CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 2 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 2 NOVEMBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea MED

The passage runs in a clear arc. The opening example sets two equally careless drivers against each other and notes that only luck separates them. The second paragraph states the control principle, that we answer only for what lies 'within our control', and shows how it 'erodes more than the driver's guilt' by dissolving responsibility into 'a fog of causes'. The third paragraph reports one reaction, abandoning blame, and then a rival reply that treats moral assessment as a response to the person 'as he actually appears in the world'. The last paragraph concedes that unfairness remains. Option B captures this movement of problem, pressure and qualified defence. Option A describes only the first reaction, which the author reports without endorsing. Option C is a legal claim the passage never makes. Option D elevates a single illustration into the topic.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A tempts students who stop reading at the 'fog of causes' sentence; the author explicitly sides with the thinkers who reject abandoning blame.

Q2 D Inference HARD

The relevant sentence is the last in the third paragraph: 'The regret felt by the second driver is not an error awaiting correction but a recognition of this.' The 'this' refers back to the claim that 'to act is to stake oneself on the world's cooperation, and to answer for what happens when it is withheld.' The author therefore reads the driver's self-reproach as appropriate, a fitting acknowledgement of responsibility for consequences. Option B is exactly what the sentence denies, since regret is 'not an error awaiting correction'. Option A overreaches: the author concedes that the control principle is intuitive and never calls it false in every setting. Option C goes too far in the other direction, because the passage says intentions are 'inseparable from what they bring about', which is different from saying outcomes alone decide guilt.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is attractive because the passage does link guilt with outcome, but 'alone' is unsupported; the author keeps intention and outcome together.

Q3 A Tone / attitude MED

In the last paragraph the author writes that the difficulty 'is not thereby resolved' and that a theory accepting moral luck 'must live with the unfairness it has admitted'. That is candour about a real cost. The author then adds that 'a morality purged of that unfairness would be a morality for beings who do not act', which is a defence of accepting the cost rather than a retreat. Together these make Option A accurate on both halves: the concession and the argued defence. Option B misreads the concession as surrender, although the passage keeps defending moral assessment. Option C fails because the author does not dismiss the unfairness objection; the word 'concedes' signals the opposite. Option D ignores the evaluative language of the final sentence, which clearly favours one side.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C appeals to those who notice the confident closing sentence, but confidence in the defence is not dismissal of the objection, which is openly conceded.

Q4 C Vocabulary in context EASY

The sentence is explaining why a surgeon cannot disown a patient's death. Acting, it says, means committing oneself to the world's cooperation and then answering for what happens 'when it is withheld'. The idea is therefore of risking oneself on a result that depends on forces beyond one's command, which is exactly Option C. The surrounding clause supplies the cue: the cost falls on the agent if cooperation fails, so the agent has put something of his own at risk. Option A and Option B are literal senses of the noun and verb that have no connection with the abstract moral argument. Option D is the closest rival because it shares the idea of wagering, but it adds the notion of profit and of a financial investment, whereas the passage is concerned with accountability, not gain.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the attractive wrong answer because 'stake' is common in financial contexts; the passage speaks of answering for failure, not of expecting profit.

Q5 B Structure / purpose HARD

The surgeon appears in the third paragraph, directly after the statement that moral assessment responds to 'the person as he actually appears in the world, a being whose intentions are inseparable from what they bring about'. The surgeon cannot plead that 'his intention was admirable and the patient's death merely unlucky', and the next clause generalises: 'to act is to stake oneself on the

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

world's cooperation'. The example thus illustrates a general feature of action, not a special rule for professionals. Option B states that function. Option A turns an illustration into a claim about professional standards, which the passage never makes. Option C is too absolute, since intentions are said to be inseparable from outcomes rather than irrelevant. Option D reverses the paragraph, because the surgeon belongs to the rival camp that rejects abandoning blame.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D tempts students who read the surgeon as part of the 'vindictive habit' discussion, whereas the surgeon supports the thinkers who answer that view.

Q6 A Main idea MED

The first paragraph states the Jevons proposition. The second paragraph sorts the rebound effect into direct, indirect and economy-wide forms, then reports estimates of 'between ten and thirty per cent' lost for appliances and larger losses for industry. The third paragraph draws the lesson: standards 'remain worthwhile so long as the rebound stays below one hundred per cent', but 'cannot do alone' the job of capping consumption, which 'requires a price or a quantity limit on the resource itself'. Option A condenses this: partial erosion of savings, hence the need for a ceiling. Option B uses 'invariably' and 'every', which the passage contradicts by calling standards worthwhile. Option C overstates the empirical literature, which is called 'more sober than the legend', not a refutation. Option D wrongly makes the poor the cause, whereas the passage treats their rebound as partly a welfare gain.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B attracts those who remember only the Jevons paradox in the first paragraph; the author deliberately narrows that claim later.

Q7 C Inference HARD

The third paragraph says that efficiency standards 'remain worthwhile so long as the rebound stays below one hundred per cent' but 'cannot do alone' the task of capping total consumption. It also says that only 'a price or a quantity limit on the resource itself' can do so. From this we can infer that standards alone may reduce resource use per unit of service while total use is still free to grow, which is Option C. Option A uses 'every country', but the passage reports typical losses of ten to thirty per cent, so net savings usually survive. Option B misreads the discussion of poorer households, which describes their rebound as partly a welfare gain, not as a total loss. Option D sets an impossible test: the passage itself justifies standards when some saving survives, so zero rebound is not required.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the tempting extreme because it echoes Jevons, but the author explicitly says the rebound usually stays below one hundred per cent.

Q8 D Tone / attitude MED

The author calls the Jevons proposition 'an elementary consequence of how prices work', which is appreciative. Yet the second paragraph says the empirical literature is 'more sober than the legend' and the third says the policy lesson is 'narrower than the paradox suggests'. The author thus endorses the insight and limits its scope, which is Option D. Option A fails because the author never calls the example outdated; indeed Jevons is said to have reached a view on remedies that the author echoes. Option B ignores the repeated qualifications, including the statement that estimated losses are only a fraction of expected savings. Option C is wrong because the author relies on the economists' estimates and describes them as contested, not as objectionable. The tone is balanced, not hostile.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B attracts students who read the first paragraph as the whole message; the later qualifying phrases reveal the measured attitude.

Q9 B Vocabulary in context MED

The comparison is between the legend, that efficiency always increases demand, and the findings of studies, which show a loss of 'between ten and thirty per cent' of expected savings. The empirical finding is thus less dramatic and more qualified than the legend, so 'sober' means restrained and measured in its claims, which is Option B. Option A gives the literal sense, which cannot apply to literature. Option C is tempting because 'sober' can mean sombre, but the evidence is not described as hopeless; the author goes on to say that standards remain worthwhile. Option D concerns style, whereas the contrast in the sentence is about the size of the effect that each source reports. The cue 'than the legend' fixes the meaning as less sweeping and more cautious.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C appeals through the secondary meaning 'gloomy', but the author concludes that efficiency still delivers real savings, so the findings are cautious, not despairing.

Q10 A Structure / purpose HARD

The sentence says that for poorer households, 'who were previously going without adequate heating or lighting, the rebound is partly a welfare gain rather than a waste.' Its function is to complicate the otherwise negative picture of rebound by showing that extra use can reflect needs that were unmet. That is Option A. Option B turns a descriptive point into a policy recommendation, which the passage never makes. Option C compares poor and rich countries, but the sentence concerns poorer households, and no cross-country comparison of rebound size is offered. Option D confuses the types: the indirect rebound was defined earlier as saved money spent on something else, whereas here the households simply consume more of the same service they lacked.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is attractive because both passages talk about extra consumption, but the poor households' extra heating is a direct use of the same service, not spending diverted elsewhere.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 D Main conclusion MED

The last paragraph moves from a comparison to a recommendation: 'On that comparison, the transfer wins' and 'A government that wishes to keep the poor fed should pay for it openly rather than collect the payment covertly from those who grow the food.' This is the claim that every other statement is built to support, so it is the conclusion; Option D restates it. Option A is a premise offered in the

first paragraph to explain why governments choose bans. Option B is an intermediate conclusion, the causal mechanism described in the second paragraph, which supports the final recommendation but is not itself the destination. Option C misrepresents the third paragraph: the author uses compensation only to show the ban is not free, and does not recommend it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B attracts students because it is the most developed claim in the passage, but it is a stepping stone toward the recommendation, not the final point.

Q12 C Assumption (necessary) HARD

The author's final step is that a direct transfer 'wins' over a ban plus compensation because it 'relieves the hardship without distorting the signal' for next year's harvest. For this to follow, the transfer must itself be workable: if reaching poor consumers cost more, through leakage, delay or fiscal strain, than the planting damage it avoids, the comparison could reverse. The argument never examines this, so it assumes it, which is Option C. Option A is far too strong; the argument needs only that farmers generally respond to expected price ceilings. Option B is not needed, since the argument concerns farmers' losses precisely because others are also affected. Option D contradicts the text, which treats compensation as possible but costly, as 'a tax on farmers'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D attracts students who notice the discussion of compensation, but the author only calls compensation costly; she never says it is impossible.

Q13 B Weaken (alternative cause) HARD

The second paragraph claims that bans caused lower sowing, citing a fall in sown area after the bans and higher prices later than in comparable open-border countries. Option B supplies an alternative cause for the same fall, regional input costs and rainfall, and shows that it occurred even where no ban existed. That undercuts the causal link between the ban and the fall. Option A is weak because the author never says open borders prevent price rises, only that bans make later spikes sharper. Option C adds a further influence on planting, but 'also' leaves the expectation mechanism intact. Option D reports what governments did later and has no bearing on whether bans reduced planting. Only Option B removes the ban as the distinguishing factor.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the tempting wrong answer because it lists other determinants of planting, but it does not show that the ban played no part, whereas the control group in Option B does.

Q14 A Strengthen (controlled comparison) ELITE

The author's mechanism is that planting falls because farmers expect a ceiling on earnings once a government shows it will close the border. Option A tests this directly. With weather held constant, sown area falls only where the ban is open-ended and so signals a lasting ceiling, and not where it is credibly temporary. That matches the proposed cause and removes the weather rival. Option B explains why governments impose bans, not what bans do to farmers. Option C describes a political aftermath and says nothing about farmers' behaviour. Option D is already accepted by the author, who calls the ban a measure that appears to work at first; a short-term price fall does not show that planting later declines, so it adds no support to the causal claim.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D tempts students because it is about bans and prices, yet the author concedes that effect; it cannot strengthen the claim about future planting.

Q15 D Parallel reasoning ELITE

The model argument has four moves: a popular control on a price (the export ban) protects a favoured group; it distorts the producer's incentives; the usual repair, compensation, merely turns it into a hidden tax; so the same help should be given openly to the needy by direct transfer. Option D repeats each move with a rent cap, landlords, compensation as a hidden tax and a voucher for needy tenants. Option A drops the concept of a direct transfer and ends with an unrelated measure. Option B proposes raising fees, which neither distorts a price nor offers an open payment to the needy. Option C changes the topic to publishing data, which has no counterpart in the structure. Only Option D matches the sequence of reasoning step by step.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B appears similar because both weigh a saving against a loss, but it lacks the key step of replacing the control with an open transfer to the needy.

Q16 C Main conclusion HARD

The third paragraph opens with 'We therefore propose that agencies adopt a two-stage procedure', and the word 'therefore' marks it as the conclusion drawn from the earlier evidence. The procedure is screening for 'competence and feasibility' followed by a random draw among 'the surviving proposals'. That is Option C. Option A is the central premise of the first paragraph, offered to show that review is already noisy. Option B is supporting evidence from the history of the field, used to show that the noise has costs. Option D is a mechanism in the second paragraph explaining why unorthodox ideas lose out; it is also a premise. Each of the other options supports the proposal but none of them is what the author is urging agencies to do.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A attracts students because it opens the passage and is backed by evidence, but it is a premise that the proposal is built on.

Q17 A Assumption (necessary) HARD

The author says a random draw 'would not reduce the quality of funded work, since every proposal in the draw has already been judged sound'. That claim holds only if the first-stage screen is reliable: if panels cannot separate sound from unsound proposals any better than they can rank among sound ones, the draw would admit poor work. The proposal therefore assumes the distinction between a dependable coarse filter and an undependable fine ranking, which is Option A. Option B concerns applicant behaviour, which the author mentions only as a side benefit. Option C is not required, since a lottery works at any budget level. Option D is a stretch: the author cites several prize-winners only as illustrations, not as evidence that all great work is unorthodox.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D appeals because the second paragraph mentions prizes and unorthodoxy, but the plan stands even if only some great work is of that kind.

Q18 D Weaken (undercuts key premise) ELITE

The author's case is that distinctions among sound proposals 'cannot reliably be distinguished', so scores among them carry no useful information and a lottery loses nothing. Option D attacks exactly that premise: if higher scores within the passing group predict more influential results even when the gaps are small, then ranking carries real information and a draw would throw it away, lowering the quality of funded work. Option A merely repeats the author's own point about wasted effort. Option B shows that conventional review sometimes succeeds, but the argument needs only that it often errs. Option C notes a difficulty at the boundary of the screen; that is a minor practical problem and does not show that ranking within the passing group is informative.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option C attracts students because it points to a weakness in the screening stage, but it attacks the edge of the process, not the claim that scores above the threshold are meaningless.

Q19 C Strengthen (supports key premise) HARD

The argument says that fine distinctions near the funding line are unreliable, so funding by rank rewards luck. Option C offers direct evidence: proposals narrowly missing the line performed as well as those narrowly clearing it, so the ranking near the line did not capture real merit. That supports both the diagnosis and the claim that a draw among competent proposals would not lower quality. Option A concerns panel members' feelings and does not bear on accuracy. Option B describes growing competition for money; it might raise the stakes of the problem but says nothing about whether the ranking is informative. Option D is a point about disclosure by journals, which is unrelated to the quality of funding decisions.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is attractive because greater competition makes the system's noise matter more, but it does nothing to show that rank near the line is noise.

Q20 B Flaw in reasoning ELITE

The evidence is that agreement between reviewers is 'barely better than chance' once one looks beyond the best and worst few. That is a statement that reviewers' signal is weak, not that it is zero. The author nevertheless concludes that distinctions among competent proposals are not worth making and replaces them with a pure lottery. This moves from 'unreliable' to 'uninformative', ignoring that a weak signal, or a coarse tiering, could still raise average quality. That is the flaw in Option B. Option A has no basis in the passage, which cites studies from several countries. Option C is a misreading: the author separates competence from taste explicitly. Option D attributes to the author a universal claim; the text says only that 'several' honoured discoveries were first rejected.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D tempts students who spot the prize example as the weakest evidence, but the author claims only 'several', so no universal claim is being made.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Plural of 'phenomenon'? — **phenomena**

2. Meaning of 'ubi jus ibi remedium'? — **Where there is a right, there is a remedy**

3. Fallacy: attacking the speaker, not the argument? — **Ad hominem**

4. Fallacy: 'Everyone believes it, so it is true'? — **Ad populum (bandwagon)**

5. Fallacy: assuming what is to be proved? — **Begging the question (circular reasoning)**

6. Fallacy: only two options offered when more exist? — **False dilemma**

7. Fallacy: 'After this, therefore because of this'? — **Post hoc ergo propter hoc**

8. Meaning of 'mitigate'? — **To make less severe**

9. Confusable: 'militate' means? — **To have a strong influence against something**

10. Meaning of 'ephemeral'? — **Lasting a very short time**

11. Meaning of 'ubiquitous'? — **Present everywhere at once**

12. Meaning of 'laconic'? — **Using very few words**

13. Synonym of 'obdurate'? — **Stubborn**

14. Antonym of 'candid'? — **Evasive / guarded**

15. Meaning of 'sub judice'? — **Under judicial consideration; not yet decided**

16. Meaning of 'mens rea'? — **Guilty mind; the mental element of a crime**

17. Meaning of 'actus reus'? — **The guilty act; the physical element of a crime**

18. 'Neither of the boys ___ present': is or are? — **is (neither takes a singular verb)**

19. Correct: 'fewer' or 'less' for countable nouns? — **fewer**

20. Meaning of 'prima facie'? — **At first sight; on the face of it**

21. Meaning of 'ultra vires'? — **Beyond one's legal powers**

22. A person who dabbles superficially in many subjects? — **Dilettante**

23. What is a 'premise' in an argument? — **A statement offered as support for the conclusion**

24. A 'necessary assumption' is one that? — **Must be true for the conclusion to hold**

25. What does a 'weaken' question ask for? — **A fact that makes the conclusion less likely to follow**

26. Meaning of 'the rebound effect' in economics? — **Part of an efficiency saving lost because cheaper use raises demand**

27. Meaning of 'sophistry'? — **Clever but misleading reasoning**

28. Meaning of 'equivocate'? — **To use ambiguous language to avoid committing oneself**

29. Meaning of 'perfunctory'? — **Done with minimal effort or care**

30. Meaning of 'sanguine'? — **Optimistic, especially in a difficult situation**

31. Meaning of 'corollary'? — **A natural consequence or proposition that follows from another**

32. Meaning of 'nugatory'? — **Of no value or importance; futile**