect of the rule.

Final Answer: A district where the same rule worked strengthens it \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q9](#)

Q10.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The officer assumes the compulsory rule will push the vaccination rate back up. Option C describes a similar district where so many parents withdrew



their children or got exemptions that the number of unvaccinated children did not fall. If the rule fails to reduce the unvaccinated number, it cannot end the outbreaks as claimed. This shows the rule may not achieve its aim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few genuine medical exemptions are minor and do not undo the whole plan.
- Option B: A mild one-day fever does not bear on whether the rule raises coverage.
- Option D: Some teachers being vaccinated is irrelevant to the children's vaccination rate.

Final Answer: Families evading the rule so coverage does not rise weakens it ⇒

C

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

Q11.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The passage sets the officer's plan against the warning that families may withdraw children or claim exemptions. If enough families did so, the compulsory rule would not increase the overall vaccination rate. So it follows that the rule might fail to raise coverage. Option A draws exactly this supported, cautious conclusion.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: "Never again" is far too strong and unsupported.
- Option C: "The only way" overstates what the passage says.
- Option D: The doubts raised make "certain to accept without complaint" clearly unsupported.

Final Answer: The rule might fail to raise coverage if families evade it ⇒ A

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



Q12.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The officer assumes that ordering the vaccine for school entry will automatically raise the vaccination rate. But how people react to the rule is left out: families might withdraw children or seek exemptions. His argument takes the rule's intended effect for granted without considering that it could be evaded. Option D names exactly this flaw.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage says the vaccine *is* effective, so this misreads it.
- Option B: Nothing says the outbreak figures were invented; they are treated as real.
- Option C: The passage does not reverse the order of the fall in coverage and the outbreaks.

Final Answer: It assumes the rule will work without allowing for evasion ⇒ **D**

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

Q13.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The columnist reasons from the fact that electric cars give off no exhaust on the road. He uses this to urge a specific action. That action is that the government should spend heavily to get drivers to switch to electric vehicles. This recommendation is what his argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: That electric cars give off no exhaust is his starting premise, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The point about coal and gas is made by the critics, not the columnist's conclusion.
- Option D: The link between exhaust and illness is background, not the point argued for.

Final Answer: The call to spend on the switch is the conclusion ⇒ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q13](#)



Q14.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the argument depends on.

Reasoning: The columnist concludes that switching to electric cars will cut the nation's air pollution. But electric cars must be charged, and generating that electricity may itself create pollution. His conclusion holds only if charging the cars does not produce as much pollution as the cars save. So he must assume that generating the electricity will not itself produce as much pollution, which is option C.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Running cost is about money, not about the pollution claim.
- Option B: The argument does not need *every* driver to afford an electric car.
- Option D: It does not depend on petrol cars ceasing to be made.

Final Answer: It assumes charging the cars does not just shift the pollution ⇒ C

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

Q15.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The doubt is whether switching to electric cars cuts *total* pollution or merely moves it to power stations. Option D reports a comparable country where, counting power-station emissions, total measured air pollution fell markedly after the switch. Measuring the total, including the power stations, meets the critics' objection head-on. So it supports the columnist's claim that the switch cuts pollution overall.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Being quieter says nothing about air pollution.
- Option B: Drivers wanting to switch does not show pollution actually falls.
- Option C: Fewer moving parts is about repairs, not about emissions.

Final Answer: Evidence that total pollution fell elsewhere strengthens it ⇒ D

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



Q16.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The columnist claims that switching to electric cars cuts the nation's pollution. Option A says charging millions of them would make coal power stations release just as much pollution as the petrol cars would have saved. If the pollution merely moves from tailpipes to chimneys with no net fall, the switch does not cut pollution at all. This defeats the columnist's core claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: A higher purchase price is about cost, not about pollution.
- Option C: A delay in building charging points does not show the switch fails to cut pollution.
- Option D: Some drivers liking the engine sound is irrelevant to the pollution claim.

Final Answer: The pollution merely shifts to power stations, no net fall ⇒

[Go Back to Q16](#)

Q17.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The critics point out that most electricity here is made by burning coal and gas. If the power to charge electric cars comes from burning coal, the pollution saved at the tailpipe reappears at the chimney. So switching to electric cars may move the pollution rather than remove it. Option D states precisely this supported conditional.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Never under any circumstances" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option B: Nothing in the passage says the country will run out of coal.
- Option C: The passage says petrol cars pollute, so "no pollution at all" is plainly false.

Final Answer: With coal power, the switch may move pollution, not remove it ⇒



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

Q18.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The columnist's reasoning is: remove the pollution from the visible point (the tailpipe) and treat the problem as solved, ignoring that it reappears at the power station. Option A has the same shape: pipe the waste off the factory's own land and call the total waste reduced, ignoring that it simply reappears downstream. Both treat merely *moving* a problem out of sight as though it had been *eliminated*. So option A is the closest parallel.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: This is prediction from past cases, a matter of induction, not shifting a problem out of sight.
- Option C: This generalises from a couple of successes; it is weak induction, not the shift-as-removal pattern.
- Option D: This applies a known general rule to one case; the reasoning is valid, not the flawed pattern.

Final Answer: The waste-piped-downstream argument matches the pattern \Rightarrow **A**

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

Q19.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The writer argues that the ticket price shuts people out and that removing it would open the museums to all. She uses this to urge a specific action. That action is that the government should abolish entry charges and make all public museums free. This recommendation is what her argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: That museums are far from full is a background observation, not the conclusion.



- Option B: The cost to a family is a supporting premise, not the point argued for.
- Option D: That the collections are world-famous is background colour.

Final Answer: The call to make museums free is the conclusion \Rightarrow **C**

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

Q20.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The writer expects free entry to bring in the people who now stay away. That works only if the ticket price is what is keeping those people away. If they stay away because museums do not interest them, removing the price would not bring them in. So the argument assumes the non-visitors are kept away mainly by the price, not by lack of interest, which is option B.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need museums to earn money only from tickets.
- Option C: It need not claim *every* family wants to visit weekly.
- Option D: It does not depend on foreign museums being run identically.

Final Answer: It assumes price, not lack of interest, keeps people away \Rightarrow **B**

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

Q21.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her case needs free entry to draw in the very people who now stay away, especially poorer, first-time visitors. Option D reports that when a comparable city went free, visits by low-income families who had never been before rose sharply. That is direct evidence that removing the charge brings in exactly the group she is trying to reach. So option D strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The age of the museums says nothing about who would come if



entry were free.

- Option B: Wealthy visitors happy to pay more does not show free entry widens access.
- Option C: More café sales is a side effect, not evidence about who comes through the doors.

Final Answer: Free entry drawing in first-time low-income visitors strengthens it ⇒ D

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

Q22.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes the price is what keeps non-visitors away. Option B reports surveys showing they stay away because museums do not interest them, and that where entry was free the extra visitors were mostly tourists and regulars who would have paid. If the real barrier is lack of interest, not price, then free entry would not bring in the target group. This attacks the argument's core assumption, so it most weakens it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few far-off museums is a minor point, not a blow to the access argument.
- Option C: Running costs concern funding, not whether free entry widens access.
- Option D: A few people preferring art books does not undo the general case.

Final Answer: Non-visitors kept away by lack of interest, not price, weakens it ⇒ B

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

Q23.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The passage sets the writer's plan against the finding that rare visitors stay away out of lack of interest, not price. If the main reason people stay away is



that museums do not interest them, then removing the price need not bring them in. So making entry free might not widen access as hoped. Option A states exactly this supported conditional.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: “No poor family ever” is far too absolute and unsupported.
- Option C: “Always more crowded in every city” is a sweeping claim the passage does not back.
- Option D: Nothing says the government has already decided to keep charging.

Final Answer: If lack of interest is the barrier, free entry need not bring them in ⇒

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

Q24.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The statement that the ticket price is a barrier keeping many people away is a reason the writer offers. It is used to support the final recommendation that the museums be made free. A claim offered in support of the conclusion is a premise. So the statement functions as a premise for the recommendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The writer relies on it, she does not raise it as an objection to reject.
- Option B: The main conclusion is the call to make museums free, not this claim.
- Option D: It is central to the reasoning, not unrelated background.

Final Answer: It supports the recommendation, so it is a premise ⇒

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



Answer Key

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

