

CLAT English Language

Sample Paper – 1

Duration: 24 Minutes

Maximum Marks: 24

Instructions

- This paper contains **24** Multiple Choice Questions (Single Correct Answer), modelled on the English Language 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 followed by **six** questions. Only **one** option is correct; choose the most appropriate answer based only on the passage.
- 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 carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.

For three decades, economists have argued that the cheapest way to cut greenhouse-gas emissions is to put a price on carbon. The logic is elegant. If polluters must pay for each tonne of carbon dioxide they release, they will find the least costly ways to pollute less, whether by switching fuels, improving efficiency, or inventing new technologies. A carbon price, in this view, harnesses the market rather than fighting it, letting millions of individual decisions do the work that clumsy regulation cannot. Yet after years of experiments with carbon taxes and emissions-trading schemes, the results are more sobering than the theory promised.

The trouble is not that carbon pricing fails to work; where it has been tried seriously,



emissions have indeed fallen. The trouble is political. A carbon price is, by design, a visible cost imposed on voters who feel it immediately at the petrol pump or on their heating bills, while its benefits are diffuse, delayed, and shared with the rest of the planet. Governments that raise the price too quickly invite a backlash; those that set it too low achieve little. Several countries have watched promising schemes collapse the moment fuel prices rose for unrelated reasons, because citizens blamed the tax they could see rather than the market they could not.

Defenders of carbon pricing have learned to soften this blunt instrument. Some return the revenue directly to households as a dividend, so that most families come out ahead even as the price nudges their choices. Others ring-fence the money for popular projects such as public transport or home insulation. These designs blunt the political sting, but they also dilute the pure market logic that made economists fall in love with the idea in the first place. A dividend, after all, is a form of redistribution, and ring-fenced spending is a form of the very industrial policy that carbon pricing was meant to replace.

Perhaps the deeper lesson is that no single instrument can carry the whole weight of decarbonisation. Carbon pricing works best not as a lonely hero but as one member of a crowded team, alongside regulations that ban the worst technologies and subsidies that pull new ones to market. The economists were not wrong about the power of prices. They were wrong to imagine that prices alone could persuade a nervous public to accept a cost today for a benefit their grandchildren would inherit.

- Q1.** Which of the following best captures the central argument of the passage?
- (A) Carbon pricing has failed everywhere it has been tried and should be abandoned altogether.
 - (B) Carbon pricing works economically but is limited by politics, and works best combined with other policies.
 - (C) Carbon taxes are always more effective than emissions-trading schemes.
 - (D) Governments should return all carbon revenue to households as a dividend.
- Q2.** The schemes that “collapse[d] the moment fuel prices rose for unrelated reasons” did so, it can be inferred, because:
- (A) citizens blamed the visible carbon tax they could see rather than the market forces they could not.
 - (B) the carbon tax itself had caused the fuel prices to rise.



- (C) governments had deliberately raised the carbon price at that very moment.
- (D) the schemes had been economically unworkable from the start.

Q3. The author's attitude toward carbon pricing is best described as:

- (A) hostile and dismissive.
- (B) uncritically enthusiastic.
- (C) qualified and measured.
- (D) wholly indifferent.

Q4. As used in the passage, the word "diffuse" (the benefits are "diffuse, delayed, and shared") most nearly means:

- (A) confused and disordered.
- (B) immediate and sharp.
- (C) brightly reflected.
- (D) spread out and not concentrated.

Q5. The author suggests that returning carbon revenue as a dividend is, judged by the economists' original logic, somewhat awkward because it:

- (A) cuts emissions far too sharply to be sustainable.
- (B) introduces redistribution, departing from the pure market logic that first attracted economists.
- (C) makes the scheme much more expensive to administer.
- (D) is deeply unpopular with most ordinary households.

Q6. With which statement would the author most likely agree?

- (A) Prices have no real power to influence how much people pollute.
- (B) Regulation should entirely replace carbon pricing.



- (C) Decarbonisation needs a mix of instruments rather than carbon pricing alone.
- (D) The public readily accepts a cost today for a benefit far in the future.

Passage II

Directions (Q7–Q12): Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.

When the first social-media platforms appeared, many commentators greeted them as a gift to democracy. Here, at last, was a technology that would let ordinary citizens speak without the permission of editors or broadcasters, organise without the blessing of parties, and hold the powerful to account in full public view. For a brief period the optimism seemed justified, as online networks helped topple dictators and gave voice to movements that traditional media had ignored. A decade later, the mood has darkened, and the same platforms are now blamed for polarisation, misinformation, and the coarsening of public life.

What changed was not the technology so much as our understanding of it. Early enthusiasts assumed that more speech would automatically produce better collective judgement, as though truth would win any fair fight. But the platforms were never neutral pipes. Their algorithms were tuned to maximise attention, and outrage, it turns out, holds attention better than nuance. A furious post travels farther and faster than a careful one, so the loudest and angriest voices are amplified while moderate ones fall silent. The marketplace of ideas, it seems, can be rigged by whoever designs the shelves.

Yet it would be too easy to blame the machines alone. Social media did not invent human tribalism; it merely gave it a faster engine. People have always preferred news that flatters their existing beliefs and company that shares their prejudices. What the platforms did was lower the cost of finding such company to almost nothing, so that anyone can now assemble, within minutes, a personalised audience that never disagrees. The result is not one shared public square but millions of private rooms, each convinced that it alone sees clearly.

The remedies on offer are all imperfect. Governments can regulate, but heavy-handed rules risk handing officials the power to decide what may be said. Platforms can redesign their algorithms, but a company that profits from attention has little reason to dampen it. Users can be taught to read more sceptically, but education is slow and the flood of content is fast. Perhaps the honest conclusion is that no clever fix will restore a calm that may never have existed. Democracies survived earlier revolutions in communication, from the printing press to the radio, each of which was also blamed for chaos in its day. They adapted, painfully and imperfectly, and they will have to adapt again.

Q7. Which of the following best states the main idea of the passage?



- (A) Social media ought to be banned outright in order to protect democracy.
- (B) Social media deserves credit chiefly for having toppled dictators.
- (C) The passage is mainly a technical account of how algorithms function.
- (D) Early hopes that social media would strengthen democracy have given way to concern, for reasons rooted in both design and human nature.

Q8. The remark that “the marketplace of ideas . . . can be rigged by whoever designs the shelves” most nearly implies that:

- (A) the way a platform is designed can decide which ideas rise, regardless of their truth.
- (B) ideas are literally bought and sold in shops.
- (C) retailers should physically rearrange their store shelves.
- (D) truth is certain to win any open contest of ideas.

Q9. According to the author, social media’s main effect on human tribalism was to:

- (A) create tribalism where none had existed before.
- (B) lower the cost of finding like-minded company, speeding up a tendency people already had.
- (C) abolish tribal feeling altogether.
- (D) make people prefer news that challenges their beliefs.

Q10. The tone of the final paragraph is best described as:

- (A) triumphant.
- (B) despairing.
- (C) soberly hopeful.
- (D) mocking.



- Q11.** As used in the passage, the word “coarsening” most nearly means:
- (A) making rougher or more crude.
 - (B) gradually refining.
 - (C) sharply speeding up.
 - (D) completely silencing.
- Q12.** Which statement best captures the author’s conclusion?
- (A) Social media has permanently destroyed democratic life.
 - (B) Technology by itself is entirely to blame for polarisation.
 - (C) A single clever fix will soon repair public discourse.
 - (D) Democracies adapted to earlier revolutions in communication and will have to adapt again.

Passage III

Directions (Q13–Q18): Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.

Every week, roughly three million people around the world leave the countryside for a city. It is the largest migration in human history, and by mid-century two-thirds of humanity will be urban. To many, this sounds like a catastrophe in the making: images of overcrowded slums, choked traffic, and polluted air seem to confirm that cities are simply too full. Yet the flow of people into cities, however chaotic it looks, is driven by a stubborn and rational hope. People move because cities, for all their squalor, offer something the village cannot: the chance of a better life.

The economic case for the city is well established. When people crowd together, ideas collide, skills are shared, and businesses find both workers and customers close at hand. A worker who moves from a struggling rural district to a thriving city typically sees her income rise, often several times over, even after accounting for the higher cost of living. Cities are engines of productivity precisely because density, which the eye reads as congestion, is what economists read as opportunity. The same proximity that spreads disease also spreads knowledge.

The problem is not that people come, but that cities are so often unready for them. When authorities treat migrants as an invasion to be resisted rather than a workforce to be housed, the newcomers end up in informal settlements without clean water, sanitation, or legal title to their homes. These conditions are not an inevitable feature of urban growth; they are the predictable result of planning that lags behind reality. Cities that



invest early in transport, water, and affordable housing absorb newcomers and grow richer. Those that pretend the migrants will go away simply grow more crowded and more unequal.

History offers some comfort. Today's gleaming metropolises were once notorious for filth and disease. London in the nineteenth century was a byword for squalor before sewers and clean water transformed it. The slums of one generation have repeatedly become the respectable neighbourhoods of the next, provided the city kept building. The lesson is not that urban poverty solves itself, but that it can be solved, and that the solution lies in embracing growth rather than fearing it. The great migration to the cities will not be stopped by wishing it away. It can only be managed, and managed well, by those willing to build fast enough to keep up.

Q13. The central idea of the passage is that:

- (A) migration to cities, though it looks chaotic, is rational and can be managed well through timely planning.
- (B) cities have become too full, and migration into them should be halted.
- (C) rural life is, on the whole, preferable to life in any city.
- (D) the history of London proves that cities can never really improve.

Q14. As used in the passage, the word "squalor" most nearly means:

- (A) sudden wealth.
- (B) perfect silence.
- (C) complete safety.
- (D) filthy, degraded conditions.

Q15. The statement that "density, which the eye reads as congestion, is what economists read as opportunity" suggests that:

- (A) economists strongly dislike crowded cities.
- (B) congestion carries no economic value at all.
- (C) the very crowding that looks like a problem is, in economic terms, a source of advantage.
- (D) the eye and the economist always see cities in exactly the same way.



- Q16.** According to the author, informal settlements without clean water arise mainly because:
- (A) migrants actually prefer to live without basic services.
 - (B) cities plan too slowly and treat migrants as an invasion to resist rather than a workforce to house.
 - (C) rural areas have become far too attractive to leave.
 - (D) density, by its very nature, must always breed disease.
- Q17.** The author's attitude toward urban migration is best described as:
- (A) deeply alarmed.
 - (B) wistfully nostalgic.
 - (C) cautiously optimistic.
 - (D) openly contemptuous.
- Q18.** The author refers to nineteenth-century London chiefly in order to:
- (A) show that even squalid cities can be transformed if they keep building and investing.
 - (B) argue that great cities never really change over time.
 - (C) prove that migration into cities should be stopped.
 - (D) ridicule the failures of modern town planners.

Passage IV

Directions (Q19–Q24): Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow. Base your answers only on what is stated or implied in the passage.

In an age that prizes measurable skills, the reading of novels can seem a quaint indulgence. Why spend hours in the company of people who never existed, doing things that never happened, when the same hours might be spent learning to code or mastering a spreadsheet? The question assumes that fiction teaches nothing useful, that it is at best a pleasant escape from the serious business of life. A growing body of research suggests the opposite: that reading fiction may be one of the most practical things a person can do.

The argument turns on a capacity psychologists call theory of mind, the ability to imagine



what another person is thinking and feeling. This skill underlies almost every human relationship, from negotiating a deal to comforting a friend, and it is precisely what a good novel exercises. To follow a story is to inhabit, for a while, minds not our own, to guess at motives, weigh conflicting loyalties, and feel the weight of choices we would never face ourselves. Several studies have found that people who read literary fiction perform better on tests of empathy and social perception than those who read non-fiction or nothing at all. The novel, in this view, is a kind of flight simulator for social life.

Not all fiction, however, seems to do the job equally well. The research points to a difference between literary fiction, which resists easy judgement and leaves its characters ambiguous, and popular genre fiction, which often tells readers exactly what to feel. A thriller may thrill without ever asking us to understand its villain; a great novel forces us to grant even unpleasant characters an inner life. It is the effort of interpretation, the work of filling in what the author leaves unsaid, that appears to build the mental muscle. Ease, in this case, is the enemy of benefit.

None of this means that novels should be read as medicine, swallowed for their effects rather than enjoyed for themselves. A reader who opens a book merely to become more empathetic will probably gain little, much as a person who exercises only while resenting every minute gains less than one who runs for joy. The deepest benefits of fiction arrive, paradoxically, when we forget to look for them, lost in a story for its own sake. That we should emerge from such absorption a little wiser about other people is a gift, not a transaction, and perhaps the strongest argument of all for keeping the novel alive.

Q19. Which of the following best states the main idea of the passage?

- (A) Reading novels is a pleasant but essentially useless escape from real life.
- (B) Learning to code is plainly more valuable than reading fiction.
- (C) Every kind of fiction builds empathy to exactly the same degree.
- (D) Reading literary fiction can strengthen empathy and social understanding, making it surprisingly practical.

Q20. As used in the passage, the word “quaint” most nearly means:

- (A) modern and highly efficient.
- (B) old-fashioned in a charming but impractical way.
- (C) openly dangerous.
- (D) needlessly expensive.



- Q21.** The description of the novel as “a kind of flight simulator for social life” implies that novels:
- (A) let readers rehearse understanding other minds within a safe, imagined setting.
 - (B) are chiefly useful for teaching people to fly aircraft.
 - (C) are dangerous to a reader’s real relationships.
 - (D) remove any need for real friendships.
- Q22.** According to the passage, literary fiction builds empathy more effectively than genre fiction because it:
- (A) is generally much longer.
 - (B) tells readers exactly what they ought to feel.
 - (C) leaves its characters ambiguous and demands the reader’s own effort of interpretation.
 - (D) offers more thrilling and fast-moving plots.
- Q23.** The author suggests that the benefits of fiction are greatest when the reader:
- (A) reads deliberately in order to become more empathetic.
 - (B) treats each novel as a dose of medicine.
 - (C) avoids literary fiction in favour of lighter books.
 - (D) is absorbed in the story for its own sake rather than hunting for benefits.
- Q24.** The author’s overall stance toward the reading of fiction is best described as:
- (A) skeptical and grudging.
 - (B) appreciative and persuasive.
 - (C) strictly neutral.
 - (D) gently mocking.



Detailed Solutions

Q1.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: The central argument is the single claim the whole passage is built to support, not one detail within it.

Passage support: The passage concedes emissions “have indeed fallen” where pricing was tried, stresses the “political” trouble, and closes that pricing “works best . . . as one member of a crowded team.” So it both defends the economics and limits it, urging a policy mix.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage says pricing does work, so it is not calling to abandon it.
- Option C: It never ranks carbon taxes above trading schemes.
- Option D: The dividend is one softening device, not the main thesis.

Final Answer: It works economically but is politically limited and best combined with other policies ⇒ **B**

Answer: (B) [Go Back to Q1](#)

Q2.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Read the stated reason the schemes collapsed and restate it.

Passage support: Citizens “blamed the tax they could see rather than the market they could not.” So a rise from unrelated market forces was wrongly pinned on the visible tax.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: The rise was “for unrelated reasons,” not caused by the tax.
- Option C: No deliberate price rise by governments is mentioned.
- Option D: The passage says pricing did work, not that it was unworkable.

Final Answer: Citizens blamed the visible tax, not the unseen market ⇒ **A**

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



Q3.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Judge whether the author leans for, against, or between the sides.

Passage support: The author praises the “elegant” logic yet calls the results “sobering” and lists real limits. The verdict is that the economists “were not wrong” but overreached, a weighed, in-between judgement.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Hostile” ignores the genuine praise for the idea.
- Option B: “Uncritically enthusiastic” ignores the catalogue of limits.
- Option D: The author is clearly engaged, not indifferent.

Final Answer: A qualified, measured attitude ⇒ C

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

Q4.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Substitute each meaning into the sentence and keep the one that fits.

Passage support: Benefits are “diffuse, delayed, and shared with the rest of the planet,” set against a cost felt “immediately.” The contrast with “immediately” and “shared” shows “diffuse” means spread thin, not concentrated.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Confused” does not fit a description of benefits.
- Option B: “Immediate” is the opposite, applied to the cost.
- Option C: “Reflected” plays on a different sense of the word.

Final Answer: Spread out and not concentrated ⇒ D

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



Q5.

Solution

Concept — Argument: Find why the author calls the dividend a departure from the original idea.

Passage support: The dividend designs “dilute the pure market logic” economists loved, and “a dividend . . . is a form of redistribution.” So it strays from the market-only logic that first attracted them.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The concern is political and conceptual, not that cuts are too sharp.
- Option C: Administrative cost is never raised as the issue.
- Option D: The dividend is designed to make households “come out ahead,” i.e. popular.

Final Answer: It adds redistribution, departing from pure market logic ⇒ B

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

Q6.

Solution

Concept — Summary / agreement: Pick the view that matches the passage’s own conclusion.

Passage support: The “deeper lesson is that no single instrument can carry the whole weight of decarbonisation,” and pricing works best “alongside regulations . . . and subsidies.” That is a call for a mix of instruments.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The author affirms “the power of prices,” not their powerlessness.
- Option B: Pricing is to be joined by regulation, not entirely replaced by it.
- Option D: The last line says the public is “nervous” about present costs, i.e. resists them.

Final Answer: Decarbonisation needs a mix of instruments, not pricing alone ⇒

C

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



Q7.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: Choose the option that spans the whole arc of the passage.

Passage support: It opens with early optimism “a gift to democracy,” turns to how “the mood has darkened,” and explains this through both algorithm design and human tribalism. Option D captures that full arc and its twin causes.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The passage never calls for a ban.
- Option B: Toppling dictators is one early episode, not the main point.
- Option C: The mechanics of algorithms are a detail, not the theme.

Final Answer: Optimism gave way to concern, rooted in design and human nature ⇒

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

Q8.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Unpack the metaphor using the sentences around it.

Passage support: Algorithms “tuned to maximise attention” amplify outrage over nuance, so “the loudest . . . voices are amplified.” The “shelves” are the platform’s design, which decides what rises regardless of truth.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: The marketplace is a metaphor, not a literal shop.
- Option C: It is about idea-visibility, not retail shelving.
- Option D: The passage denies that truth automatically wins.

Final Answer: Design decides which ideas rise, regardless of truth ⇒

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



Q9.

Solution

Concept — Author’s argument: Read the sentence that assigns social media its precise role.

Passage support: “Social media did not invent human tribalism; it merely gave it a faster engine,” lowering “the cost of finding such company to almost nothing.” So it accelerated an existing human tendency.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: It did not “invent” tribalism.
- Option C: It intensified, rather than abolished, tribal feeling.
- Option D: People are said to prefer flattering, not challenging, news.

Final Answer: It cheaply sped up a tendency people already had ⇒ **B**

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

Q10.

Solution

Concept — Tone: Read the emotional colour of the closing lines.

Passage support: The paragraph admits “no clever fix” yet recalls that democracies “survived earlier revolutions” and “will have to adapt again.” Acknowledging difficulty while trusting adaptation is soberly hopeful.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Nothing is triumphant about “painfully and imperfectly.”
- Option B: The historical precedent lifts it out of despair.
- Option D: There is no mockery in the measured close.

Final Answer: Soberly hopeful ⇒ **C**

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



Q11.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Fit the meaning to the phrase “coarsening of public life.”

Passage support: It sits beside “polarisation” and “misinformation” as a harm, and the essay laments amplified “outrage.” Coarsening thus means becoming rougher or more crude.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “Refining” is the opposite of coarsening.
- Option C: Speed is a separate idea, not the word’s meaning.
- Option D: “Silencing” does not fit “of public life.”

Final Answer: Making rougher or more crude ⇒

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

Q12.

Solution

Concept — Summary: Pick the option that matches the passage’s final judgement.

Passage support: Democracies “survived earlier revolutions in communication . . . and they will have to adapt again.” That is the author’s closing claim.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The historical parallel rejects “permanently destroyed.”
- Option B: The essay blames human nature too, not technology alone.
- Option C: It explicitly doubts any single “clever fix.”

Final Answer: Democracies adapted before and must adapt again ⇒

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



Q13.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: Find the claim the passage keeps returning to.

Passage support: The flow is “driven by a stubborn and rational hope,” and migration “can only be managed, and managed well,” by cities that build fast enough. So the theme is rational migration that good planning can manage.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: The passage argues against halting migration.
- Option C: It presents the city as offering “a better life,” not rural superiority.
- Option D: London is used to show cities *can* improve.

Final Answer: Chaotic-looking migration is rational and manageable with planning ⇒

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

Q14.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Read “for all their squalor” beside images of slums and pollution.

Passage support: Squalor is paired with “overcrowded slums, choked traffic, and polluted air,” and later with London as “a byword for squalor before sewers.” So it means filthy, degraded conditions.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Wealth” is the opposite of the squalid scene.
- Option B: “Silence” is unrelated to filth.
- Option C: “Safety” contradicts the degraded picture.

Final Answer: Filthy, degraded conditions ⇒

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



Q15.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Read the contrast between the two ways of “reading” density.

Passage support: Density “which the eye reads as congestion” is what “economists read as opportunity,” because crowding lets ideas, skills, and customers meet. So the apparent problem is an economic advantage.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Economists here value density, not dislike it.
- Option B: The whole point is that congestion *has* value.
- Option D: The eye and economist are contrasted, not agreed.

Final Answer: The crowding that looks like a problem is an economic advantage

⇒ C

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

Q16.

Solution

Concept — Author’s argument: Locate the stated cause of informal settlements.

Passage support: When authorities “treat migrants as an invasion to be resisted rather than a workforce to be housed,” newcomers land in settlements without water; such conditions “result from planning that lags behind reality.” So slow, hostile planning is the cause.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Migrants seek “a better life,” not an absence of services.
- Option C: Rural attraction is the reverse of what drives migration here.
- Option D: The passage says density spreads knowledge too; disease is not inevitable.

Final Answer: Cities plan too slowly and resist migrants instead of housing them

⇒ B

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



Q17.

Solution

Concept — Tone / attitude: Balance the author’s acknowledgement of problems against the hopeful thrust.

Passage support: The author grants the “squalor” yet insists poverty “can be solved” by “embracing growth rather than fearing it.” Hope tempered by realism is cautious optimism.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Alarmed” ignores the confident, solvable framing.
- Option B: There is no yearning for a lost past.
- Option D: The author respects migrants’ rational hope, not contempt.

Final Answer: Cautiously optimistic ⇒ C

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

Q18.

Solution

Concept — Author’s purpose: Ask why the London example is introduced.

Passage support: London was “a byword for squalor before sewers and clean water transformed it,” and slums became “respectable neighbourhoods . . . provided the city kept building.” The example shows squalid cities can be transformed by continued investment.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: It shows change, not permanence.
- Option C: It supports managing, not stopping, migration.
- Option D: It illustrates success, not a job at planners.

Final Answer: To show squalid cities can be transformed by building and investing ⇒ A

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



Q19.

Solution

Concept — Main idea: Select the option that unites the passage's central claim.

Passage support: Against the view that fiction “teaches nothing useful,” the research says “reading fiction may be one of the most practical things a person can do,” building empathy and social perception. Option D states exactly that.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: This is the view the passage sets out to refute.
- Option B: The coding comparison is a foil, not the author's claim.
- Option C: The passage insists not all fiction works equally.

Final Answer: Literary fiction builds empathy, making it surprisingly practical ⇒

D

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

Q20.

Solution

Concept — Vocabulary in context: Read “a quaint indulgence” in an age that “prizes measurable skills.”

Passage support: Reading is framed as seemingly outdated beside coding and spreadsheets, “at best a pleasant escape.” “Quaint” therefore means charmingly old-fashioned and impractical.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: “Modern and efficient” is the opposite.
- Option C: Nothing suggests danger.
- Option D: Expense is not the sense intended.

Final Answer: Old-fashioned in a charming but impractical way ⇒ **B**

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



Q21.

Solution

Concept — Inference: Unpack the “flight simulator” image using the surrounding sentences.

Passage support: A novel lets us “inhabit . . . minds not our own . . . and feel the weight of choices we would never face ourselves.” A simulator lets one practise safely; so novels let readers rehearse understanding other minds.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option B: “Flight simulator” is a metaphor, not literal flying.
- Option C: The passage sees fiction as helpful, not harmful, to relationships.
- Option D: It supplements, it does not replace, real friendship.

Final Answer: They let readers safely rehearse understanding other minds ⇒

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

Q22.

Solution

Concept — Author’s argument: Read the stated reason literary fiction outperforms genre fiction.

Passage support: Literary fiction “resists easy judgement and leaves its characters ambiguous,” and “it is the effort of interpretation . . . that appears to build the mental muscle.” So its ambiguity and demand for effort are why it works better.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Length is never given as the reason.
- Option B: Telling readers what to feel is the *genre*-fiction trait it faults.
- Option D: Thrilling plots describe the thriller it contrasts unfavourably.

Final Answer: It is ambiguous and demands the reader’s effort of interpretation ⇒

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



Q23.

Solution

Concept — Author’s view / paradox: Read the closing point about how benefits actually arrive.

Passage support: “The deepest benefits of fiction arrive, paradoxically, when we forget to look for them, lost in a story for its own sake.” So absorption for its own sake, not benefit-hunting, yields the most.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: Reading deliberately for empathy “will probably gain little.”
- Option B: Treating novels “as medicine” is exactly what the author warns against.
- Option C: Avoiding literary fiction removes the very source of benefit.

Final Answer: When absorbed in the story for its own sake ⇒ **D**

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

Q24.

Solution

Concept — Tone / stance: Weigh how warmly the author argues for fiction.

Passage support: The essay marshals research to defend fiction and ends calling empathy from reading “a gift . . . perhaps the strongest argument of all for keeping the novel alive.” That is appreciative and persuasive.

Why other options are wrong:

- Option A: The author champions, not doubts, fiction.
- Option C: The advocacy is too warm to be strictly neutral.
- Option D: There is admiration, not mockery.

Final Answer: Appreciative and persuasive ⇒ **B**

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



Answer Key

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

