

# CLAT Logical Reasoning

## Sample Paper – 5

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 city of Fernhill has struggled for years with clogged roads and dirty air. Its buses run half empty for much of the day, while the roads beside them fill with private cars. The transport office reports that a single-journey bus ticket now costs about as much as a cheap lunch, and that the number of bus trips taken each year has slowly fallen over the past decade.

A councillor proposes a bold remedy. Bus fares, he argues, are what keep people off the buses; the price at the gate is the main thing standing between a resident and a bus seat. If the city scrapped fares altogether and let everyone ride for free, he reasons, large



numbers of drivers would leave their cars at home and switch to the bus. With fewer cars on the road, traffic would ease and the air would grow cleaner. He therefore urges the council to make every bus in Fernhill free to ride. He adds that free buses would also help residents on low incomes, though he treats this as a happy extra rather than his main reason.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the councillor's argument?
- (A) With fewer cars on the road, Fernhill's traffic would ease and its air would grow cleaner.
  - (B) Bus fares are the main reason that residents stay off the buses.
  - (C) The council should make every bus in Fernhill free to ride.
  - (D) The number of bus trips taken each year has fallen over the past decade.
- Q2.** The councillor's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) For many car drivers the fare is a real barrier, so removing it would in fact lead them to switch to the bus.
  - (B) Free buses would earn the council enough goodwill to win the next election.
  - (C) Buses are the only form of public transport available anywhere in Fernhill.
  - (D) The city could run its buses at no cost to anyone at all.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the councillor's argument?
- (A) Many residents say they find the seats on Fernhill's buses comfortable.
  - (B) The buses in Fernhill are kept cleaner than the city's trains.
  - (C) Fernhill has raised its parking charges on several occasions in the past.



(D) In two similar cities that made their buses free, large numbers of car drivers switched to the bus and road traffic fell noticeably.

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

(A) A few residents dislike the idea of a public subsidy purely on principle.

(B) When a nearby city scrapped its bus fares, the extra riders were almost all former cyclists and walkers, while car drivers kept driving.

(C) Running free buses would require the city to buy a number of additional buses.

(D) Some bus routes in Fernhill do not run late at night.

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

(A) Traffic in Fernhill will vanish completely once the buses are made free.

(B) Free buses are the only way any city has ever managed to reduce its traffic.

(C) If free buses failed to draw drivers out of their cars, the councillor's case for them would be weakened.

(D) The council has already agreed to scrap the fares.

**Q6.** In the argument, the statement that bus fares are what keep people off the buses serves as:

(A) a premise supporting the recommendation that the buses be made free.

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

(C) an objection that the councillor raises in order to reject it.

(D) a background statistic included only for 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.*

For years, pupils at Brookside School were set homework every evening. This year the school's head decided to try something new: she abolished homework for all pupils below the final two years. At the end of the year she reported the results with enthusiasm. Since homework was dropped, she noted, the average marks pupils scored in their end-of-year tests had risen, and far fewer pupils were arriving at school tired or anxious. The head concluded that homework does pupils more harm than good, and she recommended that every school in the district abolish homework for its younger pupils. Some teachers were doubtful. They pointed out that the same year had brought several other changes to Brookside. The school had cut its class sizes by hiring three new teachers, so each pupil now received far more individual attention during lessons. A new library and a quiet study room had also opened, and many pupils made use of them during the school day. The end-of-year tests, moreover, had been set by the school itself and were widely felt to be a good deal easier than those of previous years.

- Q7.** What is the main conclusion the head draws?
- (A) Pupils at Brookside were set homework every evening for many years.
  - (B) Every school in the district should abolish homework for its younger pupils.
  - (C) The school hired three new teachers during the year.
  - (D) Fewer pupils arrived at school tired once homework was dropped.
- Q8.** The head's argument assumes which of the following?
- (A) Pupils would rather play sport than sit down to homework.
  - (B) Parents were pleased to see homework abolished.
  - (C) Homework had always been unpopular with the school's teachers.
  - (D) The rise in marks was due to dropping homework rather than to the other changes made that year.
- Q9.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the head's conclusion?
- (A) Pupils said that they enjoyed having their evenings free of homework.



- (B) The head has taught at Brookside School for many years.
- (C) At other schools that dropped homework but changed nothing else, pupils' marks also rose.
- (D) Homework used to take Brookside pupils about an hour each night.

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

- (A) The end-of-year tests were set by the school itself and were far easier than in previous years, which on its own could explain the higher marks.
- (B) A few pupils carried on doing extra practice at home of their own accord.
- (C) The school's new library cost a good deal of money to fit out.
- (D) Some parents wished that their children still had homework to do.

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

- (A) Homework always lowers pupils' marks in every school.
- (B) Brookside will certainly close its new library next year.
- (C) The size of a class has no effect on how well pupils learn.
- (D) If the smaller classes and easier tests explain the better results, abolishing homework elsewhere need not raise marks.

**Q12.** The head's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:

- (A) assumes that homework has never once helped any pupil anywhere.
- (B) treats an improvement that merely came after homework was dropped as though dropping homework must have caused it.
- (C) relies on test scores that the passage says were invented.
- (D) rests on the personal opinion of a single parent.

### 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.*



Sorting through job applications by hand is slow and expensive, and human recruiters are known to let personal bias creep into their choices. The technology firm Vantor now screens its applicants with an algorithm that scores each candidate and ranks them automatically. A consultant urges every company to do the same. Because the algorithm applies the very same rule to every applicant, he argues, it cannot play favourites the way a human interviewer can. An automated scorer therefore removes bias from hiring, and so any firm that wants to hire fairly should hand its shortlisting over to an algorithm like Vantor's.

Researchers who have studied such systems are less sure. An algorithm, they note, is trained on the records of a company's past hiring decisions, and it learns to copy the patterns it finds there. If a company's earlier managers tended to favour applicants from certain schools or backgrounds, the algorithm will quietly learn the same preference and repeat it at scale, all while appearing perfectly neutral. One widely reported tool had to be scrapped after it was found to be marking down every application that mentioned a women's college.

- Q13.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the consultant's argument?
- (A) Any firm that wants to hire fairly should hand its shortlisting over to a hiring algorithm.
  - (B) Human recruiters sometimes let personal bias affect their choices.
  - (C) Vantor scores and ranks its job applicants automatically.
  - (D) Sorting job applications by hand is slow and expensive.
- Q14.** The consultant's argument assumes that:
- (A) every company receives a very large number of job applications.
  - (B) algorithms are cheaper to run than human recruiters are to employ.
  - (C) the single rule the algorithm applies to everyone is not itself a biased rule.
  - (D) job applicants would rather be assessed by a machine than by a person.
- Q15.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the consultant's argument?



- (A) Vantor's algorithm returns its rankings within a few seconds.
- (B) When independent auditors examined Vantor's algorithm, they confirmed that its scoring rule drew on job skills alone and showed no preference for any school or background.
- (C) Many firms complain that their hiring takes far too long.
- (D) Human interviewers are sometimes tired or distracted during the day.

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

- (A) The algorithm can process many thousands of applications in a single day.
- (B) Some applicants dislike the idea of being scored by a piece of software.
- (C) Vantor still lets a human manager make the final job offer.
- (D) Because it is trained on a firm's past decisions, the algorithm learns and repeats whatever biases those earlier hiring choices contained.

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

- (A) If an algorithm copies the biases contained in past hiring records, automating the shortlist need not make hiring any fairer.
- (B) No company will ever again choose to employ a human recruiter.
- (C) An algorithm is always fairer than the people who built it.
- (D) Vantor's applicants are all equally well qualified for the job.

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

- (A) This ruler has measured every desk in the classroom, so it will measure this desk too.
- (B) The last two candidates the firm hired both worked out well, so its hiring method is clearly reliable.



- (C) The entrance test asks every candidate the very same questions, so it treats all candidates equally and cannot be unfair to any of them.
- (D) Every book in this shop is on sale today, so this particular book must be on sale 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.*

Concern about chemical pesticides and fertilisers has grown among shoppers in the Dales region, and produce labelled “organic” now sells at a clear premium. A farming advocate has seized on this. Organic vegetables, she notes, fetch a far higher price at market than conventional ones, and a handful of organic farms in the Dales have earned healthy profits in recent years. She concludes that the Dales should convert all of its farmland to organic methods, reasoning that if every farm went organic, each would come to earn the same handsome profits that those few organic farms now enjoy.

Agricultural scientists urge caution. Organic farms, they point out, typically produce a smaller harvest per acre than conventional ones, because they cannot use synthetic fertilisers or the most powerful pesticides. The high prices that organic produce commands, the scientists add, depend heavily on its being scarce; shoppers pay a premium precisely because organic food is still only a small share of what is on offer. If every farm in the Dales switched at once, they warn, the market would be flooded with organic produce and the premium price would very likely collapse.

**Q19.** What is the main conclusion of the advocate’s argument?

- (A) Organic vegetables fetch a higher price at market than conventional ones.
- (B) Shoppers in the Dales have grown worried about chemical pesticides.
- (C) A few organic farms in the Dales have earned healthy profits in recent years.
- (D) The Dales should convert all of its farmland to organic methods.

**Q20.** The advocate’s argument assumes that:

- (A) organic produce is more nutritious than conventionally grown produce.



- (B) the high price of organic produce would hold up even if every farm switched and organic food became the norm.
- (C) shoppers in the Dales will always prefer vegetables to fruit.
- (D) conventional farms use more water than organic farms do.

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

- (A) In a region where almost every farm converted to organic, prices for organic produce stayed high and the farms kept earning strong profits.
- (B) Some shoppers say that they trust the organic label when they see it.
- (C) Organic farming avoids the use of synthetic pesticides on crops.
- (D) A few farmers in the Dales have grown vegetables for many years.

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

- (A) Some organic farms also sell eggs and milk alongside their vegetables.
- (B) A few of the conventional farms in the Dales are not very profitable.
- (C) The premium price of organic produce depends on its being scarce, so if every farm switched the flood of organic produce would drive the price back down.
- (D) Organic vegetables sometimes look less uniform than conventional ones.

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

- (A) Organic farming will soon disappear from the Dales entirely.
- (B) Conventional produce will never sell again once organic farming spreads.
- (C) Every organic farm anywhere in the world earns a large profit.



(D) If the premium price depends on organic produce being scarce, converting every farm need not earn each the profits the few now enjoy.

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

- (A) assumes that no shopper has ever bought organic produce.
- (B) assumes that what holds for a few organic farms while they are rare would still hold if every farm became organic.
- (C) relies on price figures that the passage says were invented.
- (D) denies that organic produce sells at any premium at all.



**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 councillor lists facts about traffic, dirty air and empty buses as reasons. These reasons all build towards one call to act. That call is that the council should make every bus in Fernhill free to ride. Everything else is offered to support this recommendation.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The easing of traffic is the predicted effect of the plan, not the recommendation itself.
- Option B: That fares keep people off buses is a supporting premise, not the final point.
- Option D: The fall in bus trips is background evidence, not the conclusion.

**Final Answer:** The recommendation to make buses free is the conclusion  $\Rightarrow$

[Go Back to Q1](#)

Q2.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The argument runs: scrap fares, so drivers leave their cars and switch to buses. This works only if the fare is really what is keeping drivers off the bus. If drivers stay in their cars for other reasons, removing the fare would not move them. So the argument must assume the fare is a genuine barrier that, once removed, leads drivers to switch.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: Winning an election is not something the traffic argument relies on.
- Option C: The argument does not need buses to be the only transport in the city.
- Option D: It does not require the service to cost literally nobody anything.

**Final Answer:** It assumes the fare is a real barrier that removal would overcome



⇒  A

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

Q3.

### Solution

**What is asked:** the option that most strengthens the argument for free buses.

**Reasoning:** The weak point is whether free buses really pull car drivers out of their cars. Evidence that this has actually happened elsewhere would directly support that link. Option D reports two similar cities where free buses drew many car drivers over and cut traffic. This is real evidence the plan works as claimed, so it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Comfortable seats say nothing about whether fares are what keep drivers away.
- Option B: Clean buses versus trains is beside the point about switching from cars.
- Option C: Past parking charges are a different measure and do not show free fares move drivers.

**Final Answer:** Evidence that free buses drew drivers 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 free buses will take cars off the road. Option B says that when a nearby city went free, the extra riders were former cyclists and walkers, not drivers. If the people who switch are not car drivers, then traffic and air would not improve. That breaks the link between free buses and the stated goal, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: A few objectors on principle do not touch whether the plan reduces traffic.



- Option C: Needing to buy more buses is a cost point, not evidence about the effect.
- Option D: Some routes not running late does not undo the case for scrapping fares.

**Final Answer:** New riders being walkers and cyclists, not drivers, defeats the aim ⇒

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

Q5.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The councillor's whole case rests on free buses drawing drivers out of their cars. It follows that if free buses did not draw drivers over, 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: "Vanish completely" is far stronger than anything the passage claims.
- Option B: The passage never says free buses are the only way to cut traffic.
- Option D: Nothing says the council has already agreed to scrap the fares.

**Final Answer:** The conditional about drivers not switching 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 fares are what keep people off the buses is offered as a reason. It is used to support the final recommendation that the buses 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 B: The main conclusion is the call to make buses free, not this claim.



- Option C: It is asserted as true and relied upon, not raised in order to be rejected.
- 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 head's main conclusion.

**Reasoning:** The head reports better marks and calmer pupils, then infers a cause and makes a recommendation. The recommendation is the point her report is meant to establish. That recommendation is that every school in the district should abolish homework for younger pupils. The rest is evidence and inference leading to it.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The history of nightly homework is background, not the conclusion.
- Option C: Hiring three teachers is a change raised by the doubting teachers, not her conclusion.
- Option D: Fewer tired pupils is a piece of evidence, not the point argued for.

**Final Answer:** The call for every school to abolish homework is the conclusion ⇒

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

Q8.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The head moves from "marks rose after homework was dropped" to "dropping homework caused it". That step works only if nothing else during the year caused the rise. So she must assume the rise was due to dropping homework and not to the other changes made that year. Option D states exactly this needed assumption.

**Why the other options are wrong:**



- Option A: Whether pupils prefer sport to homework is irrelevant to the marks claim.
- Option B: Parents being pleased does not bear on the cause of the higher marks.
- Option C: Teachers disliking homework is not something the argument needs.

**Final Answer:** She assumes dropping homework, not other changes, raised the marks ⇒  D

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

Q9.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** Her claim is stronger if dropping homework, rather than the year's other changes, explains the rise. Option C says that at other schools which dropped homework but changed nothing else, marks also rose. That isolates dropping homework as the factor that mattered, since those schools made no other change. This supports her causal claim, so it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Enjoying free evenings says nothing about marks or learning.
- Option B: The head's long service does not show homework caused the change.
- Option D: How long homework took is a detail that does not support the causal claim.

**Final Answer:** Other schools improving with no other change points to homework ⇒  C

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

Q10.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The head blames the higher marks on dropping homework. Option A offers a rival cause: the tests were set by the school and were far easier than be-



fore. Easier tests could by themselves raise marks, whether or not homework was dropped. This rival explanation undercuts her causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: A few pupils doing extra practice is minor and, if anything, cuts against her.
- Option C: The cost of the library says nothing about the cause of the marks.
- Option D: Some parents' wishes do not bear on whether homework caused the change.

**Final Answer:** Far easier tests offer a rival cause for the higher marks ⇒

**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 the head's causal claim against rival causes raised by the teachers. If those rival causes (smaller classes, easier tests) really explain the rise, then dropping homework was not what did it. So abolishing homework at other schools, which lack those changes, need not raise their marks. Option D draws exactly this supported conclusion.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: "Always lowers marks in every school" is far too strong and unsupported.
- Option B: Closing the library next year is nowhere suggested by the passage.
- Option C: "No effect at all" overstates the case about class size.

**Final Answer:** Abolishing homework elsewhere need not raise marks ⇒

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



Q12.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The head sees that marks rose after homework was dropped and concludes that dropping homework caused it. Treating “after this” as “because of this” is the post hoc error. Since other changes occurred in the same period, 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 assume homework never helped anyone.
- Option C: The passage does not say the scores were invented; they are treated as real.
- Option D: It rests on test results, not on one parent’s opinion.

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

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

Q13.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The consultant gives reasons about bias and uniform rules. He uses them to urge a specific course of action on firms. That action is that any firm wanting to hire fairly should hand its shortlisting to a hiring algorithm. This recommendation is what his argument is meant to establish.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: Human bias is a supporting premise, not the conclusion.
- Option C: What Vantor does is background that sets up the argument.
- Option D: The cost of hand-sorting is a premise, not the point argued for.

**Final Answer:** The call to hand shortlisting to an algorithm is the conclusion ⇒

**A**

**Answer: (A)** [Go Back to Q13](#)



Q14.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The consultant argues that applying the same rule to everyone removes bias. But treating everyone by one rule is fair only if that rule is not itself biased. If the shared rule already favours some group, applying it uniformly just spreads the bias. So the argument must assume the single rule the algorithm applies is not itself a biased rule, which is option C.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The number of applications a firm gets is not needed by the argument.
- Option B: Relative cost is a separate practical point, not the core assumption.
- Option D: Whether applicants prefer machines is irrelevant to the fairness claim.

**Final Answer:** It assumes the shared rule is not itself biased  $\Rightarrow$  **C**

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

Q15.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The doubt is whether the algorithm's rule is genuinely unbiased or merely applied uniformly. Option B reports that independent auditors checked the rule and found it used job skills alone, with no preference for any group. That directly confirms the rule itself is not biased, which is what the argument needs. So it strengthens the consultant's case.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Speed of ranking says nothing about fairness.
- Option C: Long hiring times support using an algorithm for convenience, not for fairness.
- Option D: Tired interviewers point to human weakness but do not show the rule is unbiased.

**Final Answer:** An audit confirming the rule is unbiased strengthens it  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

**Answer: (B)** [Go Back to Q15](#)



Q16.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The argument claims that automating the shortlist removes bias. Option D says the algorithm is trained on past decisions and learns to repeat whatever biases they held. If it copies old bias while appearing neutral, automating hiring does not remove bias at all. That directly attacks the conclusion, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Processing many applications quickly is about speed, not bias.
- Option B: Some applicants disliking software does not show the results are biased.
- Option C: A human making the final offer does not address bias in the shortlist itself.

**Final Answer:** The algorithm learning past bias defeats the fairness claim ⇒ **D**

**Answer: (D)** [Go Back to Q16](#)

Q17.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The researchers point out that an algorithm can learn and copy the biases in its training records. If it copies those biases, then handing the shortlist to it does not make hiring fairer. Option A states precisely this supported conditional. It follows directly from the researchers' point.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: "Never again employ a human" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option C: "Always fairer than the people who built it" is the opposite of what the passage suggests.
- Option D: Nothing says all of Vantor's applicants are equally qualified.

**Final Answer:** Copying past bias means automation need not be fairer ⇒ **A**

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



Q18.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** His reasoning is: the same rule is applied to everyone, so the process cannot be unfair. Option C has the same shape: the same questions are set for every candidate, so the test cannot be unfair. Both leap from equal treatment of persons to the fairness of the shared standard, ignoring that a common standard can itself favour some group. So option C is the closest parallel.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: This applies a measuring tool to a new case; the reasoning is valid, not the flawed pattern.
- Option B: This generalises from two successes; it is weak induction, not the equal-treatment pattern.
- Option D: This applies a known general rule to a case and is valid, not flawed.

**Final Answer:** The same-questions-for-all argument matches the pattern ⇒  C

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

Q19.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The advocate cites high prices and a few profitable organic farms as her reasons. She uses them to urge a specific action for the region. That action is that the Dales should convert all of its farmland to organic methods. This recommendation is what her argument is meant to establish.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The higher price of organic vegetables is a supporting premise.
- Option B: Shopper concern about pesticides is background that sets up the argument.
- Option C: The profits of a few farms are evidence, not the point argued for.

**Final Answer:** The call to convert all farmland to organic is the conclusion ⇒  D

**Answer:** (D) [Go Back to Q19](#)



Q20.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The advocate reasons that if every farm went organic, each would earn the profits the few now enjoy. Those profits come from the high price organic produce fetches today. So the argument needs that high price to survive even once every farm has switched. It therefore assumes the premium would hold up even when organic food becomes the norm, which is option B.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The argument does not rest on organic food being more nutritious.
- Option C: A preference for vegetables over fruit is not something the argument needs.
- Option D: Water use by conventional farms is irrelevant to the profit claim.

**Final Answer:** It assumes the premium survives once all farms switch  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

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

Q21.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The weak point is whether the high price would hold up if every farm went organic. Option A describes a region where almost every farm converted and prices stayed high with strong profits. That is direct evidence that widespread conversion need not sink the premium. So it supports the advocate's claim and strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: Trusting the label says nothing about what happens to prices after mass conversion.
- Option C: Avoiding synthetic pesticides describes organic farming but does not defend the profits.
- Option D: A few long-standing vegetable growers is beside the point about the premium.

**Final Answer:** A region that converted and kept high prices strengthens it  $\Rightarrow$  **A**

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



Q22.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The advocate assumes each converted farm would keep earning the current high profits. Option C says the premium depends on organic produce being scarce. If every farm switched, the market would be flooded and the price would fall, wiping out the profits. That defeats the promised outcome, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Some farms also selling eggs and milk does not bear on the vegetable premium.
- Option B: A few unprofitable conventional farms does not touch the organic profit claim.
- Option D: A less uniform look is a minor cosmetic point, not a blow to the profits.

**Final Answer:** The premium depends on scarcity, which mass conversion destroys ⇒  C

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

Q23.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The scientists point out that the high price rests on organic produce being scarce. If that is so, then converting every farm would remove the scarcity and with it the premium. So converting all farms need not earn each the profits that the few now enjoy. Option D states exactly this supported conditional.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The passage does not predict organic farming will disappear.
- Option B: “Never sell again” is far too absolute and unsupported.
- Option C: Nothing supports the claim that every organic farm everywhere is highly profitable.

**Final Answer:** Converting every farm need not earn each the current profits ⇒  D



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

Q24.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The advocate observes that a few organic farms are profitable while organic produce is rare. She then assumes the same profits would follow if every farm became organic. But what holds for a small part while it is rare need not hold once it becomes the whole, since the scarcity that drives the price would be gone. Treating what is true of a few as automatically true of all is the fallacy of composition, which option B names.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The argument does not assume no shopper has bought organic produce.
- Option C: The passage treats the price figures as genuine, not invented.
- Option D: It plainly relies on the premium; it does not deny that one exists.

**Final Answer:** It assumes what holds for a rare few would hold for all  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

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



## Answer Key

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

