

# CLAT Logical Reasoning

## Sample Paper – 6

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.*

Cigarette packs today are carefully designed objects. Manufacturers choose their colours, logos and finishes with great care, and surveys of young people show that a bright, well-branded pack is often thought of as stylish and grown-up. A public-health campaigner points out that most smokers pick up the habit as teenagers, when the look and feel of a pack can matter a good deal to them.

The campaigner argues that the government should act. Attractive branded packaging, she writes, makes cigarettes appealing to young people at exactly the age when they are deciding whether to start. Strip that appeal away and the packs become dull and



off-putting; fewer teenagers, drawn in by nothing glamorous, would take up smoking in the first place. She therefore urges the government to require that all cigarettes be sold in plain, standardised packs, identical in colour and typeface, with only a brand name in small print. She notes that adult smoking rates have already fallen over the past decade, but treats this as background rather than as the reason for her proposal.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the campaigner's argument?
- (A) Attractive branded packaging makes cigarettes more appealing to young people.
  - (B) Fewer teenagers would take up smoking if packs were made dull.
  - (C) The government should require that all cigarettes be sold in plain, standardised packs.
  - (D) Adult smoking rates have fallen over the past decade.
- Q2.** The campaigner's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) The look of the packaging genuinely influences whether young people take up smoking.
  - (B) Cigarettes are the only product ever sold in brightly branded packaging.
  - (C) Plain packs are cheaper for manufacturers to print than branded ones.
  - (D) Adults are more strongly swayed by packaging than teenagers are.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the campaigner's argument?
- (A) Many smokers say they dislike the taste of one particular brand.
  - (B) Cigarette companies spend large sums each year designing their packs.
  - (C) Some shops already keep their cigarettes hidden under the counter.
  - (D) In a country that adopted plain packaging, the share of teenagers taking up smoking fell markedly in the years that followed.



- Q4.** Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the campaigner's argument?
- (A) Some adult smokers find plain packs unattractive.
  - (B) Where plain packs were introduced, teenagers who wanted to smoke simply turned to cheap smuggled cigarettes, and youth smoking did not fall.
  - (C) Plain packs are slightly harder for shopkeepers to sort on the shelf.
  - (D) Cigarette taxes have also risen over the same period.
- Q5.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage?
- (A) Plain packaging will bring youth smoking to a complete end.
  - (B) Cigarettes will soon be banned from sale altogether.
  - (C) Branded packaging is the only reason anyone ever starts to smoke.
  - (D) If the look of the packaging has no effect on whether young people start smoking, the campaigner's case for plain packs would be weakened.
- Q6.** In the argument, the statement that attractive branded packaging makes cigarettes appealing to young people serves as:
- (A) a premise supporting the recommendation that cigarettes be sold in plain packs.
  - (B) the main conclusion that the rest of the passage is meant to prove.
  - (C) an objection that the campaigner raises only in order to dismiss it.
  - (D) an unrelated aside included merely 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.*

More and more of daily life now runs on software, from the apps people bank with to the systems that keep factories and hospitals working. The number of jobs that ask for some ability to write or understand computer code has grown steadily, and firms in many



fields say they struggle to find enough staff with those skills.

An education commentator draws a conclusion for schools. Because the economy increasingly depends on software, he writes, and because young people who can code will find it easier to get good jobs, computer programming should be made a compulsory subject in every school, taught to all pupils from an early age. Just as every child is taught to read and to do arithmetic, he argues, every child should now be taught the basics of writing code, so that a whole generation leaves school ready for the workplace that awaits them.

Others are less sure. They point out that the school timetable is already full, and that adding a compulsory subject means giving less time to something else. They add that the kind of programming most in demand from employers is advanced and specialised, learned over years of dedicated training, and quite unlike the simple exercises that could realistically be taught to every child in an ordinary classroom.

- Q7.** What is the main conclusion of the commentator's argument?
- (A) The modern economy depends heavily on software.
  - (B) Computer programming should be a compulsory subject in every school.
  - (C) Young people who can code find it easier to get good jobs.
  - (D) The number of jobs asking for coding skills has grown in recent years.
- Q8.** The commentator's argument assumes which of the following?
- (A) Every pupil enjoys studying computer programming.
  - (B) Coding is the single most important subject on the school timetable.
  - (C) Schools already own enough computers for every pupil to use one.
  - (D) The coding taught in compulsory school lessons would actually give pupils skills that employers value.
- Q9.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the commentator's argument?
- (A) Many pupils already own smartphones and tablets of their own.
  - (B) Several famous entrepreneurs taught themselves to code without any schooling.



- (C) In regions that made coding a compulsory school subject, young people went on to find skilled, well-paid jobs at noticeably higher rates than elsewhere.
- (D) Popular programming languages are updated every few years.

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

- (A) The coding that can realistically be taught to all schoolchildren is too basic to interest employers, who hire only those with advanced, specialised training.
- (B) A few pupils already pick up some coding at home in their spare time.
- (C) Computers have become considerably cheaper over the past decade.
- (D) Some teachers would need extra training before they could teach the new subject.

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

- (A) Compulsory coding lessons would guarantee every pupil a job.
- (B) If compulsory school coding does not give pupils the skills employers want, the case for making it compulsory is weakened.
- (C) No school subject other than coding has any value in the job market.
- (D) Every school would refuse to teach coding if asked to.

**Q12.** Which of the following arguments is most similar in its reasoning to the commentator's argument?

- (A) The team that scored the most goals won the league, so scoring goals is the only route to success.
- (B) Every bird I have ever seen could fly, so the next bird I see will probably be able to fly.
- (C) Because the country needs more doctors and doctors are well paid, every pupil should be required to study medicine.



- (D) Every pupil in that class passed the test, so the class as a whole passed.

### 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 centre of Ashford has long suffered from poor air. On busy weekdays, the narrow streets around the old market fill with slow-moving traffic, and readings taken by the city's monitors regularly show high levels of the fumes that come from car exhausts. A councillor has put forward a plan. Cars, she argues, are a major source of the pollution people breathe in the city. If the central district were closed to private cars and turned into a permanent car-free zone, the traffic crawling through it would disappear; and with the cars gone, the air in the centre would grow noticeably cleaner and healthier to breathe. She therefore proposes that the city make its central district a permanent car-free zone, open only to pedestrians, cyclists and the occasional delivery vehicle, in order to clean up the air that shoppers and residents breathe there. Not everyone agrees that it would work. Some of the city's own monitoring, critics say, suggests that a large part of the dirty air in the centre does not come from the cars on its streets at all. On many days the worst of the pollution appears to drift in on the wind from a cluster of factories and a busy ring road that lie upwind of the district, beyond the reach of any local traffic ban.

- Q13.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the councillor's argument?
- (A) Cars are a major source of the pollution people breathe in the city.
  - (B) The air in the city centre is dirtier than the air in the suburbs.
  - (C) Traffic in the centre crawls slowly on busy weekdays.
  - (D) The city should turn its central district into a permanent car-free zone.
- Q14.** The councillor's argument assumes that:
- (A) every resident of Ashford owns a private car.
  - (B) much of the polluted air in the centre comes from the cars driving through it, rather than from other sources or from outside the area.



- (C) car-free zones make city centres more pleasant places in which to walk.
- (D) buses and delivery vans give off no pollution of any kind.

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

- (A) In a comparable city that closed its centre to private cars, air-pollution readings in that centre dropped sharply in the months that followed.
- (B) Many shoppers say they prefer streets that are free of traffic.
- (C) Cars have on the whole become more fuel-efficient over the years.
- (D) The centre of Ashford contains several historic buildings.

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

- (A) Some drivers would be annoyed at having to park further from the shops.
- (B) The car-free zone would require new signs and barriers to be installed.
- (C) Air monitors show that most of the pollution in the centre drifts in from factories upwind, so removing the centre's own cars would barely change the readings.
- (D) A few shops in the centre might see fewer customers once cars are banned.

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

- (A) The car-free zone would remove every trace of pollution from the city.
- (B) Cars have no effect on air quality anywhere.
- (C) The suburbs will always enjoy cleaner air than the centre.
- (D) If most of the centre's pollution comes from sources other than its own cars, a car-free zone might not make the air there much cleaner.



- Q18.** The councillor's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:
- (A) overlooks the possibility that the pollution comes from, or would simply move to, sources the ban does not touch.
  - (B) relies on air-quality figures that the passage admits were invented.
  - (C) assumes that no city anywhere has ever created a car-free zone before.
  - (D) depends entirely on the personal opinion of a single shopkeeper.

### 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.*

More people than ever now watch films at home. Streaming services offer thousands of titles for a flat monthly fee, and over the past decade the number of households paying for them has risen steeply while cinema ticket sales have drifted downward. Many viewers say they simply prefer the convenience of choosing a film from the sofa to the trouble and cost of a trip to the cinema.

A film-industry columnist draws a bold lesson for the studios. Since audiences are steadily moving to streaming and away from the cinema, he writes, studios are wasting money on cinema releases that fewer and fewer people attend. The sensible course, he concludes, is for studios to stop releasing their films in cinemas at all and send every new film straight to streaming, where the audience now is. That way, he argues, they would follow their viewers instead of clinging to a dying habit.

Others in the industry think he moves too fast. They observe that a great deal of a film's money still comes from cinema tickets, and that the excitement and press coverage of a big cinema opening are often what make audiences eager to watch the film later at home. Drop the cinema release, they warn, and a studio may lose not only its ticket income but much of the buzz that draws viewers to the streaming version afterwards.

- Q19.** What is the main conclusion of the columnist's argument?
- (A) More people now watch films on streaming services than a decade ago.
  - (B) Studios should stop releasing their films in cinemas and send every new film straight to streaming.
  - (C) Cinema ticket sales have drifted downward in recent years.
  - (D) Watching films at home is more convenient for many viewers.



- Q20.** The columnist's argument assumes that:
- (A) every household owns a subscription to a streaming service.
  - (B) cinemas are more expensive to run than streaming services are.
  - (C) releasing films straight to streaming would earn studios at least as much as cinema releases do.
  - (D) no one enjoys going to the cinema any more.
- Q21.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the columnist's argument?
- (A) Studios that began sending their films straight to streaming found their overall earnings held up as well as, or better than, in their cinema years.
  - (B) Some viewers now own very large television screens.
  - (C) Cinema tickets have become more expensive over the past few years.
  - (D) A few classic films were originally shown only in cinemas.
- Q22.** Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the columnist's argument?
- (A) Some viewers still enjoy the taste of cinema popcorn.
  - (B) Streaming services occasionally raise their monthly prices.
  - (C) A few small cinemas have closed down in recent years.
  - (D) Studios still earn a large share of their money from cinema tickets, and the excitement of a cinema opening is what draws big audiences to a film later on streaming.
- Q23.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage as a whole?
- (A) Cinemas will vanish altogether within a year.
  - (B) No one will ever set foot in a cinema again.
  - (C) If cinema releases still earn money that streaming alone would not, dropping them could lower a studio's total earnings.



(D) Streaming services will soon stop making films of their own.

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

- (A) denies that anyone at all watches films on streaming services.
- (B) treats the recent shift toward home viewing as bound to continue until no one goes to the cinema, ignoring the revenue that cinema releases still bring.
- (C) assumes that no film has ever been shown in a cinema.
- (D) relies on ticket-sales 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 about branded packs appealing to teenagers. Those reasons all build towards one call to act. That call is that the government should require plain, standardised packs. Everything else is offered to support this recommendation.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: This is a supporting premise about how packs work, not the point argued for.
- Option B: The fall in teenage take-up is the expected effect, an intermediate step, not the final recommendation.
- Option D: The fall in adult smoking is called background, not the conclusion.

**Final Answer:** The recommendation to mandate plain packs is the conclusion ⇒

C

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

Q2.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The argument runs: plain packs remove the appeal, so fewer teenagers start smoking. This works only if the appeal of the packaging really affects whether teenagers start. If the look of the pack made no difference to that choice, dulling it would change nothing. So the argument must assume packaging genuinely influences whether young people take up smoking.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: The argument does not need cigarettes to be the only branded product.
- Option C: Printing cost is irrelevant to whether plain packs cut youth smoking.
- Option D: The claim is about teenagers; it does not need a comparison with adults.



**Final Answer:** Packaging must really influence young people's choice  $\Rightarrow$

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

Q3.

### Solution

**What is asked:** the option that most strengthens the case for plain packs.

**Reasoning:** The weak point is whether plain packs actually reduce how many teenagers start smoking. Evidence that this has happened elsewhere would directly support that link. Option D reports that after a country adopted plain packs, teenage take-up fell markedly. This is real evidence that the measure works as claimed, so it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Disliking a brand's taste says nothing about packaging and youth uptake.
- Option B: That firms spend money on packs shows packs matter to firms, not that plain packs cut uptake.
- Option C: Hiding cigarettes under the counter is a separate measure, not evidence about plain packs.

**Final Answer:** Evidence that plain packs cut youth uptake elsewhere strengthens it  $\Rightarrow$

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

Q4.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The argument assumes plain packs will lead fewer teenagers to smoke. Option B says that where plain packs were introduced, would-be teenage smokers just bought cheap smuggled cigarettes and youth smoking did not fall. If that happened, the policy failed to achieve its whole aim of fewer young smokers. That breaks the link between plain packs and the goal, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: A few adults disliking plain packs does not touch the youth-



smoking aim.

- Option C: Slightly harder shelving is a minor inconvenience, not a blow to the argument.
- Option D: Rising taxes are a separate change and do not show plain packs fail.

**Final Answer:** Youth smoking held up despite plain packs defeats the aim  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

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

Q5.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The campaigner's whole case rests on packaging influencing whether teenagers start. It follows that if packaging had no such effect, that case would be undermined. Option D states exactly this conditional, which the argument's own structure supports. So D is the best-supported statement.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: "Complete end" is far stronger than anything the passage claims.
- Option B: The passage never suggests cigarettes will be banned outright.
- Option C: "The only reason anyone starts" overstates the modest claim in the passage.

**Final Answer:** The conditional about packaging's effect is supported  $\Rightarrow$  **D**

**Answer: (D)** [Go Back to Q5](#)

Q6.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The statement that branded packaging makes cigarettes appealing to young people is a reason offered. It is used to support the recommendation that cigarettes be sold in plain packs. 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 for plain packs, not this claim.



- Option C: It is asserted as true and relied upon, not raised only to be dismissed.
- Option D: It is central to the reasoning, not mere background colour.

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

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

Q7.

### Solution

**What is asked:** the commentator's main conclusion.

**Reasoning:** The commentator cites the economy's reliance on software and the good jobs coders get. He uses these reasons to urge a specific policy for schools. That policy is that computer programming be made a compulsory subject in every school. The rest is evidence leading up to this recommendation.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The economy's reliance on software is a premise, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The ease of getting jobs is an intermediate reason, not the final point.
- Option D: The growth in coding jobs is background evidence, not the conclusion.

**Final Answer:** Making coding compulsory is the conclusion  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

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

Q8.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The argument moves from "the economy needs coders" to "teach all pupils to code". This only helps pupils if the coding they are taught matches the skills employers actually want. If school coding gave pupils nothing employers valued, compulsory lessons would not prepare them for work. So the argument must assume school coding really gives pupils skills employers value.

**Why the other options are wrong:**



- Option A: The argument does not need every pupil to enjoy the subject.
- Option B: It need not be the single most important subject, only worth teaching to all.
- Option C: Having enough computers is a practical detail, not the core assumption.

**Final Answer:** School coding must give pupils skills employers value ⇒  D

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

Q9.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** His claim is stronger if compulsory school coding really leads to good jobs. Option C reports that in regions which made coding compulsory, young people found skilled jobs at higher rates. That is direct evidence that the policy delivers the job-market benefit he promises. So it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Owning phones and tablets says nothing about the value of compulsory coding.
- Option B: Self-taught entrepreneurs suggest schooling is not needed, which cuts against him.
- Option D: That languages keep changing is, if anything, a point against fixed school lessons.

**Final Answer:** Higher job rates where coding was compulsory strengthens it ⇒

C

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

Q10.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The argument promises that compulsory coding will prepare pupils for the jobs employers offer. Option A says the coding that can be taught to all children is too basic to interest employers, who want advanced specialists. If school-level coding gives no skill employers value, the promised job-market benefit



vanishes. That undercuts the reason for making it compulsory, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: A few pupils coding at home does not undo the case for teaching everyone.
- Option C: Cheaper computers, if anything, make the plan easier, not weaker.
- Option D: Needing teacher training is a practical hurdle, not a blow to the benefit claimed.

**Final Answer:** School-level coding too basic for employers defeats the benefit ⇒

**A**

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

Q11.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The whole case for compulsory coding rests on it giving pupils job-ready skills. If those lessons did not give pupils the skills employers want, the reason for compulsion falls away. So the case for making coding compulsory would be weakened. Option B states exactly this supported conditional.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: “Guarantee every pupil a job” is far stronger than the passage claims.
- Option C: Nothing says other subjects have no value in the job market.
- Option D: The passage does not suggest schools would refuse to teach coding.

**Final Answer:** No employer-valued skills would weaken the case ⇒ **B**

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



Q12.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** His reasoning is: the economy needs skill X and those with X do well, so every pupil should be made to learn X. Option C has the same shape: the country needs doctors and doctors are well paid, so every pupil should be required to study medicine. Both jump from "the economy needs this and it pays" to "make everyone learn it", ignoring that not all can or should. So option C is the closest parallel.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: This wrongly treats one cause as the only route to success; a different error.
- Option B: This is a simple prediction from past cases, not a "make everyone learn it" leap.
- Option D: This is a whole-from-parts (composition) inference, not the same pattern.

**Final Answer:** The require-everyone-to-study-medicine argument matches ⇒  C

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

Q13.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The councillor argues from cars being a source of pollution to a specific action. That action is to close the central district to cars. Her conclusion is that the city should make the centre a permanent car-free zone. The rest is offered to support this proposal.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: That cars are a source of pollution is a premise, not the conclusion.
- Option B: The comparison with suburbs is background, not the point argued for.
- Option C: Slow-crawling traffic is descriptive background, not the recommendation.

**Final Answer:** The plan for a car-free centre is the conclusion ⇒  D



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

Q14.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The councillor concludes the centre's air will grow cleaner once its cars are gone. This follows only if the centre's dirty air comes mainly from those very cars. If the pollution came from other sources or blew in from outside, removing local cars would not clean it. So the argument assumes much of the centre's pollution comes from the cars driving through it.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The argument does not need every resident to own a car.
- Option C: Pleasantness of walking is a side benefit, not needed for the air claim.
- Option D: It need not claim buses give off no pollution at all.

**Final Answer:** The centre's pollution must come mainly from its own cars ⇒ **B**

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

Q15.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The doubt is whether banning cars from the centre really cleans its air. Option A reports that a comparable city closed its centre to cars and saw pollution there drop sharply. That is direct evidence that the measure produces the cleaner air she predicts. So it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: Preferring traffic-free streets is about comfort, not air quality.
- Option C: More fuel-efficient cars, if anything, weakens the need to ban them.
- Option D: Historic buildings in the centre are irrelevant to the air.

**Final Answer:** A city that banned cars and cleaned its centre's air strengthens it ⇒ **A**



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

Q16.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The argument assumes the centre's cars are the main source of its dirty air. Option C says monitors show most of the pollution drifts in from factories upwind. If the pollution mostly comes from outside the ban's reach, removing local cars would barely change the readings. That removes the basis for the plan, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Annoyed drivers are a cost of the plan, not evidence it fails to clean the air.
- Option B: Needing signs and barriers is a practical detail, not a blow to the air claim.
- Option D: Fewer customers is an economic worry, not about air quality.

**Final Answer:** Pollution drifting in from upwind means the ban barely helps ⇒

C

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

Q17.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The critics note that much of the centre's pollution may come from factories and a ring road upwind. If most of the pollution comes from sources other than the centre's own cars, banning those cars would do little. So a car-free zone might not make the centre's air much cleaner. Option D states exactly this cautious, supported conditional.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: "Remove every trace of pollution" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option B: "No effect anywhere" overstates the case; cars are still a source.
- Option C: "Always cleaner" in the suburbs is a sweeping claim the passage does not support.



**Final Answer:** A car-free zone might not clean the air if other sources dominate  
⇒ **D**

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

Q18.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The councillor assumes that removing the centre's cars will remove its pollution. But the dirty air may come from factories and a ring road outside the zone, or simply move to nearby streets. Her argument overlooks these sources that the ban does not touch. Option A names exactly this flaw.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: The passage does not say the figures were invented; they are treated as real.
- Option C: The argument does not assume no car-free zone has ever existed.
- Option D: It rests on monitoring data, not on one shopkeeper's opinion.

**Final Answer:** It overlooks pollution sources the ban does not reach ⇒ **A**

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

Q19.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The columnist starts from the shift of audiences to streaming. He turns this into advice for the studios. His conclusion is that studios should stop cinema releases and send every film straight to streaming. That recommendation is what his argument is meant to establish.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The rise in streaming is the opening fact he reasons from, not his conclusion.
- Option C: The fall in ticket sales is a premise, not the point argued for.
- Option D: The convenience of home viewing is another premise, not the conclusion.

**Final Answer:** Sending films straight to streaming is the conclusion ⇒ **B**



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

Q20.

### Solution

**What is asked:** the assumption behind the columnist's advice.

**Reasoning:** He tells studios to drop cinema releases to follow their viewers. This is sound advice for the studios only if going streaming-only does not cost them money. That requires a straight-to-streaming release to earn at least as much as a cinema release would. So the argument assumes streaming-only earnings match those of cinema releases.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The advice does not need every household to hold a subscription.
- Option B: The relative running cost of cinemas and streaming is not what the argument needs.
- Option D: It need not claim that no one enjoys the cinema, only that studios should follow the crowd.

**Final Answer:** Streaming-only must earn at least as much as cinema  $\Rightarrow$  **C**

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

Q21.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The advice is sound only if dropping cinema releases does not cut studios' earnings. Option A reports that studios which went straight to streaming earned as much as, or more than, before. That directly supports the claim that abandoning cinemas costs nothing and may help. So it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: Owning big televisions is a minor point that does not show earnings hold up.
- Option C: Dearer cinema tickets do not show streaming-only would earn as much.
- Option D: A few old cinema-only films are irrelevant to today's earnings.

**Final Answer:** Earnings holding up under streaming-only strengthens it  $\Rightarrow$  **A**



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

Q22.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The advice assumes studios lose nothing by dropping cinema releases. Option D says a large share of a film's money still comes from cinema tickets, and the buzz of a cinema opening draws the later streaming audience. If that is so, abandoning cinemas would cut both ticket income and later streaming viewers. That attacks the advice directly, so it most weakens it.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Enjoying popcorn is trivial and does not bear on studio earnings.
- Option B: Occasional price rises by streamers do not show cinema releases are worth keeping.
- Option C: A few small cinemas closing, if anything, supports the columnist.

**Final Answer:** Lost ticket money and lost buzz defeat the advice  $\Rightarrow$  **D**

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

Q23.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The passage sets the columnist's advice against the point that cinema releases still bring in money and buzz. If cinema releases still earn money that streaming alone would not, then dropping them could reduce a studio's total earnings. Option C states exactly this supported conditional. It follows from combining the advice with the critics' point.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The passage does not predict cinemas will vanish within a year.
- Option B: "No one will ever" is far too absolute for anything the passage says.
- Option D: Nothing supports a claim that streamers will stop making their own films.

**Final Answer:** Dropping cinema releases could lower total earnings  $\Rightarrow$  **C**



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

Q24.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The columnist sees audiences drifting to streaming and concludes cinemas should be dropped entirely. He treats the trend as certain to run all the way to no one attending, and ignores the money cinema releases still bring. A current drift need not continue to its extreme, and cinemas may still be worth keeping meanwhile. Option B names exactly this objection.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B is correct; Option A: He does not deny that people stream films; his case rests on it.
- Option C: He never assumes no film has been shown in a cinema.
- Option D: The passage treats the sales figures as genuine, not invented.

**Final Answer:** It over-projects the trend and ignores cinema revenue ⇒ **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	D
6	A	7	B	8	D	9	C	10	A
11	B	12	C	13	D	14	B	15	A
16	C	17	D	18	A	19	B	20	C
21	A	22	D	23	C	24	B		

