CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 27 October 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 27 OCTOBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B — Main idea / central argument — MED

The passage opens with the control principle, that a person is fairly judged only for what lay within her control, and says that applied consistently it 'begins to dissolve the very practice it was meant to refine'. The two drivers, the taxonomy of resultant, constitutive and circumstantial luck, and the two rival responses all elaborate this clash. The closing paragraph concludes that responsibility is 'stitched from two threads', a fairness that looks inward at the will and an accountability that looks outward at consequences. Option B captures both the clash and the unresolved duality. Option A is the first response the author describes and calls 'coherent but costly', so it cannot be the author's own thesis. Option C narrows the passage to one species of luck and invents a reduction the author never makes. Option D overstates: nobody is said to have refuted Kant, only that the principle he voiced strains when pushed to its limit.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap. It restates the first response, which the author spends a full paragraph weighing and finds costly, so a student who stops reading at the midpoint mistakes one side of the debate for the author's position.

Q2 D — Inference — HARD

The passage says the intuition about control 'underwrites our excuse of the infant, the sleepwalker and the coerced', so the principle does explain some familiar excuses. It then adds that applying the principle to outcomes would mean revising our reactions and asks us 'to feel no differently towards the surgeon who kills through negligence than towards one who merely might have', a change the agent's own regret appears to resist. Option D joins these two observations and goes no further than the text. Option A reports what the passage describes, namely that the second driver may be imprisoned, as though the author were recommending identical punishment; no recommendation is made. Option B misstates Williams, who is said to press the second response and to link identity with outcomes, not to reject every judgement of outcomes. Option C claims a psychological certainty about adopters of the proposal that the passage never asserts.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A attracts students because the passage stresses that the two drivers' recklessness and control are identical. But the author is describing how we treat them differently, not prescribing that we should treat them alike.

Q3 A — Tone / authorial attitude — HARD

The tone is set in the closing paragraph. The author observes that 'Neither camp is entirely comfortable, and perhaps that is the instructive result', and concludes that 'a mature ethics may have to live with the seam rather than pretend to remove it'. Each response receives a fair hearing, the first being called 'coherent but costly' and the second being reported without ridicule. That is the stance of an analyst who finds the tension informative. Option B fails because the author never endorses the second response and says explicitly that neither camp is comfortable. Option C is contradicted by the claim that the problem shows how the concept of responsibility is built; a puzzle of no practical bearing would not do that. Option D imports alarm: the principle is said to dissolve a practice of judging, not the foundations of justice systems, and the register throughout is calm and measured.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the attractive distractor, because the author gives the second response a little more development through Williams. But more space is not endorsement, and the closing lines refuse to choose between the camps.

Q4 C — Vocabulary in context — MED

The sentence says the control principle 'was meant to refine' the practice of assigning blame, and then complains that, applied consistently, it begins to dissolve that very practice. Because the principle was introduced as an aid to judging, its intended effect on the practice must be positive: making our judgements more precise, so that we blame only where blame is deserved, and so more defensible. Option C states this sense. Option A gives the chemical meaning, which suits a substance such as sugar or metal but not a social practice of judgement. Option B reverses the direction, since the principle was meant to clarify rather than to embellish. Option D has some surface plausibility because the principle does limit blame to what is controllable, but 'restrict' does not capture the sense of improvement that the contrast with 'dissolve' demands.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is tempting because the control principle does narrow the range of blame. Yet the contrast with 'dissolve' shows the author means an intended improvement in quality, not merely a smaller territory.

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Q5 B Structure / purpose of an example ELITE

In the third paragraph the author weighs the first response, that we should revise our reactions and judge intention alone. The sentence about the driver who has killed follows the statement that this response is costly, and it opens with the claim that the agent's regret 'seems to rebut the proposal'. The example therefore works as evidence against the proposal: a driver who has killed gets no consolation from being told he is as blameworthy as his luckier twin, so the reactions of agents themselves do not fit a purely intention-based scheme. Option B states this function. Option A reads the example in the opposite direction, as if regret were a defect. Option C changes the topic to constitutive luck, which the example does not concern. Option D is the most seductive, because the Williams sentence follows closely, but it is introduced for the second response, while the driver is used earlier to test the first.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the attractive wrong choice because Williams appears in the very next sentence. A student who reads by proximity credits the regret to his argument, missing that the driver is deployed against the first response.

Q6 A Main idea MED

The passage begins with the puzzle of why services grow dearer, answers it with Baumol's cost disease, and builds the answer step by step: output per worker in services is 'stubbornly fixed', yet wages 'tend to move together', so costs there 'climb faster than prices in general, not through mismanagement or greed'. It then adds that this does not mean society is poorer and that the policy lesson is to look at quality, not only at the size of the bill. Option A compresses that line of thought. Option B exaggerates: the passage says households can afford the dearer services, so there is no inability to employ people in them. Option C goes beyond the text, which calls cost control 'partly futile' rather than something to abandon entirely. Option D contradicts the passage, which says gains in some services come 'with their own ambiguity' and that stagnation is 'not absolute', never that the disease has been cured.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the most attractive wrong choice because the last paragraph questions cost control. But 'partly futile' and 'chase a target' do not amount to advice to give up on restraint altogether.

Q7 C Inference / counterfactual HARD

The passage traces the cost disease to a chain: manufacturing productivity rises, wages there 'rise in step with that output', and because 'wages in an economy tend to move together', service employers must raise pay too even though their own output per worker has not grown. If manufacturing gains stop, the first link of the chain is removed, so the upward pull on service wages disappears and services would no longer grow dearer relative to goods. Option C draws exactly this conclusion. Option A assumes prices would fall in absolute terms, which nothing in the passage implies; the claim concerns relative prices only. Option B reverses the causal arrow, making service wages respond to stalled factories by rising faster. Option D keeps the linkage of wages but forgets that the linkage matters only when something is pulling wages upward; the passage ties the rising budget share to the wage drift that productive sectors set off.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the careful student's trap. Linked wages are indeed central to the argument, but linkage transmits a rise only when one sector's productivity is supplying it. With no manufacturing gains, there is nothing to transmit.

Q8 D Inference / authorial position HARD

The final paragraph is the evidence. The author calls the familiar instruction to control costs 'partly futile', explains that the same quantity of service takes a growing fraction of revenue 'even if nothing is wasted', and warns that a government treating every rise in per-pupil expense as proof of inefficiency 'will cut quality to chase a target that the structure of the economy keeps moving'. The author therefore treats cost control as a limited guide, not a worthless one, and points to quality as the better test. Option D says this. Option A turns a partial criticism into an absolute one and adds a claim about extravagant spending that is nowhere made. Option B assigns a motive to governments that the passage does not discuss. Option C reverses the passage's premise: service productivity is described as largely stagnant, with some measured gains, not as outstripping manufacturing.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the attractive distractor for students who notice the author's scepticism and then generalise it. The word 'partly' in the text is the guard against that, since it limits the criticism.

Q9 B Vocabulary in context MED

The paragraph that begins 'The policy consequences are sobering' goes on to say that public budgets will absorb a growing fraction of revenue even if nothing is wasted, and that the familiar instruction to control costs is partly futile. These are unwelcome facts that force policymakers to give up easy assumptions and to look at the matter realistically. 'Sobering' therefore means prompting a serious and realistic appraisal, which is Option B. Option A gives the literal sense, which has no connection to a discussion of public finance. Option C states the opposite of the intended effect, since the consequences described are discouraging for budget planners. Option D confuses the adjective with 'sombre' or 'staid' in describing a style of writing, while the word here describes the consequences themselves and not the manner in which the author presents them.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the one students pick if they remember that the earlier paragraph was reassuring about prosperity. The new paragraph turns to costs, and the word signals that reassurance ending.

Q10 C Structure / purpose of an example ELITE

The sentence containing the example begins 'Yet these gains come with their own ambiguity', and the clause that follows says the teacher 'may have raised productivity on paper while lowering what each pupil receives'. 'On paper' marks the measured figure, and 'what each pupil receives' marks the quality actually delivered. The example is therefore a caution that headline productivity gains in services can be misleading if quality is left out of the count. Option C expresses this. Option A contradicts the preceding sentence,

which says online lectures and similar tools 'have lifted measured productivity in some services'. Option B contradicts 'the stagnation is not absolute'. Option D lifts the idea of workload from the example and turns it into a wage claim, but the passage is talking about measurement and quality, not about the fairness of teachers' pay.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is attractive because a class of two hundred conjures a heavy workload and a natural demand for higher pay. The sentence, though, is about how productivity is measured, not about what teachers deserve.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 D Main conclusion MED

The editorial's last paragraph begins 'If this is right', which is the standard marker of a conclusion resting on what came before, and it states that regulators and courts 'should not treat voluntary donations as mitigating factors', that the public 'should withhold the moral credit it now extends', and that wrongs are answered by restitution and a change in conduct 'not by generosity directed elsewhere'. Option D summarises this: offsetting does not answer the wrong, and so such donations should not earn credit. Option A uses a point that belongs to the defenders, who say beneficiaries do not care about motives; the author accepts it as fair but irrelevant. Option B adds a demand for harsher punishment that is never made. Option C twists the laboratory evidence into a claim that value is exchangeable only in the laboratory, which the editorial never says; it uses the studies as support, not as a limit.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the trap because it borrows a sentence the editorial actually contains. A student who picks a premise or a quoted opponent's claim in place of the author's own conclusion falls for it.

Q12 A Assumption HARD

The editorial moves from a laboratory finding, that individuals offered a way to compensate for a lie went on to lie more often, to a claim about firms: they 'are pricing misconduct and finding the price tolerable', and offsetting may therefore reduce caution in the 'next wrong'. That step is valid only if the licensing effect seen in individuals in a laboratory carries over to institutions in real settings. Option A states this bridge. If it were false, the studies would say nothing about corporate behaviour and the argument would lose its main empirical support. Option B concerns the donor's motive, a matter the author explicitly sets aside by conceding that motives are irrelevant to the school being built. Option C may be true but is not needed; the argument holds even if penalties are high. Option D plays no part, since the argument is about donors, not recipients' knowledge.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B tempts students because the opening paragraph treats a press release as a transaction. But the argument is about the effect on future conduct, not about why the donor gives, so the motive need not be assumed.

Q13 C Weaken HARD

The argument's core is that offsetting makes the donor 'more or less likely to commit the next wrong', and that where evidence 'suggests less caution' the net result may be negative. Option C attacks exactly that. A field study showing no greater repeat violation among donating firms removes the real-world support for the licensing claim, leaving only the laboratory result and the intuition about fungibility. Option A is irrelevant to the argument's concern, which is not the beneficiaries' awareness. Option B concerns feelings of guilt, which could be read either way and does not show that repeat wrongdoing is unaffected. Option D describes what regulators now do, but the editorial argues what they ought to do; the fact that a practice is accepted and survives appeals says nothing about whether it encourages further misconduct.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D attracts students who treat established practice as evidence. The editorial's claim is normative and rests on consequences, so the fact that regulators already do something cannot weaken it.

Q14 B Strengthen HARD

The editorial claims that offsetting makes a wrong 'a purchasable service rather than a prohibition' and so raises the chance of further wrongs. The strongest support would show this in the field. Option B does so: firms with a donation-after-fine policy recorded more violations than comparable firms, which matches the licensing effect the editorial describes and extends the laboratory result to institutions. Option A speaks of the efficiency of foundations, a quality of the donation that the author concedes is beside the point. Option C reports public approval, which, if anything, shows why firms offset, but it does not show that offsetting harms conduct. Option D tells us about the participants' reasons for donating, which shows donations are conditional on a lie but does not show that the lie, or later wrongdoing, becomes more likely because of the chance to donate.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the careful trap. It sounds like licensing, but it only shows donation followed wrongdoing. The argument needs evidence that the availability of an offset increased the wrongdoing itself.

Q15 D Parallel reasoning ELITE

The editorial's structure has four steps: a practice lets a wrong be balanced by a good elsewhere; the practice puts a price on the wrong; evidence shows people offered the option repeat the wrong more often; so the authorities should not treat the compensating act as mitigation. Option D reproduces each step with copying and bonus essays, down to the closing recommendation that the compensating act not be counted as mitigation. Option A has a different structure, linking two traits of candidates and recommending a screening requirement, with no compensation and no price. Option B reasons that a second chance is fair and therefore deserves credit, which runs against the editorial's direction since it would give credit to the compensating practice. Option C argues from unequal access to a conclusion about the accuracy of marks; it contains no claim about incentives or repeat wrongdoing.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B shares the exam setting and a 'second chance' flavour, so it feels close. But it grants credit to the compensating act, while the editorial's whole move is to withhold it.

Q16 A Main conclusion MED

The final paragraph supplies the conclusion in so many words: 'The most reasonable explanation of Rampur's improvement is the curriculum itself, and the state would be unwise to ignore what it suggests for schools elsewhere.' Everything before it, the comparison with neighbouring districts, the answer to the objection about easier papers, the point about entry-level results and the account of costs, is offered in support. Option A restates that conclusion. Option B inverts the discussion, because the author concedes that pass rates are a blunt instrument and does not rank them above oral assessments. Option C is the sceptics' objection which the author rejects as implausible. Option D exaggerates a passing remark that policy is rarely made with controlled trials into a claim that such trials are of little use, which the author never asserts and in fact concedes would be more conclusive.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is the trap for students who mistake a rejected objection for the author's view. The passage raises the claim about easier papers only in order to dismiss it.

Q17 B Assumption HARD

The argument runs from a larger gain in Rampur than in its neighbours to the conclusion that the curriculum caused it. The author tries to remove two rivals, easier papers and better-prepared entrants, but the inference still requires that nothing else particular to Rampur, such as extra tuition, new funding, or a change in school leadership, accounts for the difference. Without that, the comparison is open to a third explanation and the conclusion would not follow. Option B states the needed premise. Option A introduces district size, which has no part in the logic; a gain in the pass rate is a proportion and does not depend on the number of students. Option C is about teachers' preferences in other districts, which is not needed to link the curriculum to results. Option D is about costs, which the author mentions to show modesty of expense, not to prove that the curriculum worked.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C is attractive because the passage reports teachers' approval of the oral assessments. But approval is background colour; the causal claim needs the absence of rival local causes, not the popularity of the method.

Q18 D Weaken HARD

The argument excludes easier papers and stronger entrants, then names the curriculum as the best explanation. To weaken it, one must supply a rival explanation that applies to Rampur alone and that the author has not excluded. Option D does exactly this: a state-funded remedial tuition programme for Rampur's Class IX and X students, absent in the other districts, could by itself account for the larger gain, which would leave the curriculum's contribution unproven. Option A reports a temporary difficulty that was resolved, and so does not touch the cause of the final gain. Option B concerns the neighbouring districts and if anything suggests they, too, might have improved, which would make Rampur's relative gain more notable, not less. Option C reports parental satisfaction, a result that fits the curriculum story as well as any other and gives no rival cause for the pass-rate difference.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the tempting trap: it mentions a change in other districts. But a change in the comparison group that left them improving only slightly does not supply an alternative cause for Rampur's far larger gain.

Q19 C Strengthen ELITE

Causal arguments are most strengthened by evidence of a dose-response pattern: if more of the cause goes with more of the effect, the link is harder to attribute to a coincidence. Option C supplies this within the district. Schools that implemented the curriculum fully gained more than schools implementing it partly, which supports the curriculum as the driver and also reduces the force of any district-wide rival explanation, since such a rival would not obviously vary with how fully each school adopted the curriculum. Option A is damaging, not helpful, because a Class VIII rise would suggest that the students were improving before the curriculum reached secondary level. Option B suggests the neighbouring districts may have borrowed ideas, which muddies the comparison without confirming the curriculum's effect. Option D describes a policy decision that follows the argument and gives no evidence about the cause of past results.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A looks like supporting evidence because it mentions a rise in Rampur. But a rise at the stage before the curriculum arrived would undermine the claim that entrants were no stronger, so it cuts against the author.

Q20 A Flaw in reasoning ELITE

The argument proceeds by elimination. It deals with easier papers and with better-prepared entrants, then concludes that the curriculum is 'the most reasonable explanation'. The weakness is that eliminating some rivals does not establish the remaining candidate unless the list of rivals is complete, and the passage never considers other Rampur-specific influences such as new funding, tuition, leadership changes or migration of students. Option A names this flaw. Option B misdescribes the structure: the opinions of teachers and parents are given as supplementary colour, and the main weight rests on pass rates and the comparison. Option C attributes to the author a ranking of pass rates above oral assessments, but the author concedes that pass rates are blunt. Option D accuses the author of reasoning from low cost to effectiveness, whereas the cost is mentioned only as a favourable feature once effectiveness has been argued.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is attractive because the passage does cite teachers and parents. But those reports sit in the third paragraph as supplementary detail, so the argument does not depend on them.