

# CLAT Logical Reasoning

## Sample Paper – 8

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.*

Every Saturday morning, thousands of children across Brindle lace up their boots and take to the field for junior football, cricket and hockey. A youth coach writing in the local paper argues that these games do far more than keep children fit. Children who play organised sport, he says, learn to turn up on time, to practise a skill until they master it, and to keep their tempers when a match goes against them. Over a season they also learn to put the team's needs ahead of their own and to accept a referee's decision without sulking.

From this the coach draws a firm conclusion. Because organised youth sport teaches



punctuality, self-control, perseverance and teamwork, playing it, he says, builds character and discipline in the children who take part. The trophies and medals, he adds, are pleasant but beside the point; the real reward is the strength of character a child carries into adult life. Parents who want disciplined children, he suggests in passing, could do worse than sign them up for a local club.

A parents' group is less sure. They point out that many of the best-behaved and most self-disciplined children they know have never played a competitive sport at all, having built the same habits through music lessons, chores or scouting. They also note that some children come away from youth sport having learned mainly to argue with officials and to taunt opponents, picking up habits their parents would rather they had not. Character, the group suggests, may depend far more on how a child is coached and guided than on whether a ball is involved.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the coach's argument?
- (A) Organised youth sport keeps children physically fit.
  - (B) The trophies and medals children win are beside the point.
  - (C) Playing organised youth sport builds character and discipline in the children who take part.
  - (D) Parents who want disciplined children could sign them up for a local club.
- Q2.** The coach's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) The habits a child shows on the sports field carry over into his or her character more generally.
  - (B) Children enjoy playing organised sport more than they enjoy music lessons.
  - (C) Sports clubs in Brindle are free for every child to join.
  - (D) Trophies and medals have no value of any kind.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the coach's argument?
- (A) Many children say they find sports practice tiring.



- (B) A study that tracked children over several years found that those who took up organised sport later became markedly more punctual and self-controlled than similar children who did not.
- (C) Brindle has more sports clubs than any neighbouring town.
- (D) Some professional athletes are widely admired for their discipline.
- Q4.** Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the coach's argument?
- (A) Some parents cannot easily afford club fees and kit.
- (B) A few of the coaches in Brindle are volunteers with little training.
- (C) Not every child in Brindle enjoys playing team sports.
- (D) When children of similar background were compared, those who played organised sport turned out to be no more disciplined than those who did not.
- Q5.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage?
- (A) Children who play sport will never develop good character.
- (B) If the same habits can be built through music, chores or scouting, then sport is not the only way to raise a disciplined child.
- (C) Youth sport always teaches children to taunt their opponents.
- (D) Character depends entirely on a child's coach and not at all on the child.
- Q6.** In the coach's argument, the statement that youth sport teaches punctuality, self-control, perseverance and teamwork serves as:
- (A) a premise offered in support of the conclusion that youth sport builds character.
- (B) the main conclusion the passage sets out to prove.
- (C) an objection that the coach raises in order to reject it.
- (D) an unrelated remark included only for background colour.



**Passage II**

*Directions (Q7–Q12): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.*

At Halton College the science department has long tested its students with closed-book exams, in which no notes or textbooks are allowed. This year the head of department, Dr Rees, trialled open-book exams in one module, letting students bring any printed material they liked into the hall. The results were striking: the average mark rose by eight points, and far fewer students failed. Dr Rees concluded that open-book exams are the better form of assessment and proposed that the college switch every science module to the open-book format.

Her reasoning is straightforward. In an open-book exam, she says, students are not rewarded for memorising facts they could simply look up, but for understanding and applying ideas, which is what really matters. Because the trial produced higher marks and fewer failures, she argues, it shows that students learn and perform better under the open-book system, and so the college should adopt it everywhere.

Several colleagues have raised doubts. The module Dr Rees chose for the trial, they note, was one of the easier courses in the degree, and the exam paper that year was widely felt to be gentler than usual. They also point out that a higher average mark does not by itself show that students understood more; it may simply show that an open-book paper is easier to pass. One tutor adds that in subjects which really do depend on quick recall, such as anatomy, being able to leaf through a textbook during the exam might teach students nothing at all about what they still need to know by heart.

**Q7.** What is the main conclusion Dr Rees draws?

- (A) Open-book exams stop rewarding students for memorising facts they could look up.
- (B) The college should switch every science module to the open-book exam format.
- (C) The trial module's average mark rose by eight points.
- (D) Anatomy is a subject that depends heavily on quick recall.

**Q8.** Dr Rees's argument assumes which of the following?

- (A) Every student at Halton College owns the required textbooks.
- (B) Closed-book exams have never produced a high average mark.
- (C) Students prefer open-book exams to closed-book ones.



(D) The rise in marks was due to the open-book format itself, not to the trial module or paper being easier than usual.

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

(A) Students said they felt less nervous in the open-book exam.

(B) The college library has enough copies of each textbook.

(C) When a module of average difficulty was tested both ways under the same paper, the open-book group still scored markedly higher on questions that required applying ideas.

(D) Open-book exams take less time for tutors to mark.

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

(A) The higher marks came from an unusually easy module with a gentle paper; on a normal module, the open-book format made no difference to the results.

(B) Some students forgot to bring any notes to the open-book exam.

(C) Dr Rees has taught at the college for many years.

(D) A few students dislike carrying heavy textbooks into the hall.

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

(A) Closed-book exams should be banned throughout the college.

(B) Students never learn anything in a closed-book exam.

(C) Open-book exams are the fairest form of assessment in every subject.

(D) If the higher marks reflect an easier paper rather than deeper understanding, the trial does not show that open-book exams are better.

**Q12.** Dr Rees's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:

(A) assumes that no student has ever passed a closed-book exam.

(B) treats a higher average mark as proof of deeper learning, when higher marks may only show that the paper was easier to pass.



- (C) relies on results that the passage says were invented.
- (D) depends entirely on the opinion of a single student.

### 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.*

When the Vance family fitted solar panels to the roof of their house last year, their monthly electricity bill fell sharply. In an article for a home-owners' magazine, Mr Vance now argues that fitting rooftop solar is a simple financial win for almost any household. The panels, he writes, generate free electricity from sunlight during the day, so the family draws far less power from the grid and pays far less for it. Over the year his own bill dropped by more than half, and he expects the panels to pay back their purchase price within a few years and then to save money for decades.

From his own experience Mr Vance draws a general conclusion: any homeowner who fits rooftop solar panels will save a large amount of money on electricity. He urges readers not to delay, insisting that the sooner the panels go up, the sooner the savings begin. Whatever a household spends on the system, he says, it will earn back and more.

Other homeowners are cautious. They point out that the Vance house has a large, unshaded south-facing roof in one of the sunniest districts in the region, and that the family is at home during the day using power exactly when the panels produce most. A neighbour with a small, shaded roof who is out at work all day found that her panels generated little, and that most of what they did generate was fed back to the grid for a very low price. How much a household saves, they argue, depends heavily on its roof, its location and its daily pattern of use.

- Q13.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of Mr Vance's argument?
- (A) The Vance family's electricity bill fell after they fitted solar panels.
  - (B) Solar panels generate electricity from sunlight during the day.
  - (C) Any homeowner who fits rooftop solar panels will save a large amount of money on electricity.
  - (D) Households should not delay in fitting solar panels.
- Q14.** Mr Vance's argument assumes that:
- (A) other households' roofs, locations and patterns of use are enough like the Vances' for them to save as much.



- (B) solar panels never need any cleaning or maintenance.
- (C) electricity prices will fall over the coming years.
- (D) every homeowner would like to reduce their electricity bill.

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

- (A) The Vance family are pleased with how their panels look on the roof.
- (B) Solar technology has improved a great deal over the past decade.
- (C) Many homeowners say they would like to help the environment.
- (D) A survey of thousands of ordinary households with varied roofs, locations and daily routines found that nearly all made large savings after fitting solar panels.

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

- (A) Fitting a set of panels usually takes an installation crew only a day or two.
- (B) Households with small, shaded or north-facing roofs, or who are out all day, typically saved little or nothing after fitting panels.
- (C) Some homeowners choose to install more panels than they really need.
- (D) The Vance family also made a habit of switching off unused lights.

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

- (A) Rooftop solar panels never save any household money.
- (B) Every household in the sunniest district will halve its electricity bill.
- (C) If savings depend heavily on a home's roof, location and daily use, then fitting panels will not bring large savings to every household.
- (D) The Vance family made a mistake in fitting their panels.



- Q18.** Which of the following arguments is most similar in its reasoning to Mr Vance's argument?
- (A) My south-facing garden grew a wonderful crop of tomatoes, so anyone who plants tomatoes in their garden will get a wonderful crop too.
  - (B) Every house on this street has a chimney, so this house probably has a chimney as well.
  - (C) The medicine worked for me and for my brother, so it may help others with the same illness.
  - (D) All metals expand when heated, so this copper wire will expand when it is heated.

### 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.*

When the food-delivery app QuickBite arrived in Marlow, many local restaurants signed up to it, and orders poured in. A restaurant consultant points to this rush of orders as proof of something. Since joining QuickBite, she notes, the Spice Garden restaurant saw the number of meals it sold each week jump by half. On the strength of cases like this, she advises every restaurant owner in the town that the way to raise profits is to sign up to the delivery app and chase as many online orders as possible.

Her argument is simple. Delivery apps put a restaurant in front of thousands of customers who would never have walked past its door, she says. More customers seeing the menu means more orders, and more orders means more money; so any restaurant that joins the app and pushes for online orders will make more profit than one that stays off it.

Some owners who tried this tell a different story. The app, they found, charges a large commission on every order it passes on, often close to a third of the bill. Once that commission, the extra packaging and the cost of the delivery drivers were counted, several restaurants discovered that their busiest delivery weeks were also their least profitable, because each online meal earned them far less than a meal eaten in the restaurant. One owner said she was working harder than ever, cooking more meals than ever, and yet taking home less at the end of the month than before she joined.

- Q19.** What is the main conclusion of the consultant's argument?
- (A) QuickBite arrived in Marlow and many local restaurants signed up to it.



- (B) Delivery apps put a restaurant in front of thousands of new customers.
- (C) The Spice Garden's weekly sales jumped by half after it joined the app.
- (D) To raise profits, every restaurant should sign up to the delivery app and chase as many online orders as possible.

**Q20.** The consultant's argument assumes that:

- (A) every restaurant in Marlow owns a kitchen large enough to cook more meals.
- (B) QuickBite will remain the only delivery app in the town.
- (C) the money earned from the extra online orders is more than the added costs of serving them.
- (D) customers prefer delivered food to food eaten in the restaurant.

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

- (A) A study of similar restaurants found that, even after commission and delivery costs, those that joined the app ended each month with clearly higher profits than those that stayed off it.
- (B) QuickBite's app is quick and easy for customers to use.
- (C) A great many people in Marlow own smartphones.
- (D) Some restaurants decorate their delivery boxes with a printed logo.

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

- (A) A few customers complain that delivered food sometimes arrives cold.
- (B) After the app's large commission, packaging and driver costs, each online meal earns a restaurant far less than a meal eaten in, and the busiest delivery weeks proved the least profitable.



- (C) Some restaurants in Marlow do not have a website of their own.
- (D) QuickBite occasionally runs discounts that its customers enjoy.

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

- (A) No restaurant in Marlow should ever use a delivery app.
- (B) Delivered meals always taste worse than meals eaten in the restaurant.
- (C) QuickBite will soon go out of business.
- (D) If the app's commission and extra costs outweigh the revenue from online meals, then chasing more online orders can lower a restaurant's profit rather than raise it.

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

- (A) assumes that no customer has ever ordered food for delivery.
- (B) denies that restaurants have any costs at all in the kitchen.
- (C) treats a rise in the number of orders as though it must mean a rise in profit, ignoring the costs that come with each online order.
- (D) relies on sales figures that the passage says were invented.



**Detailed Solutions**

Q1.

**Solution**

**What is asked:** the main conclusion, the single claim the whole argument is meant to support.

**Reasoning:** The coach lists things children learn on the field (punctuality, self-control, perseverance, teamwork). He offers these as reasons. They all build towards one central claim. That claim is that playing organised youth sport builds character and discipline.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Keeping children fit is a minor point the coach sets aside as not the main thing.
- Option B: That trophies are beside the point is an aside, not the claim being argued for.
- Option D: Enrolling children is a passing suggestion that follows from the conclusion, not the conclusion itself.

**Final Answer:** The character-building claim 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 coach infers general character from habits shown during a game. This only follows if those on-field habits actually shape the child more widely. If the punctuality and self-control stayed on the pitch, no character would be built. So the argument must assume the field habits carry over into the child's wider character.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: Which activity children enjoy more is irrelevant to whether sport builds character.
- Option C: The cost of joining a club is not something the argument depends on.
- Option D: The argument does not need trophies to be worthless, only beside



the point.

**Final Answer:** The field habits must carry over into character  $\Rightarrow$  **A**

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

Q3.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The weak point is whether sport really builds discipline or whether disciplined children happen to play. Evidence tracking children over time would test this directly. Option B says children who took up sport later became more punctual and self-controlled than similar children who did not. That supports the claim that the sport itself builds the habits, so it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Practice being tiring says nothing about character being built.
- Option C: The number of clubs in Brindle does not show sport builds discipline.
- Option D: A few disciplined professionals do not show ordinary children gain discipline from playing.

**Final Answer:** A study showing sport later raised discipline strengthens it  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

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

Q4.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The coach claims playing sport makes children more disciplined. Option D compares children of similar background and finds the players no more disciplined than the non-players. If matched children turn out equally disciplined, the sport is not adding the discipline. That directly attacks the causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Cost of fees is about access, not about whether sport builds character.



- Option B: Untrained volunteers is a side point that does not settle the effect on discipline.
- Option C: Some children not enjoying sport does not show it fails to build character.

**Final Answer:** Matched children being equally disciplined defeats the claim ⇒ **D**

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

Q5.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The parents' group observes that disciplined children built the same habits through music, chores or scouting. If those routes produce the same habits, sport cannot be the only path to a disciplined child. Option B states exactly this modest, supported conclusion. It follows directly from the group's point.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: "Never develop good character" is far stronger than anything said.
- Option C: "Always teaches taunting" overstates the group's point about some children.
- Option D: "Entirely on the coach and not at all on the child" is a sweeping claim the passage does not make.

**Final Answer:** Sport is not the only route to a disciplined child ⇒ **B**

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

Q6.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The statement that sport teaches punctuality, self-control, perseverance and teamwork is a set of reasons. It is offered to support the claim that sport builds character. A statement given in support of the conclusion is a premise. So it functions as a premise for the character-building conclusion.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: The conclusion is that sport builds character, not this list of lessons.



- Option C: It is asserted and relied upon, not raised as an objection to reject.
- Option D: It is central to the reasoning, not mere background colour.

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

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

Q7.

### Solution

**What is asked:** Dr Rees's main conclusion.

**Reasoning:** Dr Rees reports the trial results and reasons from them. Her whole point leads to one recommendation. That recommendation is that the college should switch every science module to open-book exams. The rest is evidence and reasoning offered in support of it.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The point about not rewarding memorising is a supporting reason, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The eight-point rise is a piece of evidence, not the recommendation.
- Option D: The remark about anatomy is a colleague's doubt, not Dr Rees's conclusion.

**Final Answer:** The call to switch every module is the conclusion  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

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

Q8.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** She moves from "marks rose in the trial" to "open-book exams are better, so adopt them everywhere". This works only if the open-book format caused the higher marks. If the module or paper was simply easier that year, the rise would not show the format is better. So she must assume the rise was due to the format, not to an easier module or paper.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Whether students own the textbooks is a practical detail, not the



core assumption.

- Option B: The argument does not need closed-book exams to have never scored high.
- Option C: Student preference is not what the causal claim rests on.

**Final Answer:** She assumes the format, not an easier paper, raised marks ⇒  D

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

Q9.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** Her case is stronger if the open-book format, not an easy paper, produced the better results. Option C holds the difficulty fixed: an average module tested both ways under the same paper. The open-book group still scored higher on questions needing applied understanding. Isolating the format like this supports her claim, so it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Feeling less nervous does not show deeper learning or performance.
- Option B: Enough library copies is about access, not about the format being better.
- Option D: Faster marking is a convenience unrelated to whether students learn more.

**Final Answer:** A same-difficulty comparison favouring open-book strengthens it ⇒  C

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

Q10.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** Her conclusion rests on the higher marks in the trial. Option A says those marks came from an unusually easy module and a gentle paper, and that a normal module showed no gain. If an easier paper, not the format, produced the rise, the trial does not show open-book exams are better. That removes the



support for her conclusion, so it most weakens it.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: A few students forgetting notes is minor and does not undo the overall result.
- Option C: Dr Rees's long service says nothing about whether the format caused the rise.
- Option D: Dislike of carrying textbooks is beside the point about results.

**Final Answer:** An easy module and gentle paper explain the rise ⇒

[Go Back to Q10](#)

Q11.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The colleagues point out that a higher average mark need not mean deeper understanding. If the higher marks reflect an easier paper rather than more understanding, the trial proves nothing about open-book being better. Option D states exactly this careful conditional. It follows directly from the colleagues' point.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: "Should be banned" is far stronger than the passage supports.
- Option B: "Never learn anything" in a closed-book exam is an overstatement.
- Option C: "Fairest in every subject" is contradicted by the anatomy worry.

**Final Answer:** If an easier paper drove the marks, the trial shows nothing ⇒

[Go Back to Q11](#)

Q12.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** Dr Rees sees higher average marks and concludes the students learned more. But a higher mark can come simply from an easier paper, without any deeper learning. Treating the mark as proof of learning skips over this alternative. Option B names exactly this flaw.



**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The argument does not assume nobody ever passed a closed-book exam.
- Option C: The passage treats the results as real, not invented.
- Option D: It rests on trial results, not on one student's opinion.

**Final Answer:** It mistakes higher marks for deeper learning  $\Rightarrow$

[Go Back to Q12](#)

Q13.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** Mr Vance starts from his own falling bill and reasons outward. He turns his case into a general claim about other people. That claim is that any homeowner who fits rooftop solar will save a large amount on electricity. This general statement is the point his argument is built to establish.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: His own bill falling is the evidence he starts from, not the general conclusion.
- Option B: How panels work is background, not the point argued for.
- Option D: Not delaying is a follow-on urging that rests on the conclusion.

**Final Answer:** "Any homeowner will save a lot" is the conclusion  $\Rightarrow$

[Go Back to Q13](#)

Q14.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** Mr Vance generalises from his own home to every homeowner. This step works only if other homes are relevantly like his. If other roofs, locations and usage patterns are very different, his savings would not carry over. So he must assume other households are enough like the Vances' to save as much, which is option A.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: The argument does not need panels to be maintenance-free.
- Option C: It does not rely on electricity prices falling; if anything, savings grow when prices rise.
- Option D: Whether homeowners want to save is not what the argument's logic needs.

**Final Answer:** Other homes must be enough like the Vances' ⇒ **A**

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

Q15.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The doubt is whether his single, favourable case holds for ordinary homes. Option D reports a survey of thousands of varied households, nearly all of which made large savings. A broad, varied sample showing savings across many roof and usage types supports his general claim. So it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Liking the look of the panels says nothing about savings.
- Option B: Improved technology in general does not show ordinary homes save money.
- Option C: Wanting to help the environment is about motive, not about savings.

**Final Answer:** A broad survey of varied homes saving strengthens it ⇒ **D**

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

Q16.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** He claims almost any household will save a large amount. Option B says homes with small, shaded or north-facing roofs, or with occupants out all day, typically saved little or nothing. If many ordinary homes save almost nothing, the sweeping claim fails for them. That directly undercuts the generalisation, so it most weakens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**



- Option A: A quick installation does not bear on how much a household saves.
- Option C: Over-buying panels is a separate choice, not evidence savings fail.
- Option D: Switching off lights, if anything, adds to the Vances' savings rather than weakening the claim.

**Final Answer:** Many homes saving little defeats the sweeping claim  $\Rightarrow$  **B**

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

Q17.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The cautious homeowners argue that savings depend on roof, location and daily use. If those factors decide the savings, then fitting panels cannot guarantee large savings for every home. Option C states exactly this measured conditional. It follows directly from the critics' point.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: "Never save any household money" is contradicted by the Vances' own case.
- Option B: "Every household will halve its bill" is the very overreach the passage warns against.
- Option D: Nothing suggests the Vances made a mistake; their panels saved them money.

**Final Answer:** Savings hinge on the home, so not every home gains a lot  $\Rightarrow$  **C**

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

Q18.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** His reasoning takes one favourable case (his own home) and generalises it to everyone, ignoring how conditions differ. Option A does the same: one south-facing garden's fine tomato crop is used to promise anyone a fine crop. Both leap from a single lucky, favourable case to a claim about all, overlooking differences in conditions. So option A is the closest parallel.

**Why the other options are wrong:**



- Option B: This applies a near-universal feature to one more case; it is ordinary sound reasoning, not the flaw.
- Option C: This generalises cautiously from two cases and even hedges with “may”; it does not match the sweeping leap.
- Option D: This applies a known general law to a case; the reasoning is valid, not the flawed pattern.

**Final Answer:** The one-garden-to-everyone leap matches the pattern ⇒ A

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

Q19.

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The consultant cites the rush of orders and the Spice Garden’s rise as her evidence. She uses it to advise every restaurant owner. Her advice, the point she is making, is that joining the app and chasing online orders is the way to raise profits. That recommendation is her conclusion.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The app’s arrival and the sign-ups are background facts.
- Option B: Reaching new customers is a supporting reason, not the recommendation.
- Option C: The Spice Garden’s sales rise is a single example she reasons from, not the conclusion.

**Final Answer:** Sign up and chase online orders to raise profits is the conclusion ⇒ D

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

Q20.

### Solution

**What is asked:** the assumption behind the consultant’s argument.

**Reasoning:** She argues that more orders mean more money and so more profit. That step holds only if the extra orders actually bring in more than they cost to serve. If each online order costs as much as it earns, more orders would not raise profit. So she must assume the money from the extra orders exceeds the added



costs, which is option C.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: Kitchen size is a practical detail, not the core assumption about profit.
- Option B: The argument does not need QuickBite to stay the only app.
- Option D: Whether customers prefer delivery is not what the profit claim rests on.

**Final Answer:** She assumes the extra orders earn more than they cost  $\Rightarrow$  **C**

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

**Q21.**

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** Her claim is stronger if joining the app really lifts profit, not just order counts. Option A compares similar restaurants and finds that, even after commission and delivery costs, those on the app ended each month with higher profits. Counting the costs and still finding higher profit answers the main doubt directly. So it strengthens the argument.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option B: An easy-to-use app does not show restaurants make more profit.
- Option C: Widespread smartphone ownership speaks to orders, not to profit after costs.
- Option D: Decorating delivery boxes has nothing to do with profitability.

**Final Answer:** Higher profit even after costs strengthens it  $\Rightarrow$  **A**

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

**Q22.**

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** Her argument assumes more orders bring more profit. Option B says that after the app's commission, packaging and driver costs, each online meal earns far less, and the busiest delivery weeks were the least profitable. If more



orders can go with less profit, the link from orders to profit breaks. That directly undercuts the argument, so it most weakens it.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: A few cold-food complaints do not show the strategy loses money.
- Option C: Some restaurants lacking a website is beside the point about profit.
- Option D: Occasional discounts customers enjoy do not address profit after costs.

**Final Answer:** Busiest delivery weeks being least profitable defeats it ⇒ **B**

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

**Q23.**

### Solution

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

**Reasoning:** The owners' experience shows that commission and extra costs can swallow the earnings from online meals. If those costs outweigh what each online meal brings in, then chasing more orders can cut profit instead of raising it. Option D states exactly this supported conditional. It follows from combining the advice with the owners' account of the costs.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: "Never use a delivery app" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option B: "Always taste worse" is about taste, which the passage does not claim.
- Option C: Nothing suggests QuickBite is about to go out of business.

**Final Answer:** If costs outweigh earnings, more orders can lower profit ⇒ **D**

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



Q24.

**Solution**

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

**Reasoning:** The consultant slides from “more orders” to “more profit” as if they were the same thing. But every online order also brings costs: commission, packaging and delivery. More orders can mean more revenue while profit falls once those costs are counted. Treating rising orders as automatically rising profit ignores the costs, which is the objection in option C.

**Why the other options are wrong:**

- Option A: The argument does not assume nobody ever orders delivery; it relies on the opposite.
- Option B: It does not deny kitchen costs exist; it simply overlooks the added delivery costs.
- Option D: The passage treats the sales figures as genuine, not invented.

**Final Answer:** It confuses more orders with more profit, ignoring costs ⇒ **C**

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



## Answer Key

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

