CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 16 October 2026

20 Qs · 0 Min
Answer key + skill tags + examiner notes

ANSWER KEY — 16 OCTOBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
A	C	B	D	A	B	D	C	A	B
Q11	**Q12**	**Q13**	**Q14**	**Q15**	**Q16**	**Q17**	**Q18**	**Q19**	**Q20**
C	A	D	B	C	D	B	C	A	D

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 A — Main idea / author's purpose — MED

The passage explicitly presents multiple explanations for the Harappan decline — the weakening monsoon (Giosan et al. 2012), shifting river systems, trade contraction with Mesopotamia, and social fragmentation evidenced by the disappearance of standardised weights. The final sentence of the passage confirms the multi-causal framing: 'the current scholarly consensus favours a protracted, multi-causal decline.' Option A accurately characterises this purpose. Option B is wrong because the passage explicitly rejects any single-cause explanation, including climate alone. Option C is wrong because the passage does not argue the Aryan theory was always implausible — it states it has been 'largely abandoned' based on new skeletal evidence. Option D focuses only on urban characteristics described briefly in the first paragraph, not the central purpose of the passage.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The most attractive distractor is D — the first paragraph does describe Harappan achievements in detail, tempting test-takers who read only the opening. The full passage is oriented toward explaining the decline, not cataloguing achievements.

Q2 C — Inference from specific detail — HARD

The passage states that 'standardised weights — the practical signature of a coordinated administrative apparatus — largely disappeared from the archaeological record after 1900 BCE, suggesting that social fragmentation was dissolving the institutions that had produced and enforced uniformity.' This directly supports option C: the disappearance of weights signals the breakdown of the coordinating system. Option A is unsupported — the passage nowhere links the undeciphered script to the disappearance of weights. Option B conflates two separate causal factors; while trade contraction is mentioned, the passage links weights specifically to the coordinated administrative apparatus, not merely to external trade. Option D introduces a 'new ruling class' — this is a speculative inference not supported by the passage, which does not mention political succession.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the primary distractor because trade and weights are both mentioned in the same paragraph; test-takers may conflate the two. The passage is careful to distinguish standardised weights as evidence of internal administrative coordination, not just external trade.

Q3 B — Inference from evidence cited — HARD

The passage states: 'Skeletal evidence from Rakhigarhi and Harappa demonstrates substantial population continuity across the Harappan and post-Harappan phases, making a wholesale population replacement implausible.' This directly supports option B — the physical evidence establishes biological and demographic continuity, not displacement or replacement. Option A contradicts the passage: the skeletal data is specifically cited to refute, not support, the Aryan migration or invasion theory. Option C introduces a 'new ethnic group absorbing survivors' — this blended-population inference is not what the passage asserts; it claims continuity of the existing population, not a merger or cultural synthesis with a new group. Option D understates the evidential weight; the passage presents the skeletal data as sufficient to render population replacement implausible.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is attractive to careful readers who are accustomed to being cautious about inferential overreach; but the passage itself is not hedged on this point — it says skeletal evidence 'demonstrates substantial population continuity,' which is a strong evidential claim.

Q4 D — Evaluating an argument against the passage's framing — ELITE

The student's claim that all other theories are 'secondary' because the Giosan study identifies the weakening monsoon as the cause misrepresents the passage. The passage presents climate as 'one of multiple factors': river drying, trade contraction, and social fragmentation are each described with supporting evidence. The passage's concluding sentence explicitly states 'without any single cause being sufficient to explain the whole.' Option D correctly identifies that the student's reasoning commits a single-cause fallacy that the passage explicitly rejects. Option A is wrong because recency does not determine correctness, and the passage does not endorse the Giosan study over others. Option B is wrong because the Giosan study does not 'disprove' other factors. Option C is wrong because the passage does not identify climate as 'dominant' — it lists all factors without a hierarchy.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is superficially appealing because students sometimes conflate 'most recent' with 'most authoritative'; the passage gives no such primacy to the 2012 study.

Q5 A — Vocabulary in context — MED

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

In the passage, 'fragmentation' is introduced as follows: 'standardised weights — the practical signature of a coordinated administrative apparatus — largely disappeared from the archaeological record after 1900 BCE, suggesting that social fragmentation was dissolving the institutions that had produced and enforced uniformity.' The term therefore refers to the breakdown of the coordinated institutional and economic system — option A. Option B describes a physical geographic dispersal of settlements, which is not how the word is used in the passage. Option C introduces the idea of competing rulers, which is a specific political interpretation the passage does not offer. Option D relates to infrastructure maintenance, which the passage does not discuss in connection with fragmentation.

> **Examiner's note — the**
> **trap:** Option C is the most attractive distractor — political fragmentation is a common usage of the term. The passage, however, specifically ties fragmentation to the disappearance of standardised weights and coordinated administrative systems, not to political competition.

Q6 B Identifying an implied causal effect HARD

The passage states that the Anti-Nautch movement 'stigmatised devadasi performance as immoral and licentious' and that 'the campaign succeeded in delegitimising the tradition's practitioners, accelerating the form's decline in its original temple context.' This directly supports option B. Option A is unsupported — the passage does not state that the movement targeted the Natya Shastra tradition specifically in temples. Option C overstates the passage's claims — the passage says the movement stigmatised performance and delegitimised practitioners; it does not say the colonial government formally banned the devadasi system as a direct result of the movement. Option D misrepresents the chronology — Krishna Iyer's efforts to rehabilitate the form came in response to the decline the movement caused; it did not lead directly to his codification.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the most dangerous distractor because it contains true information (the Anti-Nautch movement did precede Krishna Iyer's work), but the causal link asserted — 'led directly to his codification' — is an overstatement the passage does not support.

Q7 D Author's primary motive / central claim MED

The passage states that Rukmini Devi Arundale 'set about constructing a codified pedagogical curriculum grounded in the Natya Shastra and the Abhinaya Darpana,' which aligns directly with option D — her primary motivation was systematisation within a classical textual framework. Option A contradicts the passage: scholars Meduri and Chatterjea argue that Rukmini Devi's reconstruction sanitised the erotic and devotional dimensions that devadasi practice had cultivated, implying she did not seek to preserve those dimensions. Option B is entirely speculative — the passage makes no mention of devadasi employment as a motivation for founding Kalakshetra. Option C is anachronistic — UNESCO's framework for classical heritage was established decades after 1936 and is never referenced in the passage.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the most dangerous distractor because it takes the scholars' critique at face value and inverts it — they argue she removed those dimensions, which implies they were not her goal.

Q8 C Identifying the target of a scholarly critique HARD

The passage states: 'Researchers including Avanthi Meduri and Ananya Chatterjea have argued that Rukmini Devi's reconstruction sanitised the form's erotic and ecstatically devotional registers in favour of a refined, Brahminical concert-stage aesthetic distinct from original devadasi practice.' This passage clause directly supports option C as the correct identification of their critique — they target the aesthetic choices of the reconstruction, not the naming or the institutional recognition. Option A is not attributed to these scholars anywhere in the passage; the naming discussion is separate. Option B concerns Krishna Iyer's costume choice, which is not the focus of Meduri or Chatterjea's scholarship. Option D concerns the Sangeet Natak Akademi's recognition policy, which the passage does not link to either scholar.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is attractive because the naming of the dance is discussed in the same paragraph, leading test-takers to conflate discussion of etymology with the scholarly critique, which is in fact directed at the aesthetics of the reconstruction.

Q9 A Synthesis / structural relationship between two phenomena ELITE

The passage presents the Anti-Nautch movement as stigmatising and delegitimising devadasi performance, causing it to decline in its original temple context. It then presents the 20th-century revival as a direct response to this crisis of legitimacy, with reformers like Krishna Iyer and Rukmini Devi working precisely to rehabilitate the form in a new, institutionalised, classical framework. Option A captures this dialectical relationship — suppression provoked a reconstruction that elevated the form to classical-concert status. This is a synthesis inference requiring the reader to connect both paragraphs. Option B is directly contradicted by the passage's narrative structure, which presents the revival as causally downstream of the stigmatisation. Option C inverts the causal relationship — the movement weakened, not strengthened, devadasi practice. Option D is wrong because the revival did not restore Anti-Nautch-era conventions; it created new ones.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is attractive to test-takers who feel the passage merely describes both phenomena chronologically without asserting a causal link; but the passage's use of 'response,' 'public rehabilitation,' and the sequence of events implies a tight causal connection.

Q10 B Inferring ideological or rhetorical purpose from naming HARD

The passage explains that the name 'Bharatanatyam' simultaneously encodes BHAva + RAga + TAla (invoking the Natya Shastra framework) and Bharat (India). Option B correctly identifies this dual function: grounding the form in classical textual authority (the Natya Shastra) and simultaneously positioning it as a pan-Indian national form. This gave the reconstructed art both scholarly legitimacy and nationalist prestige during a period of independence movement and cultural revival. Option A is too narrow — the passage does not characterise the revival as 'primarily a nationalist project designed to replace colonial forms'; it was also aesthetic and institutional. Option C reads a deliberate attempt to erase Tamil identity into the etymology, which the passage does not assert. Option D claims classical status depends entirely on the Natya Shastra's authorship, which the passage does not support — Tamil practice history is also acknowledged.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the most attractive distractor because the passage does note the nationalist dimension (Bharat = India); but the etymology also explicitly invokes the Natya Shastra, making nationalism only one of two aims in the naming — the full dual purpose is what option B captures.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 C Identifying the main conclusion of an argument HARD

The argument's final sentence — 'Parliament should therefore amend the Companies Act to require all listed companies to obtain mandatory third-party verification of their annual ethics disclosures' — is the explicit main conclusion. Option C restates this directly. Option A describes the mechanism of harm (ethics-washing exists because there is no penalty) — this is a premise, not the conclusion. Option B proposes SEBI extending its framework — this is not what the argument concludes; it calls for parliamentary action via the Companies Act, not a SEBI extension. Option D proposes replicating the IIM study before legislating — this contradicts the passage's argument, which treats the study as sufficient justification for immediate legislative action.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the most attractive distractor because it correctly identifies a true implication of the argument; but in CR, the conclusion is the normative claim the argument is driving toward — here, the legislative recommendation, not the diagnosis of the problem.

Q12 A Evaluating support for an analogy MED

The passage explicitly states the justification for the financial audit analogy: 'legislators recognised that investors cannot independently verify complex corporate financial claims. The same informational asymmetry applies to ethics disclosures.' Option A captures this precisely — it is the shared condition of informational asymmetry that makes the analogy hold. Option B is procedurally convenient but not the logical basis of the analogy — the ICAI's existing remit is irrelevant to whether the analogy is valid. Option C offers international precedent, which is persuasive but is about outcomes, not about the structural reason the analogy holds. Option D describes existing voluntary provisions, which actually weakens the analogy by suggesting the current regime may already address the issue.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is attractive because empirical international precedent feels like strong support; but it supports the policy conclusion rather than the analogy itself — the question asks specifically what supports the analogy.

Q13 D Identifying a necessary assumption HARD

The argument's conclusion is that mandating third-party verification will improve ethics outcomes. This conclusion depends on the assumption that verification actually causes more accurate reporting and improved compliance, not merely that it is costly or appears legitimate. Option D names this assumption: if verification could be gamed as easily as self-reporting — producing 'compliance theatre' rather than genuine improvement — then the remedy would fail the goal. Without this assumption, the entire legislative proposal is ineffective. Option A is an extreme version — the argument does not require total elimination of ethics-washing, only meaningful improvement; so A is not the most necessary assumption. Option B concerns the study's methodology — a useful premise, but not the most necessary for the policy conclusion. Option C narrows the domain to labour law — the argument is broader and does not depend on this specific prioritisation.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is attractive because we are trained to question empirical foundations; but the argument could still succeed even if the IIM study had minor flaws, provided independent verification remains a sound structural remedy. Option D is the assumption that most directly enables or disables the conclusion.

Q14 B Strengthening an argument ELITE

The argument's central claim is that mandatory independent verification of ethics disclosures will lead to more accurate reporting and improved actual compliance. Option B directly establishes this causal mechanism: in a UK pilot programme, verification led to a 45% reduction in overstated self-reported compliance claims and a 30% increase in actual measured compliance. This confirms both that verification reduces inflated claims (accuracy improves) and that it drives behavioural change (actual compliance improves) — exactly the causal chain the argument requires. Option A weakens rather than strengthens the argument by casting doubt on the IIM Ahmedabad study. Option C introduces a consultation paper, which is procedural progress but does not confirm that verification produces better outcomes. Option D is an appeal to expert authority that does not demonstrate the mechanism actually works.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is attractive because expert endorsement feels like strong support; but in CR, a strengthener must provide evidence that makes the conclusion more likely to be true — only option B provides real-world empirical evidence of the mechanism working.

Q15 C Weakening an argument HARD

The argument rests on the premise that mandatory third-party verification will lead to improved ethics outcomes. Option C directly undermines this by presenting Harvard Business School research showing that jurisdictions that implemented mandatory third-party ethics verification saw no significant improvement in actual compliance — it was absorbed as 'compliance theatre.' If verification does not change behaviour, the entire policy intervention fails its stated purpose. Option A actually provides mild support for the argument (if voluntary verification exists, making it mandatory extends that benefit more broadly). Option B introduces existing penalties, which are a different mechanism and do not address the verification gap the argument identifies. Option D raises the measurability objection, which the passage explicitly anticipates and dismisses, and therefore does not strengthen the weakening.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the most attractive distractor because it identifies a genuine limitation the passage acknowledges — the difficulty of quantifying ethics. However, the passage directly responds to this by noting that third-party social auditing has 'matured considerably as a profession,' so this objection is pre-empted by the argument itself.

Q16 D Identifying the main conclusion of an argument HARD

The argument's explicit conclusion is stated in the final paragraph: 'Parliament should therefore amend the Companies Act to require all listed companies to obtain mandatory third-party verification of their annual ethics disclosures.' Option D restates this in parallel language drawn from the passage's own framing throughout. Wait — this is Block 4 (Education), answer index 15. The conclusion of the Education argument is in the final sentence: 'It requires the enrichment of existing mathematics and logic instruction with problem-decomposition tasks, algorithmic thinking exercises, and structured deduction.' The conclusion is that computational thinking should be embedded in maths and logic, not created as a separate coding class. Option D correctly captures this. Options A, B, and C each introduce conditions or conclusions the passage does not assert: sequencing after advanced maths, consulting researchers, or replacing specific programming languages.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is attractive because the argument implicitly invites policymakers to take stock, which might suggest consulting researchers; but the conclusion the argument actually drives toward is specific — enrich maths/logic instruction, not create a new consultation process.

Q17 B Identifying a necessary assumption MED

The argument concludes that computational thinking should be developed through mathematics and logic rather than coding classes. This substitution only works if maths and logic develop the target skill as well as or better than coding does. Option B names this assumption: that transferable reasoning skills from maths/logic are equivalent to or better than those from coding. If coding actually produced equally good or superior reasoning transfer, the argument's substitution would fail. Option A raises demographic replicability — a useful caveat, but not necessary for the argument's core logic. Option C speculates about language obsolescence — the argument does not depend on Python becoming obsolete; its claim is about transfer, not shelf-life of syntax. Option D concerns teacher capability — practically relevant, but not a logical assumption the argument requires.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is attractive because teacher capacity is a real-world barrier; however, the argument is about which curriculum produces better cognitive outcomes, and teacher capability is an implementation question, not a logical precondition of the argument's core claim.

Q18 C Weakening an argument ELITE

The argument's central empirical claim is that computational thinking is more effectively developed through mathematics and logical reasoning than through programming. Option C directly attacks this claim by citing a meta-analysis of 47 studies showing that students who learned through actual programming showed significantly greater transfer to novel problem domains than those taught through mathematics alone. This is not merely a competing view — it is empirical evidence directly refuting the argument's core comparative claim. Option A addresses employment outcomes, which is a downstream effect that does not challenge the cognitive mechanism the argument describes. Option B notes Indian maths curricula already contain logic — this would actually strengthen the argument by showing the infrastructure is already present. Option D cites student engagement, which is a separate variable and does not challenge the argument's reasoning-transfer claim.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the most attractive distractor because employment outcomes are the ultimate goal both sides care about; but the argument is specifically about the cognitive mechanism of computational thinking development, and only option C addresses that mechanism directly with contradictory evidence.

Q19 A Strengthening an argument HARD

The argument's central claim is that computational thinking developed through mathematics produces reasoning skills at least as good as those developed through coding, while additionally providing more transferable cognitive tools. Option A provides direct empirical evidence for this: a longitudinal study shows maths-only students performed equally on programming aptitude tests and outperformed coding students on abstract reasoning assessments. This confirms both the sufficiency (equal programming aptitude) and the added value (superior abstract reasoning) of the maths-based approach. Option B introduces entrepreneur anecdotes, which are testimonials rather than systematic evidence and do not address the reasoning-transfer comparison. Option C links coding to rural enrolment — a different policy dimension unrelated to cognitive development. Option D cites NEP 2020 endorsement of computational thinking as a goal, which supports the importance of the objective but not the argument's specific claim about how best to achieve it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is attractive because official policy endorsement feels like authority; but the argument already agrees computational thinking is a worthy goal — the dispute is about which curriculum achieves it, and NEP 2020 does not specify a mechanism.

Q20 D Identifying the author's stated objection EASY

The passage states explicitly in multiple places that the problem with mandatory coding classes is that they teach 'syntax,' not 'computational thinking.' The final paragraph concludes: 'Creating a parallel coding class as a substitute is an expensive administrative response to a genuine educational challenge that misidentifies the mechanism by which the desired skill is actually acquired.' Option D restates this directly — syntax-specific skills vs. transferable reasoning. Option A introduces language obsolescence (Python/Scratch), which the passage uses only as an illustration of platform-dependence, not as the primary objection. Option B raises teacher training — the passage does not mention this as an objection. Option C raises cost equity — while the passage calls mandatory coding 'expensive,' this is not its primary objection; the core argument is about the misidentification of the skill-development mechanism.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the most attractive distractor because the passage does use Python obsolescence as an example; but the primary objection is the mismatch between what coding teaches (syntax) and what the curriculum aims to develop (transferable reasoning), not the specific language chosen.