

CLAT Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 4

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.

Children in the town of Ashford see a great many television and online advertisements for sugary cereals, crisps, and sweets. A study by the local health board found that in the hours around children’s programmes, most of the food advertisements shown were for products high in sugar, salt, or fat. The board also reported that childhood obesity in Ashford has risen sharply over the past eight years, and that children who watch more television tend to ask their parents for more of the branded snacks they have seen advertised.

A campaigner argues that the town should act. Advertising, she writes, teaches chil-



dren to want these unhealthy snacks, and children who want them eat more of them. If the town banned advertisements for high-sugar and high-fat foods during children's programmes, children would ask for such snacks less often, and their diets would improve. She therefore urges the town council to prohibit all junk-food advertising aimed at children. She adds that broadcasters might lose some advertising income, but treats this as a small price for healthier children.

Others are doubtful. They point out that children in Ashford see advertisements in many places the council cannot control, from streaming services based abroad to the packaging in shops and the logos on sports shirts. Much of a child's diet, they add, is decided by what parents choose to buy and cook at home, not by what the child asks for. A ban on television advertising, they suggest, might simply shift the same marketing to channels beyond the town's reach, leaving children's actual eating habits much as before.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the campaigner's argument?
- (A) Children who watch more television ask their parents for more branded snacks.
 - (B) The town council should prohibit all junk-food advertising aimed at children.
 - (C) Broadcasters may lose some advertising income if the ban is introduced.
 - (D) Childhood obesity in Ashford has risen sharply over the past eight years.
- Q2.** The campaigner's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) Broadcasters earn most of their income from junk-food advertisements.
 - (B) Parents have no influence at all over what their children eat.
 - (C) The advertising a ban would cover is a genuine cause of how much unhealthy food children eat.
 - (D) Children in Ashford watch more television than children anywhere else.



- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the campaigner's argument?
- (A) In two comparable towns that banned junk-food advertising during children's programmes, children's consumption of such snacks fell measurably and stayed lower.
 - (B) Many children say they enjoy watching food advertisements on television.
 - (C) The town has previously restricted advertising for tobacco products.
 - (D) Sugary snacks are usually cheaper to buy than fresh fruit.
- Q4.** Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the campaigner's argument?
- (A) A few children dislike the very snacks that are advertised.
 - (B) The ban would be somewhat awkward for local broadcasters to enforce.
 - (C) Some council members personally oppose introducing new restrictions.
 - (D) After a similar ban elsewhere, children saw the same adverts on foreign streaming services and their snacking did not change at all.
- Q5.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage?
- (A) Junk-food advertising will disappear from every medium once the ban is passed.
 - (B) No child in Ashford eats any healthy food at all.
 - (C) If children's eating is largely decided by what their parents buy, a ban on children's advertising might not improve their diets much.
 - (D) The town council has already agreed to introduce the ban.
- Q6.** In the campaigner's argument, the statement that advertising teaches children to want unhealthy snacks serves as:



- (A) a premise supporting the recommendation to ban junk-food advertising.
- (B) the main conclusion that the rest of the argument is meant to prove.
- (C) an objection that the campaigner goes on to reject.
- (D) an unrelated fact 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 design agency Brightmoor ran a trial in which its staff worked four days a week instead of five, for the same pay, while being asked to deliver the same amount of work. After six months, the agency's director announced the trial a success. During the trial, she reported, the number of finished designs the agency delivered each month held steady, staff took fewer sick days, and almost everyone said they felt less tired. The director concluded that the four-day week is good for business as well as for staff, and she recommended that Brightmoor adopt it permanently for the whole company.

Some managers urged caution. They noted that the six months of the trial had been unusually quiet ones for the agency. Several big clients had paused their projects, so the workload during the trial was lighter than in a normal half-year. The staff, keen for the trial to succeed, had also put off slower tasks such as training and long-term planning in order to keep their weekly output up. It was not clear, the managers said, that the same output could be kept up in a busy period, or that the postponed work could be delayed for ever.

They added that a permanent four-day week would change how the agency scheduled meetings with clients, many of whom expected to reach the team on any weekday. Whether the trial's good results would survive these pressures, the managers argued, could not be judged from six unusually light months alone.

Q7. What is the main conclusion the director draws?

- (A) Staff took fewer sick days during the trial than before.
- (B) The workload during the trial was unusually light.
- (C) Many clients expect to reach the team on any weekday.
- (D) Brightmoor should adopt the four-day week permanently for the whole company.

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



- (A) Staff would rather have a shorter week than higher pay.
- (B) The steady output during the trial was not merely a result of the unusually light workload.
- (C) No client ever needs to contact the agency at the weekend.
- (D) Sick days cost the agency more than lost output does.

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

- (A) During the one busy month of the trial, when a paused project resumed, the agency still delivered its usual volume of finished designs on time.
- (B) The staff enjoyed having a three-day weekend during the trial.
- (C) An agency in a completely different industry also tried a four-day week.
- (D) The director has managed the agency successfully for many years.

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

- (A) A few members of staff occasionally did some work on their day off.
- (B) The agency's office is expensive to keep open five days a week.
- (C) The agency's output held steady only because the trial fell in an unusually quiet period and slower tasks were postponed.
- (D) The director did not herself take part in the four-day trial.

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

- (A) A four-day week always increases a company's profits.
- (B) Brightmoor will certainly lose its clients if it keeps a five-day week.
- (C) Staff tiredness is the only thing the agency should take into account.
- (D) If the steady output was due to the light workload, a permanent four-day week might not keep output up in busy periods.



- Q12.** The director's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:
- (A) assumes that staff can never be trusted to report how tired they feel.
 - (B) draws a general conclusion from a trial period that may not represent normal conditions.
 - (C) relies on output figures that the passage says were invented.
 - (D) depends entirely on the opinion of a single client.

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 Neral river, which runs through the town of Kesar, has become badly polluted. For years, a cluster of small factories upstream has released untreated waste into the water, and the river now carries high levels of chemicals that have killed much of its fish and made its banks unpleasant to visit. The town has drawn up a plan to clean the river: it would dredge the polluted mud from the riverbed, plant reeds along the banks, and open a riverside walk to draw residents back to the water.

An official leading the project is confident. Once the river is dredged and the banks replanted, she argues, the water will run clear again, fish will return, and families will come to enjoy the new walk. She points to the sum the town has set aside and promises that within three years the Neral will be one of the town's proudest sights. The cleanup, she concludes, will restore the river to health and bring life back to its banks.

Local scientists are less sure. They point out that the factories upstream are still discharging the same untreated waste every day. Dredging the riverbed, they warn, removes only the pollution that has already settled; unless the flow of new waste is stopped at its source, the fresh mud will soon be as contaminated as the old. A clean riverbed and a pleasant walk, they argue, will not keep the water clean while the factories upstream continue to pour chemicals into it.

- Q13.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the official's argument?
- (A) The factories upstream release untreated waste into the river every day.
 - (B) The town has set aside a sum of money to pay for the project.
 - (C) The cleanup will restore the river to health and bring life back to its banks.
 - (D) The river's banks are at present unpleasant to visit.



- Q14.** The official's argument assumes that:
- (A) cleaning out the pollution already in the river will keep the water clean even though the factories continue to discharge waste.
 - (B) the riverside walk will be cheaper to build than the dredging will cost.
 - (C) the river was perfectly clean at some point in the distant past.
 - (D) residents currently prefer every other part of the town to the riverbank.
- Q15.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the official's argument?
- (A) Residents say they would enjoy having a pleasant riverside walk.
 - (B) The town has successfully cleaned a different, smaller stream in the past.
 - (C) Reeds are attractive plants that grow quickly along a riverbank.
 - (D) The factories upstream have been ordered to treat their waste and will stop discharging chemicals before the dredging begins.
- Q16.** Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the official's argument?
- (A) Some residents already visit other parks elsewhere in the town.
 - (B) Tests show that the untreated waste the factories release each day is by itself enough to re-pollute the whole river within months.
 - (C) Dredging machinery is noisy while it is operating.
 - (D) The riverside walk would need lighting to be used safely at night.
- Q17.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage?
- (A) If the factories keep discharging waste, dredging the riverbed alone may not keep the water clean.
 - (B) The Neral can never be made clean again by any method whatever.



- (C) Riverside walks always increase the number of visitors to a river.
- (D) Dredging has no effect at all on the pollution in a river.

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

- (A) Every boat in the harbour is painted white, so this boat in the harbour must be white too.
- (B) This medicine cured two of my friends, so it is surely a reliable cure for the illness.
- (C) A gardener clears out every weed now growing in a bed but leaves their roots in the soil, and expects the bed to stay free of weeds.
- (D) The last three winters here were cold, so the coming winter will probably be cold 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 public library in Fernwood is deciding how to spend its limited budget. A librarian points to a recent trend: across the country, more and more readers are borrowing e-books, which can be lent to many people at once, take up no shelf space, and never wear out. A survey of Fernwood's own members found that most of them own a phone or tablet on which an e-book can be read, and that younger members in particular say they find e-books convenient.

On this basis, the librarian makes a proposal. Since readers are moving to e-books and most members own a device that can read them, she argues, the library should spend almost all of its book budget on e-books and stop buying printed books except for a small reference collection. This, she says, would let the library offer more titles to more people for the same money, and would suit the way people increasingly prefer to read.

Other staff object. They note that saying a member owns a device is not the same as saying that member wants to read whole books on it. Several studies, they add, suggest that many readers still concentrate better and remember more from a printed page, and that some members, including older ones and those without reliable internet at home, rely on the printed collection entirely. A library that all but abandoned printed books, they warn, might offer more titles overall but serve a good part of its membership worse than before.

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



- (A) Most Fernwood members own a phone or tablet on which an e-book can be read.
- (B) The library should spend almost all of its book budget on e-books and largely stop buying printed books.
- (C) E-books can be lent to many people at once and take up no shelf space.
- (D) Younger members in particular say they find e-books convenient.

Q20. The librarian's argument assumes that:

- (A) e-books will always cost the library less than printed books.
- (B) no member of the library is over the age of sixty.
- (C) the library's book budget will grow larger in future years.
- (D) members who own a device on which an e-book can be read will be willing to read their books on it.

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

- (A) In several comparable towns, libraries that shifted most of their budget to e-books saw total borrowing rise while very few members stopped using the library.
- (B) E-books do not take up any space on the library's shelves.
- (C) The librarian has worked at this library for many years.
- (D) Some of the printed books in the collection are only rarely borrowed.

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

- (A) A few members prefer to borrow films rather than books.
- (B) E-books occasionally contain small formatting errors.
- (C) A large share of Fernwood's members have no reliable internet at home and read only printed books.



(D) Printed books can be damaged if they are dropped in water.

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

(A) E-books will soon replace printed books everywhere.

(B) No one is able to concentrate while reading on a screen.

(C) Printed books are always better than e-books for every reader.

(D) If a good share of members read only or better from print, an almost complete switch to e-books might serve them worse than before.

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

(A) denies that anyone at all still reads printed books.

(B) treats members' owning a device on which e-books can be read as though it showed that they want to read books that way.

(C) assumes that the library has an unlimited budget to spend.

(D) relies on survey figures 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 campaigner gives reasons: advertising makes children want snacks, and wanting leads to eating. These reasons all build towards a single call to act. That call is that the council should prohibit junk-food advertising aimed at children. Everything else is offered to support this recommendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is a supporting fact from the study, not the point being argued for.
- Option C: The loss of broadcaster income is treated as a small side cost, not the aim.
- Option D: The rise in obesity is background evidence, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The recommendation to ban is the conclusion \Rightarrow **B**

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

Q2.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument runs: ban the ads, children want the snacks less, their diets improve. This only works if the advertising being banned really drives how much unhealthy food children eat. If that advertising were not a real cause of their eating, banning it would change nothing. So the argument must assume the covered advertising is a genuine cause of their consumption.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: How broadcasters earn their income is irrelevant to the health argument.
- Option B: The argument needs advertising to matter, not that parents have *no* influence.
- Option D: It is not needed that Ashford children watch more television than others.



Final Answer: The ads must be a genuine cause of children's eating \Rightarrow

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

Q3.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The weak point is whether banning these ads really cuts how much junk food children eat. Evidence that this has happened elsewhere would directly support that link. Option A reports that in comparable towns such a ban cut children's snack consumption and kept it lower. This is real evidence the ban works as the campaigner claims, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Children enjoying the ads, if anything, suggests the ads may still pull at them.
- Option C: Past success with tobacco is a different product and does not show this ban cuts snacking.
- Option D: The relative price of snacks says nothing about whether the ban changes behaviour.

Final Answer: Evidence the ban cut children's snacking elsewhere strengthens it \Rightarrow

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

Q4.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes that banning local television ads will reduce children's exposure and so their eating. Option D says that after such a ban children simply saw the same adverts on foreign streaming services, and their snacking did not change. If exposure and eating stayed the same, the ban fails to reach its goal. That breaks the link between the ban and better diets, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few children disliking the snacks does not undo a general effect



of advertising.

- Option B: Enforcement being awkward does not show the ban fails to improve diets.
- Option C: Council members' personal views are a political point, not evidence about the effect.

Final Answer: The same adverts reaching children elsewhere defeats the aim ⇒

D

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

Q5.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The critics note that much of a child's diet is decided by what parents buy and cook, not by what the child asks for. If that is so, then removing advertising need not change what ends up on the plate. Option C states exactly this cautious, conditional point. It follows directly from the critics' observation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Disappear from every medium" is far stronger than anything the passage claims.
- Option B: That no child eats anything healthy is absurd and unsupported.
- Option D: Nothing says the council has already agreed to the ban.

Final Answer: If parents decide the diet, the ban may not help much ⇒ **C**

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 advertising teaches children to want unhealthy snacks is a reason offered. It is used to support the final recommendation to ban such advertising. 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 B: The main conclusion is the call to ban, 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 ⇒

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

Q7.

Solution

What is asked: the director's main conclusion.

Reasoning: The director reports several trial results and then makes a recommendation. The recommendation is the point her announcement is meant to establish. That recommendation is that Brightmoor should adopt the four-day week permanently for the whole company. The rest is evidence leading to it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Fewer sick days is a supporting result, not the conclusion.
- Option B: The light workload is a point raised by the cautious managers, not the director.
- Option C: Clients expecting weekday contact is background raised by the managers.

Final Answer: The call to adopt the four-day week permanently is the conclusion ⇒

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

Q8.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The director treats the trial's steady output as showing the four-day week is good for business. This only follows if that steady output reflects normal working, not the trial's unusually light load. So she must assume the steady output was not merely a product of the light workload. Option B states exactly this needed assumption.

Why the other options are wrong:



- Option A: Whether staff prefer time to pay is not what her business case rests on.
- Option C: The argument does not need it to be true that no client contacts the firm at weekends.
- Option D: The relative cost of sick days versus output is not required by her reasoning.

Final Answer: She assumes the steady output was not just due to the light load
⇒

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

Q9.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her case is stronger if the four-day week keeps output up even when work is heavy. Option A says that in the trial's one busy month, with a paused project resumed, the agency still delivered its usual volume on time. That shows the output held even under a real workload, not only in quiet weeks. This supports her claim, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Enjoying the long weekend says nothing about business output.
- Option C: What a firm in another industry did is only weakly relevant to Brightmoor.
- Option D: The director's track record does not show this trial's output would hold up when busy.

Final Answer: Output holding up in the busy month strengthens it ⇒

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

Q10.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The director credits the four-day week for the steady output. Option C offers a rival explanation: the output held only because the trial was unusually quiet and slower tasks were postponed. If the light period and delayed work



explain the result, the four-day week itself is not shown to preserve output. This undercuts her causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A little work on a day off is minor and does not overturn the result.
- Option B: A costly five-day office is a reason for the change, not against its success.
- Option D: The director not taking part herself does not bear on whether output held.

Final Answer: The quiet period and postponed tasks offer a rival cause ⇒ **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 director's claim against the managers' point that the trial was unusually light. If the steady output was due to that light workload, then a normal busy period might not see the same result. So a permanent four-day week might not keep output up when work is heavy. Option D draws exactly this supported conclusion.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Always increases profits" is far too strong and unsupported.
- Option B: "Certainly lose its clients" is an overstatement the passage does not back.
- Option C: The passage does not say tiredness is the only thing that matters.

Final Answer: Output may not hold in busy periods if the load was light ⇒ **D**

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



Q12.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The director judges a permanent policy from a six-month trial. But that trial fell in an unusually quiet stretch, so it may not reflect normal conditions. Drawing a general conclusion from an unrepresentative sample is the flaw here. Option B names exactly this weakness.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not claim staff can never be trusted about tiredness.
- Option C: The passage does not say the output figures were invented; they are treated as real.
- Option D: It rests on trial data, not on one client's opinion.

Final Answer: It generalises from an unrepresentative trial period \Rightarrow **B**

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

Q13.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The official describes the plan and then states what it will achieve. Her argument is meant to establish that the plan will succeed. That claim is that the cleanup will restore the river to health and bring life back to its banks. Everything else is offered in support of this.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The factory discharge is a fact the scientists stress, not her conclusion.
- Option B: The money set aside is a premise, not the point argued for.
- Option D: The banks being unpleasant is background, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The claim that the cleanup will restore the river is the conclusion \Rightarrow **C**

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



Q14.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the argument depends on.

Reasoning: The plan only removes the pollution that has already settled in the river. Yet the official predicts the water will stay clear, even though the factories keep discharging waste. For that prediction to hold, cleaning out the old pollution must be enough despite the ongoing discharge. So the argument assumes exactly what option A states.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The relative cost of the walk and the dredging is irrelevant to whether the water stays clean.
- Option C: The river's distant past does not matter to the plan's success now.
- Option D: Residents' current preferences are not something the argument needs.

Final Answer: It assumes clearing old pollution suffices despite ongoing discharge ⇒

[Go Back to Q14](#)

Q15.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The main doubt is that the factories keep pouring in fresh waste, which would re-pollute the river. Option D removes that doubt: the factories are ordered to treat their waste and will stop discharging chemicals before dredging begins. With the source of new pollution cut off, dredging the settled mud could leave the water lastingly clean. So option D directly supports the official's prediction.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Residents enjoying a walk says nothing about the water staying clean.
- Option B: Cleaning a different stream does not address the ongoing discharge here.
- Option C: Fast-growing reeds do not stop the factories re-polluting the water.

Final Answer: Stopping the discharge at source strengthens the plan ⇒



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

Q16.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The plan works only if dredging leaves the river lastingly clean. Option B says tests show the factories' daily discharge is by itself enough to re-pollute the whole river within months. If that is so, the dredged river would be filthy again very soon, whatever the plan does to the old mud. This defeats the promise of a healthy river, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Residents visiting other parks does not bear on whether the water stays clean.
- Option C: Noisy machinery is a nuisance, not a reason the cleanup fails.
- Option D: Needing lighting at night is a detail about the walk, not the water.

Final Answer: Daily discharge re-polluting the river defeats the plan \Rightarrow **B**

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

Q17.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The scientists point out that dredging removes only settled pollution while the factories keep discharging. If the discharge continues, the fresh mud will soon be contaminated again. So dredging the riverbed alone may not keep the water clean. Option A states precisely this cautious, supported conditional.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: "Never clean by any method" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option C: "Always increase visitors" is a sweeping claim the passage does not support.
- Option D: "No effect at all" overstates it; dredging does remove settled pollution.

Final Answer: Dredging alone may not keep the water clean \Rightarrow **A**



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

Q18.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her reasoning is: clear away the pollution already present and expect the river to stay clean, while ignoring the source that keeps producing it. Option C has the same shape: clear the weeds now growing but leave their roots, and expect the bed to stay clear. In both, the visible problem is removed while its source is left in place, so the problem will simply return. 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 untreated-source pattern.
- Option D: This is simple prediction from past cases, not removing a symptom while the cause remains.

Final Answer: The weeds-left-with-roots argument matches the pattern \Rightarrow **C**

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

Q19.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The librarian cites the trend towards e-books and members owning devices as her reasons. She uses them to recommend a specific way to spend the budget. That recommendation is to spend almost all the budget on e-books and largely stop buying printed books. This proposal is what her argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Members owning devices is a premise, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The advantages of e-books are supporting facts, not the point argued for.
- Option D: Younger members finding e-books convenient is another premise.



Final Answer: The proposal to spend on e-books is the conclusion \Rightarrow **B**

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

Q20.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the argument depends on.

Reasoning: The librarian moves from “most members own a device that can read e-books” to “the library should switch to e-books”. That step works only if owning such a device means members will actually want to read their books on it. If members owned devices but preferred not to read whole books on them, the switch would serve them badly. So the argument assumes exactly what option D states.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need e-books to always cost less.
- Option B: It does not require that no member is over sixty.
- Option C: A growing future budget is not something the reasoning depends on.

Final Answer: Owning a device must mean members will read books on it \Rightarrow **D**

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

Q21.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The doubt is whether switching to e-books really serves members better rather than driving some away. Option A reports that in comparable towns, libraries that made this switch saw total borrowing rise while very few members left. That is direct evidence the switch works well in practice, without losing readers. So it strengthens the librarian’s argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: E-books saving shelf space is already granted and does not show members are well served.
- Option C: The librarian’s long service does not show the switch will succeed.
- Option D: Some printed books being rarely borrowed does not show a near-



total switch is wise.

Final Answer: Libraries elsewhere gaining borrowers after the switch strengthens it ⇒

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

Q22.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The plan assumes almost all members can and will use e-books. Option C says a large share of members have no reliable internet at home and read only printed books. If so, an almost complete switch to e-books would leave that large group unable to borrow at all. That shows the plan would serve many members worse, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few members preferring films is a minor point about a different service.
- Option B: Occasional formatting errors are a small fault, not a reason the switch fails.
- Option D: Printed books being damaged by water is beside the point about e-books.

Final Answer: Many members reading only print would be left unserved ⇒

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

Q23.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The other staff point out that many readers concentrate better on print and that some members rely on print entirely. If a good share of members read only or better from print, then an almost complete switch to e-books could serve them worse. Option D states exactly this supported conditional. It follows directly from the staff's objection.

Why the other options are wrong:



- Option A: “Will soon replace print everywhere” is far stronger than the passage claims.
- Option B: “No one can concentrate on a screen” is an absolute the passage does not support.
- Option C: “Always better for every reader” overstates the mixed evidence given.

Final Answer: A near-total switch might serve print-reliant members worse ⇒ **D**

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

Q24.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The librarian treats members owning a device on which an e-book *can* be read as though it showed they *want* to read books that way. But being able to do something is not the same as being willing to do it. The argument slides from capacity to preference without support for the step. Option B names exactly this objection.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not deny that anyone reads print; it proposes keeping a small reference collection.
- Option C: It does not assume an unlimited budget; the whole point is a limited one.
- Option D: The passage treats the survey figures as genuine, not invented.

Final Answer: It mistakes being able to read e-books for wanting to ⇒ **B**

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



Answer Key

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

