

CLAT Logical Reasoning

Sample Paper – 9

Duration: 24 Minutes

Maximum Marks: 24

Instructions

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

Passage I

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

The town of Harwick, facing a tight budget, is considering whether to close its central public library to save money. A local councillor has spoken out against the plan. Last year, she notes, the library recorded more than a hundred thousand visits. It lends books without charge, offers free internet to people who have none at home, provides quiet rooms where students prepare for exams, and runs sessions that help job-seekers write their applications. Many of those who use it, she adds, could not easily pay for these things elsewhere.

The councillor argues that a public library is not a luxury but a service a fair town owes



its residents, especially its poorer ones. Closing it, she says, would leave many people with nowhere free to read, study, or get online. The small saving to the town's budget would be far outweighed by the harm done to those who depend on the library most. She therefore urges the council to reject the closure and keep the central library open and properly funded. Its running costs, she notes, are only a tiny fraction of the town's yearly spending. She adds that the library also holds a popular children's story hour every weekend, though she treats this as a welcome extra rather than her main reason.

- Q1.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the councillor's argument?
- (A) The library recorded more than a hundred thousand visits last year.
 - (B) The council should reject the closure and keep the central library open and properly funded.
 - (C) The library's running costs are only a tiny fraction of the town's yearly spending.
 - (D) A children's story hour is held at the library every weekend.
- Q2.** The councillor's argument depends on which of the following assumptions?
- (A) Every resident of Harwick uses the public library at least once a year.
 - (B) The library is the oldest public building in the town.
 - (C) Job-seekers are the largest single group of library users.
 - (D) The residents who rely on the library could not readily obtain the same free services from anywhere else in the town.
- Q3.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the councillor's argument?
- (A) A neighbouring town that closed its library saw many low-income residents lose their only free means of getting online and applying for jobs.
 - (B) Some residents of Harwick prefer to buy their own books rather than borrow them.



- (C) The library building has an attractive historic facade.
- (D) The librarians employed at the branch are generally well qualified.

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

- (A) The town is about to open free internet points and staffed study rooms in community centres across Harwick, which current library users could use instead.
- (B) A number of the library's books are old and are rarely borrowed.
- (C) The councillor has used the library herself since she was a child.
- (D) Some members of the council find long budget debates tiresome.

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

- (A) Harwick's budget problems will be solved entirely by keeping the library open.
- (B) If the library's users have nowhere else to obtain these free services, closing it would leave those users worse off.
- (C) The library is the most popular building in the whole town.
- (D) The council has already voted to go ahead with the closure.

Q6. In the argument, the statement that the small saving to the budget would be far outweighed by the harm done to those who depend on the library most serves as:

- (A) a premise supporting the recommendation that the council keep the library open.
- (B) the main conclusion that the rest of the passage is meant to prove.
- (C) an objection that the councillor goes on to reject.
- (D) an unrelated remark included only as background.

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.



A recent report examined the daily habits of several thousand young children. It found that children who spent more than three hours a day looking at screens tended to sleep less at night, took part in less outdoor play, and reached certain early speech milestones later than children who spent little time on screens. Across the group, more screen time went hand in hand with poorer sleep, less activity, and slower early development.

A well-known paediatrician draws a firm lesson from the report. Screen time, he argues, is plainly damaging young children: it is robbing them of sleep, keeping them from active play, and holding back their speech. The way to protect children's health and development, he concludes, is for parents to cut their young children's daily screen time sharply. He recommends that no child under five be allowed more than an hour of screen time a day.

Others urge caution. The children who spent the most time on screens, they note, were often those whose parents worked long or irregular hours and so had less time for outdoor play, bedtime routines, or talking with their children. It may be, they suggest, that the same crowded home circumstances lead both to heavy screen use and to the poorer outcomes, rather than the screens themselves being the cause.

Q7. What is the main conclusion the paediatrician draws?

- (A) Children who spend more time on screens tend to sleep less at night.
- (B) The report examined the daily habits of several thousand young children.
- (C) Parents should sharply cut their young children's daily screen time.
- (D) The children who used screens most often came from busier households.

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

- (A) Every young child in the study owned a personal tablet or phone.
- (B) It is the screen time itself, rather than some other factor, that is causing the children's poorer sleep, activity and development.
- (C) Parents are able to monitor exactly how long their children spend on screens.
- (D) Outdoor play is the only activity that benefits a young child's development.



- Q9.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the paediatrician's conclusion?
- (A) Many parents say they find it hard to limit their children's screen time.
 - (B) Screens have become cheaper and more common in homes over the past decade.
 - (C) Some children enjoy educational programmes as much as games.
 - (D) When children from similar households were compared, those given more screen time still slept less and spoke later than those given little.
- Q10.** Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the paediatrician's conclusion?
- (A) A few children in the study used screens for less than an hour a day.
 - (B) Some parents use screens to keep children calm during long journeys.
 - (C) When children from equally busy households were compared, the amount of screen time made no difference to their sleep or development.
 - (D) Screens are sometimes used to let children speak to relatives who live far away.
- Q11.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage as a whole?
- (A) Young children who use screens will never learn to speak properly.
 - (B) Screens are the single greatest danger to children's health today.
 - (C) Parents who limit screen time care more about their children than those who do not.
 - (D) If crowded home circumstances are what cause both the heavy screen use and the poorer outcomes, cutting screen time alone might not improve those outcomes.



- Q12.** The paediatrician's reasoning is most vulnerable to the criticism that it:
- (A) treats screen time as the cause of the poorer outcomes when a shared factor, such as a child's home circumstances, might be causing both.
 - (B) relies on figures that the passage says were invented.
 - (C) assumes that no child has ever slept badly for any other reason.
 - (D) depends entirely on the opinion of a single parent.

Passage III

Directions (Q13–Q18): Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on the reasoning in the passage.

The city of Calder recently launched a public bike-sharing scheme, placing racks of hire bikes at stations across the centre. In its first year, the bikes were used for more than two million journeys. Over the same year, the council reports, the number of cars entering the city centre fell by about eight per cent, and measured air quality improved slightly. A transport official points to these figures with pride. The bike-share scheme, she argues, has plainly taken cars off the road: people who once drove into the centre are now cycling instead, which is why car numbers have fallen and the air has grown cleaner. She urges the council to expand the scheme by adding hundreds more bikes and stations, confident that this will cut car traffic further still.

Some observers are less sure. The scheme's first year, they point out, was also the year the city sharply raised its parking charges, opened a new suburban rail line, and saw fuel prices climb to record highs. Any of these, they argue, could have discouraged people from driving into the centre. Moreover, surveys suggest that many bike-share trips replaced journeys people would otherwise have made on foot or by bus, not by car.

- Q13.** Which of the following is the main conclusion of the transport official's argument?
- (A) The bike-share scheme was used for more than two million journeys in its first year.
 - (B) The council should expand the bike-share scheme by adding hundreds more bikes and stations.
 - (C) The number of cars entering the city centre fell by about eight per cent.
 - (D) Air quality in the city improved slightly over the year.



- Q14.** The official's argument assumes that:
- (A) cycling is a healthier form of exercise than walking.
 - (B) the hire bikes are cheaper to run than the city's buses.
 - (C) every resident of Calder knows how to ride a bicycle.
 - (D) the fall in car numbers was caused by the bike-share scheme rather than by the other changes of that year.
- Q15.** Which of the following, if true, would most strengthen the official's argument?
- (A) Residents say the hire bikes are painted in bright, attractive colours.
 - (B) The bike stations are conveniently placed near the city's main shops.
 - (C) A survey of bike-share users found that most of them would otherwise have driven into the centre by car.
 - (D) Cycling has become a popular weekend pastime in the surrounding countryside.
- Q16.** Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the official's argument?
- (A) Surveys suggest that most bike-share trips replaced journeys people would otherwise have made on foot or by bus, not by car.
 - (B) A small number of the hire bikes were damaged during the first year.
 - (C) The scheme cost more to set up than the council had first expected.
 - (D) Some cyclists complain that there are too few stations near the railway.
- Q17.** Which of the following is best supported by the passage?
- (A) The city will never manage to reduce its traffic by any means.
 - (B) Bicycles are always better for a city than cars in every respect.
 - (C) If the higher parking charges, new rail line and record fuel prices caused the fall in car numbers, expanding the bike scheme need not cut car traffic any further.



(D) The bike-share scheme had no effect whatever on how people travel.

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

(A) A shop began playing soft background music in the month its sales rose, so the owner concludes the music raised the sales and plans to play more of it to raise them further.

(B) Every bus on this route has been late all week, so tomorrow's bus will probably be late as well.

(C) This cough syrup relieved my cough and my cousin's, so it is a dependable cure for coughs.

(D) All the offices in this building close on public holidays, so this particular office will be closed on the holiday.

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.

Livestock farming is a major source of greenhouse gases. Raising cattle and other animals for food produces large quantities of methane and other gases, and studies show that producing a kilogram of beef releases many times more of these gases than growing the same weight of beans or grain. In the country of Verdana, farming is responsible for a sizeable share of total emissions, most of it from livestock.

A climate campaigner draws a conclusion. If the country is to meet its targets for cutting greenhouse gases, she argues, it must sharply reduce how much meat its people eat. She urges the government to launch a heavy tax on beef and lamb, expecting that dearer meat will push people towards plant-based foods and so bring the country's farming emissions down.

Critics raise doubts. Much of the meat eaten in Verdana, they note, is already imported, and a tax on domestic sales might simply lead shoppers to buy cheaper imported meat, produced abroad with no fall in global emissions. They add that if people replace beef not with beans but with imported cheese or air-freighted foods, the saving in emissions could be small or even reversed. The campaigner, they say, has assumed that taxing meat at home will straightforwardly lower the emissions that matter, which are global.

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



- (A) Producing beef releases far more greenhouse gas than growing beans or grain.
- (B) To meet its climate targets, Verdana must sharply reduce how much meat its people eat.
- (C) Livestock farming is responsible for a sizeable share of the country's emissions.
- (D) Much of the meat eaten in Verdana is already imported from abroad.

Q20. The campaigner's argument assumes that:

- (A) beef and lamb are the most expensive meats sold in Verdana.
- (B) every shopper checks the price of meat before buying it.
- (C) taxing meat at home will lead to a real fall in the global emissions that the country's targets are concerned with.
- (D) plant-based foods taste as good to most people as meat does.

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

- (A) Many people in Verdana say they would like to eat more healthily.
- (B) Beans and grains are widely available in the country's shops.
- (C) The campaigner has studied the science of greenhouse gases for many years.
- (D) In a similar country that taxed beef, shoppers switched mainly to beans and lentils, and its overall food emissions fell with no rise in meat imports.

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

- (A) A few wealthy shoppers would be willing to pay any price for beef.
- (B) After a similar tax elsewhere, shoppers simply bought cheaper imported meat and more cheese, so total emissions did not fall.
- (C) Some farmers in Verdana raise animals on a very small scale.



(D) Meat is sold in both supermarkets and local butchers' shops.

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

(A) A tax on meat will certainly wipe out Verdana's farming industry.

(B) People in Verdana will stop eating meat altogether within a few years.

(C) Imported food is always worse for the climate than food produced at home.

(D) If taxed shoppers switch to imported meat or other high-emission foods, the tax need not lower the global emissions that matter.

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

(A) assumes that cutting the meat bought at home must cut the global emissions the target is concerned with, overlooking that consumption may simply shift to imported meat or other high-emission foods.

(B) denies that livestock farming produces any greenhouse gas at all.

(C) relies on emission figures that the passage says were invented.

(D) rests entirely on the opinion of a single farmer.



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

What is asked: the main conclusion, that is, the single claim the whole argument is put forward to support.

Reasoning: The councillor lists what the library does and whom it helps as her reasons. All of these points build towards one recommendation. That recommendation is that the council should reject the closure and keep the library open and funded. Everything else is offered to support this call to act.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The visit figure is a supporting fact, not the point argued for.
- Option C: The running-cost point is a premise backing the recommendation, not the conclusion.
- Option D: The story hour is expressly called a welcome extra, not the main aim.

Final Answer: The call to keep the library open 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 councillor claims that closing the library would leave many people with nowhere free to read, study, or get online. This holds only if those people cannot get the same free services from somewhere else. If another free source existed, closing the library would not leave them stranded. So the argument must assume there is no such alternative in the town.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need every resident to use the library.
- Option B: The age of the building is irrelevant to the harm claim.
- Option C: Which group is largest is not something the argument relies on.

Final Answer: No other free source of the services is the needed assumption \Rightarrow **D**



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

Q3.

Solution

What is asked: the option that most strengthens the argument to keep the library open.

Reasoning: The argument's key claim is that closing the library would seriously harm those who depend on it. Evidence that this harm really occurs would support it. Option A reports that a comparable town's closure left low-income residents with no free way to get online or apply for jobs. That is real evidence of the harm the councillor warns of, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: Some people preferring to buy books, if anything, cuts against the claim of dependence.
- Option C: An attractive facade says nothing about the harm of closing.
- Option D: Well-qualified staff does not show residents would be harmed by closure.

Final Answer: Evidence of real harm from a comparable closure strengthens it ⇒

A

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

Q4.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The argument assumes library users would have nowhere else free to go if it closed. Option A says the town is opening free internet points and study rooms elsewhere that those users could use instead. If the same free services are available nearby, closing the library need not leave anyone stranded. That removes the argument's central harm, so it most weakens it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: A few unread books do not undo the value of the library's other services.
- Option C: The councillor's own use is not evidence about residents' harm.
- Option D: Council members' boredom is beside the point.



Final Answer: Free alternatives elsewhere remove the claimed harm \Rightarrow **A**

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

Q5.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The councillor's case rests on users having nowhere else free to obtain these services. It follows that, on her own terms, if they truly have no alternative, closing the library would leave them worse off. Option B states exactly this conditional. It reflects the structure of the argument rather than overstating it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Solved entirely" is far stronger than anything claimed.
- Option C: The passage never says the library is the town's most popular building.
- Option D: Nothing says the council has already voted to close it; the debate is ongoing.

Final Answer: The conditional about being worse off is supported \Rightarrow **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 the small saving is far outweighed by the harm is offered as a reason. It is used to support the final recommendation to keep the library open. A claim offered in support of the conclusion is a premise. So the statement functions as a premise for the recommendation.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The main conclusion is the call to keep the library open, not this weighing claim.
- Option C: It is asserted and relied upon, not raised only to be rejected.
- Option D: It is central to the reasoning, not stray background.

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 paediatrician's main conclusion.

Reasoning: He reads the report's findings and infers that screens are damaging children. He then makes a recommendation, which is the point his argument is meant to establish. That recommendation is that parents should sharply cut their young children's daily screen time. The rest is evidence and inference leading to it.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The sleep finding is a supporting fact from the report, not his conclusion.
- Option B: The scope of the study is background, not the point argued for.
- Option D: That heavy users came from busier homes is the critics' point, not his conclusion.

Final Answer: The call to cut screen time is the conclusion \Rightarrow **C**

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

Q8.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The paediatrician moves from "more screen time goes with poorer outcomes" to "screens are causing the harm". That step works only if the screen time itself, not some other factor, is the cause. The critics offer just such another factor: crowded home circumstances. So his argument must assume the screens themselves, not that other factor, are responsible.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: He does not need every child to own a device.
- Option C: Whether parents can measure screen time exactly is not needed.
- Option D: He need not claim outdoor play is the only helpful activity.

Final Answer: He assumes screens, not another factor, cause the harm \Rightarrow **B**



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

Q9.

Solution

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

Reasoning: His claim is stronger if screen time harms children even when home circumstances are held fixed. Option D compares children from similar households and finds that more screen time still meant less sleep and later speech. Holding the home circumstances similar rules out the critics' rival explanation. That points to screens as the real cause, so it strengthens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: That parents find limits hard says nothing about whether screens cause harm.
- Option B: The spread of screens does not show they cause the poorer outcomes.
- Option C: Enjoyment of programmes is irrelevant to the causal claim.

Final Answer: Similar-household comparison points to screens as the cause ⇒ **D**

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

Q10.

Solution

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

Reasoning: He blames screen time for the poorer outcomes. Option C says that when children from equally busy households were compared, screen time made no difference. If matching the home circumstances wipes out the difference, then the home circumstances, not the screens, were doing the work. That undercuts his causal claim, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A few light users do not address the causal claim.
- Option B: Using screens on journeys does not bear on the cause of the harm.
- Option D: Calling relatives is a use of screens, not evidence about the outcomes.

Final Answer: Matching households removes the difference, pointing away from



screens \Rightarrow C

Answer: (C) [Go Back to Q10](#)

Q11.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The passage sets the paediatrician's causal claim against the critics' rival cause. If crowded home circumstances cause both the heavy screen use and the poorer outcomes, then cutting screen time leaves that real cause untouched. So reducing screen time alone might not improve the outcomes. Option D draws exactly this supported, cautious conclusion.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Never learn to speak properly" is far too strong.
- Option B: "Single greatest danger" overstates what the passage supports.
- Option C: The passage says nothing about which parents care more.

Final Answer: Cutting screen time alone might not help if a common cause is at work \Rightarrow D

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

Q12.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The paediatrician sees screen time and poorer outcomes occurring together and concludes the screens cause the outcomes. But a shared factor, the children's home circumstances, might be causing both at once. Treating a correlation as proof of cause, while ignoring such a common factor, is the flaw. Option A names exactly this 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: He does not assume no child ever slept badly for other reasons.
- Option D: The argument rests on a study, not one parent's opinion.



Final Answer: It mistakes a correlation for cause, ignoring a common factor \Rightarrow

A

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

Q13.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The official cites the fall in cars and cleaner air as her reasons. She uses them to make a specific recommendation about what the council should do. That recommendation is to expand the scheme by adding hundreds more bikes and stations. This is the point her argument is meant to establish.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The number of journeys is a supporting fact, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The fall in car numbers is evidence she reasons from, not the point argued for.
- Option D: The air-quality point is another premise, not the recommendation.

Final Answer: The call to expand the scheme is the conclusion \Rightarrow B

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

Q14.

Solution

What is asked: an assumption the official's argument depends on.

Reasoning: She moves from "car numbers fell during the scheme's first year" to "the scheme caused the fall". That step works only if the other changes of that year did not cause the fall instead. The critics list several such changes: higher parking charges, a new rail line, record fuel prices. So she must assume the fall was due to the scheme rather than to those other changes.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: Whether cycling beats walking as exercise is irrelevant to the traffic claim.
- Option B: The running cost of bikes versus buses is not needed for the argument.
- Option C: She need not assume every resident can cycle.



Final Answer: She assumes the scheme, not other changes, cut the cars \Rightarrow **D**

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

Q15.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her claim is stronger if the bikes really replaced car journeys rather than walking or bus trips. Option C reports that most bike-share users would otherwise have driven in by car. That directly links the scheme to fewer cars on the road. So it supports her claim that the scheme took cars off the road.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The colour of the bikes says nothing about car use.
- Option B: Convenient station placement does not show riders switched from cars.
- Option D: Weekend leisure cycling in the countryside is unrelated to city car traffic.

Final Answer: Users who would otherwise have driven strengthens it \Rightarrow **C**

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

Q16.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her argument needs the bikes to have replaced car journeys. Option A says most bike-share trips replaced walking or bus journeys, not car trips. If riders were not former drivers, the scheme did little to take cars off the road. That breaks the link between the scheme and the fall in cars, so it most weakens the argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: A few damaged bikes do not bear on whether the scheme cut car use.
- Option C: Higher-than-expected set-up cost is about money, not car traffic.
- Option D: Too few stations near the railway is a minor complaint, not a rival cause.



Final Answer: Bike trips replacing walking and bus trips defeats the claim \Rightarrow A

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

Q17.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The critics point to other changes that could have cut car numbers on their own. If those changes, not the bikes, caused the fall, then adding more bikes need not reduce car traffic any further. Option C states exactly this cautious conditional. It follows directly from the critics' point.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Never by any means" is far stronger than the passage warrants.
- Option B: "Always better in every respect" is a sweeping claim the passage does not support.
- Option D: "No effect whatever" overstates the case; the passage does not deny any effect.

Final Answer: If other changes cut the cars, more bikes need not help further \Rightarrow

C

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

Q18.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her reasoning is: a new measure was introduced, a desired change followed while other things also changed, so the measure caused it, and doing more of the measure will bring more of the change. Option A has the same shape: music began, sales rose, so the music caused the rise and playing more will raise sales further. Both leap from things merely occurring together to a causal remedy, ignoring other possible causes. So option A is the closest parallel.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: This is simple prediction from a run of past cases, not a correlation-to-cause leap.
- Option C: This generalises from a couple of successes; it is weak induction,



not the post hoc pattern.

- Option D: This applies a known general rule to a case; the reasoning is valid, not flawed.

Final Answer: The shop-music argument matches the pattern \Rightarrow **A**

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

Q19.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The campaigner cites the high emissions from livestock as her reason. She uses this to state what the country must do to meet its climate targets. That claim is that Verdana must sharply reduce how much meat its people eat. The meat tax is her proposed means to that end, not the end itself.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The beef-versus-beans comparison is a supporting fact, not the conclusion.
- Option C: The share of emissions from farming is a premise she reasons from.
- Option D: That much meat is imported is the critics' point, not her conclusion.

Final Answer: The call to reduce meat consumption is the conclusion \Rightarrow **B**

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

Q20.

Solution

What is asked: the assumption behind the campaigner's argument.

Reasoning: Her goal is to cut the emissions that the country's targets are concerned with, which are global. Her plan taxes meat bought at home. The plan reaches the goal only if taxing home sales actually lowers those global emissions. So she must assume that taxing meat at home leads to a real fall in global emissions, which is option C.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: The argument does not need beef and lamb to be the priciest



meats.

- Option B: It does not require every shopper to check prices.
- Option D: It does not depend on plant foods tasting as good as meat.

Final Answer: She assumes the home tax truly cuts global emissions \Rightarrow

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

Q21.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The doubt is whether a meat tax lowers overall emissions or merely shifts consumption elsewhere. Option D reports a similar country where a beef tax led shoppers to switch to beans and lentils, and its overall food emissions fell with no rise in meat imports. That is direct evidence that the tax cuts real emissions without the feared shift to imports. So it strengthens her argument.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: A wish to eat healthily does not show the tax cuts emissions.
- Option B: The mere availability of beans does not show people will switch to them.
- Option C: The campaigner's expertise supports her credibility, not the tax's effect.

Final Answer: A real case where the tax cut emissions without more imports strengthens it \Rightarrow

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

Q22.

Solution

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

Reasoning: Her plan works only if the tax lowers total emissions. Option B says that after a similar tax, shoppers simply bought cheaper imported meat and more cheese, so total emissions did not fall. If consumption just shifts to other high-emission foods, the tax fails to reach its goal. That directly attacks the argument, so it most weakens it.

Why the other options are wrong:



- Option A: A few wealthy buyers paying any price does not undo a general fall in meat buying.
- Option C: Small-scale farmers do not bear on whether the tax cuts emissions.
- Option D: Where meat is sold does not affect the emissions outcome.

Final Answer: A shift to imported meat and cheese leaves emissions unchanged
 ⇒

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

Q23.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The passage sets the plan against the critics' point about substitution. If taxed shoppers switch to imported meat or other high-emission foods, the home tax does not lower the global emissions that matter. Option D states exactly this supported conditional. It follows from combining the plan with the critics' concern.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option A: "Certainly wipe out" the industry is far too strong.
- Option B: "Stop eating meat altogether" is an overstatement the passage does not back.
- Option C: "Always worse" about imported food is a sweeping claim not supported here.

Final Answer: A shift to imports or substitutes means the tax need not cut global emissions ⇒

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

Q24.

Solution

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

Reasoning: The campaigner's target is global emissions, but her plan acts only on meat bought at home. She assumes that cutting home purchases must cut the global emissions that matter. This overlooks that consumption may simply shift to imported meat or other high-emission foods, so global emissions need not fall.



Option A names exactly this objection.

Why the other options are wrong:

- Option B: The argument does not deny that livestock produces greenhouse gas; it relies on it.
- Option C: The passage treats the emission figures as genuine, not invented.
- Option D: It rests on studies and figures, not on one farmer's opinion.

Final Answer: It assumes cutting home purchases must cut global emissions ⇒

A

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



Answer Key

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

