

CLAT Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 7

Duration: 24 Minutes

Maximum Marks: 24

Instructions

- This paper contains **24** Multiple Choice Questions (Single Correct Answer), modelled on the Logical Reasoning section of **CLAT** (Common Law Admission Test).
- Each correct answer carries **+1 mark**. There is a **negative marking of 0.25 marks** for every incorrect answer; unattempted questions carry no penalty.
- The paper has **four passages**, each presenting a short argument and followed by **six** questions. Answer **only** on the basis of the reasoning in the passage; do not use any outside information or opinion of your own.
- CLAT is an offline pen-and-paper (OMR) test with no sectional time limit; attempt this practice paper in one timed sitting of about **24 minutes**.
- Use of mobile phones, calculators, dictionaries, or electronic gadgets is strictly prohibited.

Passage I

Directions (Q1–Q6): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

For centuries the sandstone temples at Ranmore stood in near-solitude, visited by only a few hundred pilgrims a year. Since a new highway and railway link opened, the site has become one of the region's busiest attractions, drawing as many as fifteen thousand visitors on a single holiday. The temples' soft stone was never built to withstand such traffic. Guides report that the carved panels near the entrance, once crisp, are now visibly smoothed where thousands of hands brush past them each day, and the narrow stairways are worn into shallow troughs. Litter collects in the courtyards, and the sheer press of bodies makes proper cleaning and repair almost impossible.



A conservation officer at the site has put a proposal to the temple trust. The damage, she argues, rises and falls with the number of people passing through. If the crowds are the cause of the wear, then reducing the crowds must reduce the wear. She therefore recommends that the trust cap the number of visitors admitted each day at three thousand, issued by advance ticket, so that the monument can survive for future generations. Extra revenue from a small booking fee, she adds, would be a welcome bonus, though not her real aim.

Some members of the trust are uneasy. They point out that the carvings have also suffered from decades of acidic air blowing in from a nearby industrial belt, and from heavy monsoon rains that soak and crumble the exposed stone. These forces, they note, would continue to work on the temples whatever the daily headcount at the gate.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the conservation officer's argument?
- (A) The carvings at Ranmore are more worn today than they were in the past.
 - (B) The trust should cap the number of visitors admitted to the site each day.
 - (C) The booking fee from limited tickets would raise useful extra revenue.
 - (D) The temples at Ranmore have become one of the region's busiest attractions.
- Q2.** The officer's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) The temple trust has the legal power to turn visitors away at the gate.
 - (B) Every visitor to Ranmore touches the carved panels at least once.
 - (C) The new highway and railway link will soon be closed again.
 - (D) The wear on the temples is caused mainly by the visitors themselves, not chiefly by other forces.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the officer's argument?



- (A) At two comparable stone monuments, introducing a strict daily visitor cap was followed by a clear slowing in the wear of their carvings.
- (B) Many visitors say they would happily book their tickets in advance.
- (C) The temples at Ranmore are admired by art historians across the country.
- (D) The booking fee would cover the cost of hiring extra ticket staff.

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

- (A) A few of the worn stairways could be fenced off and bypassed by a side route.
- (B) Some visitors arrive at Ranmore only to find the temples closed for cleaning.
- (C) Most of the damage to the carvings is caused by acidic air and monsoon rain, which a visitor cap would do nothing to stop.
- (D) The conservation officer has proposed visitor caps at other sites before.

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

- (A) If the wear were caused mainly by something other than the crowds, capping visitor numbers would do little to preserve the temples.
- (B) Once a cap is in place, the temples at Ranmore will never suffer any further damage.
- (C) The temples attract more visitors than any other monument in the country.
- (D) The trust has already agreed to reject the officer's proposal.

Q6. In the argument, the claim that the damage rises and falls with the number of people passing through serves as:

- (A) the main conclusion that the rest of the passage sets out to prove.
- (B) an objection that the officer raises only in order to dismiss it.



- (C) a piece of background detail included only to set the scene.
- (D) a premise offered in support of the recommendation to cap daily visitors.

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.

Teenagers, sleep scientists point out, have body clocks that naturally run late: most cannot fall asleep until well after ten at night, yet many schools ring their first bell before eight in the morning. The result, researchers say, is that adolescents routinely arrive at school having slept far less than the nine hours their growing bodies need.

At a district education meeting, a head teacher presented a striking figure. Across the state, she reported, secondary schools that begin the day after half past eight record higher average examination results than schools that begin before eight o'clock. A well-rested student, she argued, concentrates better, remembers more, and sits examinations in better shape. The later-starting schools give their pupils just that extra rest. She concluded that the later start is what lifts their results, and she urged her own district to push its first bell back by an hour, from a quarter to eight to a quarter to nine, so that its pupils too could gain the benefit.

Not everyone at the meeting was persuaded. Several pointed out that the schools opening later were not a random sample. Many of them lay in the wealthier parts of the state, where families could afford private tutoring, where classes were smaller, and where more pupils had quiet rooms of their own in which to study. Schools in poorer areas, which faced quite different pressures, tended to open earlier. The gap in results, the doubters suggested, might have more to do with these advantages than with the hour on the clock.

Q7. What is the main conclusion the head teacher draws?

- (A) Teenagers naturally find it hard to fall asleep before about ten at night.
- (B) Schools in wealthier areas tend to have smaller classes and more tutoring.
- (C) The district should push its first bell back by an hour to a later start.
- (D) A well-rested student concentrates better and remembers more.

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



- (A) The later-starting and earlier-starting schools do not differ in other ways that affect examination results.
- (B) Every teenager in the district needs exactly nine hours of sleep each night.
- (C) Teachers themselves would prefer to begin the school day later in the morning.
- (D) Examination results are the only measure of how well a school performs.

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

- (A) Many parents in the district say they would welcome a later start.
- (B) Sleep scientists agree that teenagers' body clocks run late.
- (C) The head teacher has studied this question closely for many years.
- (D) When one district delayed its start time while leaving everything else unchanged, its examination results rose the following year.

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

- (A) A few pupils would still arrive late even after a later start.
- (B) The schools that begin later are mostly in wealthier areas, with smaller classes and more private tutoring than the schools that begin early.
- (C) Some teenagers say they would enjoy the extra time in bed a later start would give them.
- (D) A later finish to the school day would push some sports practices into the evening.

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

- (A) A later start is certain to turn the district's weakest pupils into its strongest.
- (B) Sleep has no effect at all on how well a student performs.



- (C) If the better results at later-starting schools are due to their other advantages, delaying the bell need not raise this district's results.
- (D) The district's pupils currently get more sleep than pupils anywhere else.

Q12. The head teacher's reasoning is most open to the criticism that it:

- (A) treats a mere correlation between later start times and higher results as though the later start must be the cause.
- (B) relies on examination figures that the passage says were invented.
- (C) assumes that no school in the state has ever changed its start time before.
- (D) depends entirely on the opinion of a single sleep scientist.

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 Calderport grinds to a halt every weekday morning. Traffic surveys show that the main routes into the business district carry far more cars at peak hours than they were ever designed to hold, and average speeds in the core have fallen to little more than walking pace. Exhaust fumes hang over the streets, buses run late because they are stuck in the same jams as everyone else, and deliveries take hours longer than they should.

A member of the city transport authority has proposed a remedy used in several other cities: a congestion charge. Under her plan, any car entering the central zone between seven and ten in the morning would pay a daily fee. Faced with the charge, she argues, a good many drivers would leave their cars at home and travel another way, so the number of cars pouring into the centre at peak hours would fall and the jams would ease. She has urged the council to bring in the charge without delay.

Others on the council are doubtful. They observe that Calderport's public transport, outside a handful of routes, is thin and unreliable, and that many of those who drive into the centre come from outlying areas with no train service at all. For such commuters, they argue, there may be no realistic alternative to the car. A fee, on this view, would be just one more cost of a journey they have no choice but to make, and the traffic on the roads at nine in the morning might look much as it does today.

Q13. Which of the following is the main conclusion of the transport authority member's argument?



- (A) Traffic in the centre of Calderport now moves at little more than walking pace.
- (B) Buses in Calderport run late because they are caught in the same jams as cars.
- (C) Many commuters travel into the centre from areas with no train service.
- (D) The council should introduce a peak-hour charge for driving into the central zone.

Q14. The member's argument assumes that:

- (A) the congestion charge would raise more money than it costs to run.
- (B) a significant number of drivers, faced with the charge, would choose not to drive into the centre rather than simply pay it.
- (C) the council has the legal power to fine drivers who try to avoid the charge.
- (D) every car entering the centre at peak hours carries only a single passenger.

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

- (A) In two other cities that brought in a peak-hour charge, the number of cars entering the centre fell by about a fifth and stayed lower for years.
- (B) Drivers in Calderport already complain about how long their morning journeys take.
- (C) The central zone contains most of the city's offices and shops.
- (D) The charge would be collected automatically by cameras, with no need for toll booths.

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



- (A) A few drivers would take quiet back streets to slip around the edge of the zone.
- (B) The revenue from the charge could be spent on improving the city's buses.
- (C) Most peak-hour drivers come from areas with no alternative to the car and would pay the charge while driving exactly as before.
- (D) Some shops in the centre fear the charge would drive their customers away.

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

- (A) The congestion charge is certain to clear the centre's roads completely.
- (B) If drivers simply pay the charge and keep driving, the scheme may raise money without easing the congestion.
- (C) Public transport in Calderport is the best in the whole region.
- (D) No driver would ever be willing to pay a fee to enter the centre.

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

- (A) Every bridge in the city has been safe for decades, so this bridge is safe to cross today.
- (B) The last three council plans all ran over budget, so this new plan will run over budget too.
- (C) A restaurant owner recalls that two customers loved a new dish, so she concludes that everyone will love it.
- (D) A council introduces a fee for dumping rubbish at the tip, expecting that the fee will lead residents to dump less rubbish there.

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.



Every year the shops fill with cheaper clothes than the year before. So-called fast-fashion brands now sell shirts and dresses for the price of a sandwich, turning out new ranges every few weeks. Because the garments cost so little, shoppers buy them freely, wear them a handful of times, and throw them away when the next style arrives. The result, environmental groups warn, is a mountain of textile waste: vast quantities of barely worn clothing sent to landfill or burned each year, along with the water and energy poured into making garments that are discarded almost at once.

A newspaper columnist argues that the government should step in. The root of the problem, she writes, is that these clothes are simply too cheap to be taken seriously. If very cheap mass-produced garments carried a special tax that pushed up their price, people would buy fewer of them and throw fewer away, and the flood of textile waste would shrink. She therefore calls on the government to impose such a tax on the cheapest ready-made clothing. The extra revenue, she notes in passing, could help fund textile-recycling schemes, though that is not the heart of her case.

Retailers dispute the idea. They point out that much of the cheapest clothing is now bought directly from overseas websites that ship parcels straight to shoppers' doors. A domestic tax, they argue, would not touch these foreign sellers at all. Shoppers who wanted cheap clothes could simply order the same quantities from abroad as before, leaving the amount bought, worn briefly, and thrown away much as it is today.

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

- (A) The government should impose a special tax on the cheapest ready-made clothing.
- (B) Fast-fashion brands bring out new ranges every few weeks.
- (C) The revenue from the tax could help fund textile-recycling schemes.
- (D) Shoppers wear many cheap garments only a handful of times before discarding them.

Q20. The columnist's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?

- (A) The government already taxes other goods that harm the environment.
- (B) Textile recycling is cheaper than sending clothes to landfill.
- (C) A tax that raised the price of cheap garments would lead people to buy fewer of them.



(D) Fast-fashion brands make no useful contribution to the economy.

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

(A) Many shoppers say they feel guilty about throwing away barely worn clothes.

(B) In a country that placed a heavy tax on ultra-cheap clothing, sales of such garments fell sharply and textile waste dropped the following year.

(C) Fast-fashion garments are often made from low-quality synthetic fibres.

(D) The columnist has written about environmental questions for many years.

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

(A) A small number of shoppers already prefer to buy second-hand clothing.

(B) Some expensive clothes are also thrown away after being worn only once.

(C) The tax would apply to clothing sold for children as well as for adults.

(D) After such a tax, shoppers could simply order the same cheap garments from foreign websites that the tax would not reach.

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

(A) Textile waste will vanish completely once the tax is introduced.

(B) No shopper anywhere will ever buy a cheap garment again.

(C) If the tax did not reduce how many cheap garments people buy, its case for cutting textile waste would be weakened.

(D) Expensive clothing never ends up in landfill.



- Q24.** The columnist's reasoning is most open to the objection that it:
- (A) denies that fast fashion produces any textile waste at all.
 - (B) overlooks the possibility that shoppers priced out of cheap garments would turn to other, equally wasteful sources rather than buy less.
 - (C) assumes that no garment is ever worn more than a handful of times.
 - (D) relies on waste figures that the passage admits were merely guessed.



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 officer sets out the damage to the temples as her reason. All of it builds towards one recommendation. That recommendation is that the trust should cap daily visitor numbers. Everything else is offered to support this call to act.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The worsening wear is a supporting fact, not the point being argued for.
- Option C: The booking-fee revenue is expressly called a bonus, not the real aim.
- Option D: The site's popularity is background that sets up the problem, not the conclusion.

Final Answer: The recommendation to cap visitors 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 plan is to preserve the temples by cutting the number of visitors. This helps only if the visitors are what is wearing the stone away. If some other force were the main cause, cutting the crowd would not save the carvings. So the argument must assume the wear is caused mainly by the visitors themselves.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Legal power to turn people away is a practical detail, not the core of the reasoning.
- Option B: The argument does not need every single visitor to touch the panels.
- Option C: Closing the transport link is neither claimed nor needed by the argument.



Final Answer: It assumes the crowds are the main cause of the wear \Rightarrow **D**

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

Q3.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The weak point is whether limiting visitors really reduces the wear. Evidence that this has worked elsewhere would support that link. Option A reports that at comparable monuments a strict cap was followed by clearly slower wear. That is real evidence the cap does what the officer claims, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Willingness to pre-book is about convenience, not about protecting the stone.
- Option C: The site being admired says nothing about whether a cap reduces damage.
- Option D: Covering staff costs is a budget point, not evidence the cap preserves the temples.

Final Answer: Evidence a cap slowed wear elsewhere strengthens it \Rightarrow **A**

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

Q4.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes the visitors are the main cause of the damage. Option C says most of the damage comes from acidic air and monsoon rain. Those forces would keep working on the stone whatever the daily headcount. If they are the main cause, a visitor cap would not preserve the temples, so this most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Fencing off a few stairways is a small fix that leaves the main case intact.
- Option B: Occasional closures for cleaning do not bear on whether the cap



works.

- Option D: The officer's past proposals say nothing about this monument's damage.

Final Answer: Weather and pollution as the real cause defeat the cap \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q4](#)

Q5.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The officer's case rests on the crowds being the cause of the wear. It follows that if the wear were caused mainly by something else, a cap would achieve little. Option A states exactly this conditional, which the argument's own logic supports. So A is the best-supported statement.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: "Never any further damage" is far stronger than anything the passage claims.
- Option C: The passage does not say Ranmore beats every other monument for visitors.
- Option D: Nothing says the trust has already decided to reject the proposal.

Final Answer: The conditional about the real cause is supported \Rightarrow

[Go Back to Q5](#)

Q6.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The claim that damage rises and falls with the number of people is offered as a reason. It is used to support the recommendation to cap daily visitors. A claim offered in support of the conclusion is a premise. So the statement functions as a premise for the recommendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The main conclusion is the call to cap visitors, not this claim.
- Option B: It is relied upon, not raised in order to be dismissed.



- Option C: It is central to the reasoning, not mere scene-setting.

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

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

Q7.

Solution

What is asked: the head teacher's main conclusion.

Reasoning: She cites the higher results of later-starting schools as her reason. She uses it to make a recommendation for her own district. That recommendation is to push the first bell back by an hour to a later start. The rest is evidence leading up to it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The late body clock of teenagers is background from the scientists, not her conclusion.
- Option B: The wealth of later-starting schools is a point made by the doubters.
- Option D: The benefit of rest is a supporting premise, not the recommendation.

Final Answer: The call to start later is the conclusion ⇒

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

Q8.

Solution

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

Reasoning: She moves from "later-starting schools get better results" to "the later start causes those results". That step works only if the two groups of schools are otherwise alike. If they differed in other ways that affect results, the start time need not be the cause. So she must assume the schools do not differ in such other ways, which is option A.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The precise nine-hour figure is not something her argument needs.
- Option C: What teachers prefer is irrelevant to the causal claim about results.



- Option D: The argument does not need results to be the only measure of a school.

Final Answer: She assumes the two groups of schools are otherwise alike ⇒

[Go Back to Q8](#)

Q9.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her claim is stronger if the later start itself, not other differences, lifts results. Option D describes a district that delayed its start while leaving everything else unchanged and then saw results rise. Holding all else fixed and changing only the start time isolates the start time as the cause. This directly supports her causal claim, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Parents welcoming the change says nothing about its effect on results.
- Option B: The late teenage body clock is already granted and does not settle the cause.
- Option C: The head teacher's diligence does not show the later start works.

Final Answer: A controlled change isolating start time strengthens it ⇒

[Go Back to Q9](#)

Q10.

Solution

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

Reasoning: She blames the higher results on the later start. Option B offers a rival cause: the later-starting schools are wealthier, with smaller classes and more tutoring. Those advantages could by themselves raise results, whether or not the bell rings later. This rival explanation undercuts her causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few late arrivals is a minor point that does not touch the main



claim.

- Option C: Pupils enjoying a lie-in says nothing about examination results.
- Option D: Sports moving to the evening is a side effect, not evidence about the cause of results.

Final Answer: The wealth of later-starting schools offers a rival cause ⇒

Answer: (B) [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 teacher's causal claim against the doubters' rival explanation. If the other advantages of later-starting schools really explain the gap, the start time is not doing the work. So delaying the bell in this district need not raise its results. Option C draws exactly this supported conclusion.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Turning the weakest pupils into the strongest is far too strong a claim.
- Option B: "No effect at all" overstates the case; the passage does not deny sleep matters.
- Option D: Nothing supports the claim that the district's pupils out-sleep everyone else.

Final Answer: If other advantages explain the gap, a later bell need not help ⇒

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

Q12.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The head teacher sees that later-starting schools also have higher results. From this pairing she concludes that the later start causes the higher results. But two things going together does not show that one causes the other, especially when the schools differ in other ways. Option A names exactly this correlation-to-cause error.



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 school has ever changed its start time.
- Option D: It rests on statewide results, not on one scientist's opinion.

Final Answer: It reads a mere correlation as proof of cause \Rightarrow **A**

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

Q13.

Solution

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

Reasoning: She describes the jams and then proposes a remedy. Her point is to get that remedy adopted. That remedy is a peak-hour charge for driving into the central zone. The description of the congestion is evidence leading to this recommendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Slow traffic is background evidence, not the point argued for.
- Option B: Buses being stuck is another piece of the problem, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The lack of train service is raised by the doubters, not her conclusion.

Final Answer: The call for a congestion charge is the conclusion \Rightarrow **D**

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

Q14.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the argument depends on.

Reasoning: The charge eases the jams only if it takes cars off the road. That requires a good many drivers to respond to the fee by not driving in, rather than just paying it. If almost everyone simply paid and drove as before, the traffic would not fall. So the argument assumes a significant number of drivers would



choose not to drive in, which is option B.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Whether the scheme turns a profit does not bear on whether it eases congestion.
- Option C: Powers to fine avoiders are a detail of enforcement, not the core assumption.
- Option D: The number of passengers per car is not something the argument needs.

Final Answer: It assumes many drivers would stop driving in, not just pay ⇒ **B**

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

Q15.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The doubt is whether a charge actually reduces the number of cars entering the centre. Option A reports that in two other cities such a charge cut incoming traffic by about a fifth and kept it low. That is direct evidence that a peak-hour charge does reduce the traffic as she claims. So it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Drivers complaining about journey times does not show the charge would cut traffic.
- Option C: Where the offices are does not bear on whether drivers would be deterred.
- Option D: How the charge is collected is a practical detail, not evidence it eases jams.

Final Answer: Evidence the charge cut traffic elsewhere strengthens it ⇒ **A**

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



Q16.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes drivers will respond to the charge by not driving in. Option C says most peak-hour drivers have no alternative to the car and would pay the fee while driving exactly as before. If that is so, the charge would not take cars off the road and the jams would not ease. That breaks the link between the charge and less congestion, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few drivers slipping around the edge is a minor leak, not the main issue.
- Option B: Spending the revenue on buses, if anything, could help, not hurt, her case.
- Option D: Shops fearing lost custom is a separate worry, not evidence about the traffic.

Final Answer: Drivers with no alternative would just pay and drive on ⇒ C

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

Q17.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The passage sets the plan against the possibility that drivers have no alternative to the car. If they simply pay the charge and keep driving, the number of cars would not fall. The charge would then raise money without easing the congestion. Option B states exactly this supported possibility.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Clear the roads completely” is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option C: Nothing says Calderport’s transport is the best in the region; the opposite is suggested.
- Option D: “No driver would ever pay” is contradicted by the doubters’ own point.

Final Answer: If drivers just pay, the scheme may not ease jams ⇒ B



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

Q18.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her reasoning is: put a cost (a fee) on an activity and people will do less of it, giving the desired result. Option D has the same shape: charge a fee for dumping rubbish and people will dump less. Both expect a new charge to change behaviour and cut the unwanted activity. So option D is the closest parallel.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: This applies a long safety record to one case; it is prediction, not a fee-changes-behaviour argument.
- Option B: This projects a past pattern onto a new plan; it is induction, not the charge pattern.
- Option C: This generalises from two happy customers; it is weak generalisation, not the fee pattern.

Final Answer: The rubbish-fee argument matches the pattern \Rightarrow **D**

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

Q19.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The columnist describes the waste caused by fast fashion as her reason. She uses it to press for a specific measure. That measure is a special tax on the cheapest ready-made clothing. This recommendation is what her argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The pace of new ranges is background about how fast fashion works.
- Option C: The recycling revenue is expressly said not to be the heart of her case.
- Option D: The short life of the garments is a supporting fact, not the conclusion.



Final Answer: The call to tax cheap clothing is the conclusion \Rightarrow **A**

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

Q20.

Solution

What is asked: the unstated assumption the argument needs.

Reasoning: Her argument runs: a tax raises the price, a higher price means people buy fewer garments, fewer bought means less waste. The key link is that a higher price will actually cut how much people buy. If a price rise did not reduce buying, the whole chain would fail. So the argument assumes that a higher price would lead people to buy fewer cheap garments, which is option C.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Whether other harmful goods are taxed is not something her argument needs.
- Option B: The relative cost of recycling is a side point, not the core assumption.
- Option D: The argument does not depend on fast fashion being economically useless.

Final Answer: It assumes a higher price would cut how much people buy \Rightarrow **C**

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

Q21.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The weak point is whether taxing cheap clothes really cuts how many are bought and thrown away. Option B reports that where such a tax was tried, sales of cheap garments fell sharply and textile waste dropped. That is real evidence the tax works as the columnist claims. So it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Shoppers feeling guilty does not show a tax would actually reduce their buying.
- Option C: The poor quality of the fibres does not show the tax would cut purchases.



- Option D: The columnist's experience does not show the tax reduces waste.

Final Answer: Evidence the tax cut sales and waste elsewhere strengthens it ⇒

B

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

Q22.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes the tax would cut the quantity of cheap garments bought and discarded. Option D says shoppers could just order the same cheap clothes from foreign websites the tax would not reach. If they did, the amount bought, briefly worn, and thrown away would stay much the same. That breaks the link between the tax and less waste, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few second-hand shoppers do not undo the general effect the tax is meant to have.
- Option B: Some costly clothes also being wasted does not show the tax on cheap clothes fails.
- Option C: The tax covering children's clothing is a detail of scope, not a blow to the case.

Final Answer: Buyers switching to untaxed foreign sellers defeats the aim ⇒ **D**

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

Q23.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The columnist's whole case rests on the tax reducing how many cheap garments people buy. It follows that if the tax did not reduce that buying, her case for cutting waste 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: “No shopper ever again” is far too absolute to be supported.
- Option D: The passage does not say expensive clothing never reaches landfill.

Final Answer: The conditional about reduced buying is supported ⇒

[Go Back to Q23](#)

Q24.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The columnist assumes that pricing cheap garments out of reach will simply mean less clothing bought and wasted. But shoppers denied cheap local garments might turn to other, equally wasteful sources instead. The retailers’ point about foreign websites shows exactly this possibility. By overlooking it, the argument takes for granted that people will buy less rather than switch, which option B names.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not deny that fast fashion produces waste; that is its starting point.
- Option C: It does not assume that no garment is ever worn more than a few times.
- Option D: The passage treats the waste figures as genuine, not as guesses.

Final Answer: It overlooks a switch to equally wasteful alternatives ⇒

[Go Back to Q24](#)



Answer Key

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

