CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 6 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 6 NOVEMBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B — Inference (narrator's motive) HARD

The phrase 'drawers ask for nothing' contrasts the drawers with something that does ask. The opening paragraph has already told us that the shelf of parcels was 'the first thing I saw, and the last thing I wanted to touch'. Drawers hold buttons, chalk and a receipt book: objects with no names, no stories and no unanswered expectations attached. The parcels, by contrast, each carry a person's name and an unfinished transaction, and when she finally opens one she is drawn at once into imagining Rafiq's later life. So the narrator is choosing, consciously, the task that makes no emotional demand on her, and postponing the one she knows will. The landlord gave her a week but set no order of work, so the first option invents an instruction. Nothing marks the drawers as valuable; the Singer is the valuable item. The receipt book is found incidentally, not sought.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because the receipt book is mentioned in the very next sentence, but the narrator finds it in passing; her stated reason concerns what the task asks of her, not what she hopes to find.

Q2 D — Character inference ELITE

The fifth paragraph is built on a contrast signalled by 'Yet'. The father 'had not been a hopeful man' and read the news 'in a voice that expected the worst'. Yet he dusted the shelf of unclaimed parcels every Monday, a ritual of care that only makes sense if some part of him expected the owners to return. The mother's 'flat tone she kept for facts she did not wish to examine' confirms that the habit was private and slightly inexplicable to the family, which is why the expectation stays private. Nothing calls him careless; the slips record sums owed precisely. The landlord appears only after his death, so there is no plan to recover debts through him. And nothing suggests his pessimism was a pose: the passage says he was 'rarely surprised', presenting the gloom as genuine. The keyed option holds both halves of the contrast together.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option is attractive because each slip records 'a sum still owing', but the weekly dusting shows the parcels were kept as things to be returned, not as evidence for a claim.

Q3 A — Tone and ending HARD

The landlord asks a practical question and receives an answer that cannot be literally true: the narrator has no reason to think any of the forty-one customers, some gone for years, will come by that evening. That gap between the words and the situation makes the reply ironic, but the irony is quiet rather than hostile. More importantly, the reply echoes the father's behaviour: he kept the parcels tied and dusted, waiting for people who did not come, and now she keeps them 'still tied' by the door and says she is waiting. The ending therefore shows that she has taken on the very habit she earlier approached with reluctance. Sarcasm aimed at punishing the landlord does not fit her earlier mild agreement with him. Nothing indicates she has written to customers. And she has not tried to sell the parcels at all, so 'failed' misreads the scene.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option tempts because the landlord's line about sentiment and rent invites a retort, but the narrator 'agreed with him' then, and her closing words turn inward, toward her father, not outward against the landlord.

Q4 C — Narrative technique HARD

The narrator reads the chalk lines on the trousers as a record: the waist was taken in, then let out again. She adds 'as if the customer had changed his mind about who he was going to be'. This is the passage's method throughout: an ordinary object (a turned collar, a blouse with hooks unsewn, a coat paid for and never collected) is used to imply a whole unseen life. The trousers hint at a man who perhaps tried to change himself, through diet, illness or ambition, and then gave up or changed course. The narrator does not display expertise for its own sake; the tailoring detail is a means to the human suggestion. She does not criticise the customer, and the coat that was 'paid in full' shows unpaid accounts are not her theme here. The tone is reflective, not comic, so it is no interlude for relief.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option traps students who notice the precise tailoring vocabulary; the precision serves the implied story, and the 'as if' clause shows that the detail exists to point beyond itself.

Q5 A — Vocabulary in context MED

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

Turning a collar is a traditional tailor's repair: the collar is unpicked from the shirt, reversed so that the worn outer edge goes to the inside, and stitched back. The context fixes this meaning. The collar was turned 'so neatly that the frayed edge had vanished': the fraying did not disappear because the collar faced a different direction while worn, or because it was pressed, but because the damaged side was now hidden. The later line, 'shirts that someone else had turned', confirms that turning is a piece of skilled work done by a tailor for a family that cannot afford a new shirt, which fits the twelve-rupee charge. Folding and pressing would leave the frayed edge exactly where it was. Dyeing changes colour and would do nothing to fraying, and the passage mentions no stains. Rotating a collar while it is worn is not something a tailor charges for.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts because 'turned down' is a familiar collar phrase, but folding a collar would leave its frayed edge on show; only reversing it makes the edge 'vanish'.

Q6 C Main idea MED

The essay opens by granting that transparency's 'instinct is sound', then argues that exposing 'every stage of a decision does not always expose the decision itself'. The second paragraph shows why: on camera, bargaining 'migrates to corridors'. The third paragraph supplies the core distinction between openness about deliberation and openness about 'what they chose and why', and favours the second because reasons 'can be tested'. The final paragraph turns this into the practical lesson: design disclosure 'around accountability rather than visibility'. The keyed option captures that thesis. The first option contradicts 'This is not an argument for secrecy'. The second distorts paragraph two: members 'do not stop bargaining'; they bargain elsewhere, so bargaining has not ended. The fourth option takes the court analogy, which is supporting evidence, and turns it into a comparison of accountability between institutions that the author never makes.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option traps readers who notice the author's criticism of televised meetings and conclude that he favours closed doors; he explicitly rules secrecy out in the third paragraph.

Q7 A Inference from figurative language MED

The sentence completes the argument of the second paragraph. Once a committee must deliberate on camera, compromise 'migrates to corridors, telephone calls and pre-meetings that no rule can reach', and the formal session 'becomes a performance of positions already settled elsewhere'. The 'stage' is the formal, televised session; 'nothing is decided' there because the deciding has already happened off-stage. Hence the keyed option. The second option shifts the problem to observers' competence, whereas the author's point is about where decisions are made, not about viewers' understanding. The third option reads 'nothing is decided' literally and adds that work stalls, but the passage says positions are 'settled elsewhere', so decisions are still reached. The fourth option imputes a deliberate intention to mislead; 'performance' describes the session's empty character, not a conspiracy against citizens.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because 'performance' and 'stage' suggest theatre, but the author describes a structural shift in where bargaining happens, not officials plotting to deceive.

Q8 D Function of a paragraph HARD

The courts paragraph comes immediately after the author's distinction between exposing deliberation and exposing reasons. It offers an institution everyone already accepts as accountable: 'Judges confer in private but must give reasoned judgments in public', and it is 'the judgment, not the conference', that is scrutinised. The final sentence adds that nobody 'calls the judiciary opaque' merely because conferences are private. The paragraph therefore works as supporting analogy: it shows, through a familiar case, that private deliberation and public accountability can coexist when reasons are published. The first option reverses the paragraph, which notes that few propose televising judicial conferences. The second option contradicts the closing sentence, which defends rather than criticises the judiciary. The third option invents a limit: the very next paragraph extends the lesson to ministers and 'every decision'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts careful readers who sense a shift of subject from ministers to judges, but the final paragraph applies the court model to all decisions, so there is no concession.

Q9 B Application of the author's view HARD

The author's practical proposal is 'a requirement that every decision record the options considered and the reasons for preferring one'. A rule making a regulator publish, for each ruling, the options weighed and the reason for the choice is a direct application of that proposal. Streaming every internal meeting is precisely the 'live camera' approach that the author says produces visibility without accountability. Exempting regulators from disclosure contradicts 'This is not an argument for secrecy'. Publishing transcripts of calls attempts to chase deliberation into the corridors; the author says such channels are ones 'no rule can reach', and in any case exposing deliberation more widely is the strategy he argues against. Only the keyed option shifts disclosure from the process to the reasons, which is the author's whole point.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it seems to fix the corridor problem the author describes, but it still targets deliberation rather than reasons, and the author doubts such rules can work.

Q10 C Weaken (author's claim) ELITE

The author claims that a reasons requirement is 'harder to evade, because a missing or thin reason is itself visible'. The claim therefore rests on thin reasons actually being noticed and challenged. If officials routinely file boilerplate grounds and nobody scrutinises them, then the reasons duty can be evaded just as easily as camera rules, and the claimed advantage disappears. That is the keyed option. The first option confirms the author's account of corridor bargaining, so it supports him. The second option shows thin reasons being caught and overturned, which strengthens the claim that reasons can be tested. The fourth option fits the author's closing worry that a

democracy may end up 'watching more and understanding less'; it says nothing about whether reasons duties can be evaded. Only the keyed option attacks the mechanism the author relies on.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it sounds like a fact about citizens' failure to engage with reasons, but it concerns viewing habits, not whether officials can evade the duty to give reasons.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 D Main conclusion MED

The argument moves from diagnosis to prescription. The first two paragraphs describe the cost of state incentive packages and explain why, in many cases, they relocate rather than create investment. The third answers an objection. The fourth announces the remedy: 'The remedy is not to forbid states from courting investors but to change what they may compete with', through a compact that caps capital subsidies and publishes each package's cost per job, leaving states 'free to compete' on fundamentals. Everything earlier supports this recommendation, so it is the main conclusion. The first option contradicts 'not to forbid'. The second hardens a hedged premise: the passage says a winning state 'may pay more per job', not that it always does. The third is a premise about firms' choices, and overstates it with 'solely'; it supports the conclusion rather than being it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option tempts because it is the most striking claim in the passage, but it is a premise and the author hedges it with 'may'; a conclusion is what the premises are offered to support.

Q12 B Assumption ELITE

The relocation claim says incentives 'do not create the investment. They merely relocate it'. For that to hold, the total amount of investment coming to India must be unaffected by the incentive war: the firm would have invested in India anyway, and incentives only decide which state gets it. The passage states that the firm 'has usually already decided to build it in India', but it never establishes that this decision was independent of the incentives the firm expected to receive once inside India. If firms chose India partly because they anticipated generous state packages, incentives would create investment, not just move it. Negate the keyed option and the relocation claim collapses, which marks it as necessary. The first option concerns the losing state's wasted effort, a separate point. The third and fourth options are irrelevant to whether investment is created or relocated.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option tempts because the passage does mention the losing state's wasted effort, but that is a side cost; the relocation claim stands or falls on whether incentives affect the decision to invest in India at all.

Q13 A Weaken HARD

A central plank of the argument is the cost claim: the winning state 'may pay more per job than the plant will ever return in taxes', so subsidies are 'the most expensive' offer 'in the long run'. If subsidised plants regularly attracted supplier clusters whose combined taxes exceeded the subsidy within a decade, subsidies would pay for themselves, and the case for capping them would weaken considerably. That is the keyed option. The second option is neutral; publication without cost per job leaves the author's reform still needed. The third option, if anything, strengthens the argument by suggesting that the announced benefits are exaggerated. The fourth option mildly questions the GST Council as a forum, but the author allows 'a similar forum', and occasional disagreement on rates does not show that a subsidy cap is unworkable.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it attacks the proposed remedy, but the author's 'or a similar forum' makes the GST Council inessential, and occasional disputes do not defeat the reform.

Q14 C Strengthen HARD

The argument's key causal premise is that firms choose among states on 'ports, power, skilled labour and courts', so incentives do not change the choice and merely 'transfer public money to shareholders'. A survey in which investors rank power and contract enforcement above subsidies, and report that incentives rarely changed their choice, directly confirms that premise. That is the keyed option. The first option links big subsidies with faster land-record reform, suggesting subsidies and fundamentals improve together, which blurs the author's sharp contrast. The second option describes reforms of the kind the author approves of but gives no evidence about subsidies, so it is neutral. The fourth option weakens the argument: if investors flock to the states with the biggest packages, subsidies appear to drive location after all, though coastal access is a possible confounder.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it mentions subsidies and investor choices together, but it points the wrong way: it suggests subsidies attract investment, the opposite of the author's premise.

Q15 D Role of a statement MED

The third paragraph reports the defenders' objection: 'rivalry disciplines governments, forcing them to clear approvals faster and improve infrastructure'. The author's reply begins, 'That is true of competition on fundamentals. It is not true of competition on subsidies.' The first sentence grants part of the objection, but only for one kind of competition; the second denies it for the other. The fourth paragraph then shows that competition on fundamentals is exactly what the author wants states to keep doing. So the sentence is a partial, limited concession. The main conclusion is the remedy in the final paragraph, not this sentence. The sentence offers no evidence about subsidies; it concerns fundamentals. Nor does it reject all benefits of rivalry; it accepts them where rivalry is over fundamentals, which is why the third option fails.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts because the next sentence does reject the defenders' claim about subsidies, but this sentence accepts the claim for fundamentals; reading the two sentences as one reverses its role.

Q16 A Main conclusion MED

The fourth paragraph opens with 'Agencies should therefore', which signals the conclusion: peer review 'should be used for what it does well, screening out proposals that are unsound', and 'the remaining fundable proposals should be selected by lottery'. The earlier paragraphs supply the reasons: panels disagree near the cut-off, and fine ranking rewards the familiar. The keyed option restates the recommendation. The second option overstates it; the author keeps peer review for screening and concedes that panels 'agree reasonably well about which proposals are weak', so review is not unreliable 'at every level'. The third option is a premise, the evidence about panel disagreement, rather than the claim it supports. The fourth option misuses the examples: the passage says the two funders 'trialled' partial lotteries, not that they proved lotteries produce better science.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The second option tempts students who equate criticism of ranking with rejection of peer review, but the author explicitly retains review as a screen for unsound proposals.

Q17 C Assumption ELITE

The author's second complaint is that ranking punishes boldness: 'Bold proposals that might fail divide reviewers, and a divided score is a low score.' The lottery is said to remove 'the incentive to write safe proposals'. But the plan keeps a screening stage run by the same kind of reviewers. If reviewers screening for soundness simply rejected bold proposals as 'unsound', bold work would be filtered out before the lottery, and applicants would still have every reason to write safe proposals. The argument therefore needs the screen to treat bold proposals more kindly than close ranking does. Negate the keyed option and the incentive benefit disappears. The first option is far stronger than anything the argument needs. The second gives a motive the passage never claims. The fourth concerns applicants' feelings, which do not bear on whether incentives change.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it discusses applicants' preferences, but the argument concerns what proposals they write, which depends on how the screen treats bold work, not on how losing feels.

Q18 B Weaken HARD

The lottery is justified by the claim that, above the threshold, the panel 'largely cannot' tell an excellent proposal from a merely good one, so ranking there is 'near-random'. If the proposals ranked at the very top went on to produce far more replicated findings than those just above the cut-off, then the rankings were tracking real differences in quality. That would undercut the premise of panel imprecision and revive the objection the author dismisses in the final paragraph. The first option concerns scientists' feelings about fairness, which the author's case on accuracy and incentives does not address. The third option is about disagreement over weak proposals, which the plan handles at the screening stage, and it varies by field only. The fourth option is compatible with the author, who says the lottery 'spares reviewers weeks of spurious ranking', not all reviewing time.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fourth option tempts because it seems to undercut the time-saving claim, but the author keeps the screen, so some review time remains; only the spurious ranking is spared.

Q19 D Strengthen HARD

One of the author's main claims is that ranking teaches applicants 'to write the proposal that offends no one', and that a lottery 'removes the incentive to write safe proposals'. Evidence from a trial in which applicants submitted markedly more unconventional proposals under a lottery than under ranking directly confirms that predicted benefit. That is the keyed option. The first option, reviewers valuing the ranking task, gives a mild reason to keep ranking, if anything. The second option points to a new cost of lotteries, so it weakens. The third option is the most damaging distractor: if panels disagree about weak proposals almost as often as strong ones, the screening stage itself becomes unreliable, which undermines the author's premise that review does well at identifying unsound work. Only the keyed option supports a link in the argument.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts because it seems to confirm that panels are unreliable, but it destroys the reliability of the screen the author's plan depends on, so it weakens rather than strengthens.

Q20 B Parallel reasoning ELITE

The author's structure has three parts. First, evaluators agree on the bottom (weak proposals) but disagree on ranking the top. Second, therefore use evaluation only to separate acceptable from unacceptable. Third, allocate the scarce reward among the acceptable by lot. The keyed option matches each step: judges agree on failing scripts but not on ranking passes, so prizes among the passes should go by lot. The first option responds to disagreement by seeking more opinions, which the author rejects with 'Adding reviewers does not cure this'. The third option abolishes the reward altogether; the author keeps the funding and changes only the selection method. The fourth option responds to evaluators' errors with closer scrutiny, again the opposite of conceding imprecision. Only the keyed option combines a reliable threshold with random selection above it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The third option tempts because it starts from evaluators' disagreement, but it abolishes the prize, whereas the author keeps both the reward and a screening threshold and randomises only the final choice.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. Where did the narrator's father keep the unclaimed clothes? — **On the top shelf of the shop**

2. What were the unclaimed parcels wrapped in? — **Brown paper, tied with white tacking thread**

3. What did each parcel slip record? — **A name, a date and, usually, a sum still owing**

4. How long did the landlord give the narrator to close the shop? — **One week**

5. Which machine did the landlord say 'alone would fetch something'? — **The Singer**

6. According to the landlord, what had 'never paid anyone's rent'? — **Sentiment**

7. Why did the narrator's agreement seem to disappoint the landlord? — **He had prepared a longer speech**

8. Why did the narrator begin with the drawers? — **Because 'drawers ask for nothing'**

9. How old was the last entry in the receipt book? — **Eleven months old**

10. On which day did the narrator untie the first parcel? — **The third day**

11. What was inside the first parcel she opened? — **A child's school shirt with a turned collar**

12. Whose name was on the school-shirt slip, and what was owed? — **Rafiq, class four, twelve rupees**

13. How many unclaimed parcels were there? — **Forty-one**

14. What was unfinished on the wedding blouse? — **Its hooks were still unsewn**

15. What did the chalk lines on the trousers show? — **They were taken in at the waist, then let out again**

16. What was unusual about the coat's owner? — **He had paid in full and never came to collect it**

17. How did the father read the newspaper aloud? — **In a voice that expected the worst**

18. How often did the father dust the shelf of parcels? — **Every Monday**

19. What did the mother's 'flat tone' signal? — **Facts she did not wish to examine**

20. What had the narrator done with the machines by the last evening? — **Sold them**

21. 'Turned' collar, in tailoring, means what? — **Unpicked and reversed so the worn side is hidden**

22. What is 'tacking' thread used for? — **Temporary, loose stitches that hold fabric before final sewing**

23. From whose point of view is 'The Top Shelf' narrated? — **First person, the tailor's daughter**

24. What principle does the essay say enjoys 'unanimous praise'? — **Transparency**

25. Where does bargaining migrate when committees deliberate on camera? — **To corridors, telephone calls and pre-meetings**

26. What does the formal session become once bargaining moves out? — **A performance of positions settled elsewhere**

27. What two kinds of openness does the author distinguish? — **Openness about deliberation vs openness about decisions and reasons**

28. Which kind of openness exposes reasons 'which can be tested'? — **Openness about what was chosen and why**

29. Name three qualities the author ascribes to deliberation. — **Messy, provisional, vulnerable to grandstanding**

30. What three things should a minister publish for a licensing decision? — **The grounds, the evidence relied on, the alternatives rejected**

31. Where do judges confer, and where do they give judgments? — **Confer in private; give reasoned judgments in public**

32. What do appellate courts scrutinise: the conference or the judgment? — **The judgment**

33. Around what should disclosure rules be designed, per the author? — **Accountability rather than visibility**

34. Why is a reasons requirement 'harder to evade'? — **A missing or thin reason is itself visible**

35. Visibility rewards the official who ___ well. — **Performs**

36. A duty to give reasons rewards the official who ___ well. — **Decides**

37. Complete the essay's warning: a democracy may end up 'watching more and ___'. — **Understanding less**

38. What does 'grandstanding' mean? — **Acting showily to win an audience's approval**

39. What does 'on camera' mean in the essay? — **Being filmed or broadcast publicly**

40. Is the essay an argument for secrecy? — **No; it says so explicitly**

41. What is 'provisional', as used of deliberation? — **Tentative; not yet final**

42. Name two incentives the passage says states offer investors. — **Waived electricity duty, reimbursed state GST (also cheap land, capital subsidies)**

43. Capital subsidies can reach what share of project cost, per the passage? — **A quarter**

44. The passage likens state incentive bidding to what? — **An auction in which the investor collects the difference**

45. Name the four fundamentals on which firms choose among states. — **Ports, power, skilled labour, courts that resolve disputes promptly**

46. What do incentives do to investment, per the author, in such cases? — **Relocate it rather than create it**

47. Who gains from the relocation, says the author? — **Shareholders, via transferred public money**

48. What does the losing state waste in the bidding contest? — **Months of administrative attention**

49. Defenders say rivalry forces governments to do what? — **Clear approvals faster and improve infrastructure**

50. Why are subsidies 'most expensive in the long run'? — **They are paid from future budgets the present minister will not defend**

51. What does the author propose instead of a ban? — **An inter-state compact capping subsidies and publishing their costs**

52. Through which body could the compact be monitored? — **The GST Council or a similar forum**

53. Each incentive package should be published with an estimate of what? — **Its cost per job**

54. Name the three things states may still compete on. — **Land records, power reliability, dispute resolution**

55. What does the author prefer to an auction 'every state can lose'? — **A race to the top**

56. Two plant types the passage gives as examples? — **Battery and semiconductor plants**

57. Meaning of 'compact' in the passage? — **A formal agreement between parties, here the states**

58. What is a 'race to the bottom' in investment policy? — **Rivals undercutting one another on subsidies or standards**

59. Is the author against states courting investors? — **No; only against competing on subsidies**

60. What do panels agree on 'reasonably well'? — **Which proposals are weak**

61. What do panels agree on far less? — **Which of the strong proposals is strongest**

62. Example rank gap between two panels given in the passage? — **Fifth by one panel, twenty-fifth by another**

63. What often explains such rank differences? — **Which reviewers happened to be assigned**

64. Why does adding reviewers not help? — **More opinions about an uncertain question do not reduce uncertainty**

65. What does the funding line turn a near-random difference into? — **A funded laboratory versus a closed one**

66. What do reviewers tend to reward when ranking excellent proposals? — **The familiar: established lines, long records, trusted methods**

67. Why do bold proposals score low? — **They divide reviewers, and a divided score is a low score**

68. What do applicants learn to write over time? — **The proposal that offends no one**

69. For what should peer review still be used? — **Screening out unsound proposals**

70. How should the remaining fundable proposals be chosen? — **By lottery**

71. Two funders named as trialling partial lotteries? — **New Zealand's Health Research Council, Swiss National Science Foundation**

72. Three benefits the author claims for a lottery? — **Honest about uncertainty, removes safe-proposal incentive, saves reviewer time**

73. What does the author call reviewers' close ranking? — **Spurious ranking**

74. Which objection does the final paragraph answer? — **That a lottery may fund a good proposal over an excellent one**

75. What should a system that cannot identify the best stop doing? — **Penalising the boldest**

76. Meaning of 'spurious' in the passage? — **False; not genuine despite appearances**

77. What is a 'partial lottery' in research funding? — **Random selection only among proposals that pass a quality screen**

78. Meaning of 'cut-off' in the passage? — **The score line separating funded from unfunded proposals**

79. How is a proposal handled under current peer review, in order? — **Read by experts, scored, ranked, funded if above the cut-off**

80. What did the coat's slip show differently from the others? — **Nothing owing; its owner had paid in full**

81. What did the landlord jingle in the doorway? — **Keys he did not need**

82. What did the landlord ask on the first morning? — **Whether the narrator meant to sell the machines**

83. What state was the chalk in, found in the drawers? — **Worn to slivers**

84. How were the buttons in the drawers arranged? — **Sorted by colour**

85. How did the father's handwriting look on the slips? — **Small and leaning**

86. What did the narrator imagine about Rafiq now? — **He might have children of his own in turned shirts**

87. How did the narrator learn of the Monday dusting? — **Her mother told her on the telephone**

88. Where were the parcels on the last evening? — **Stacked by the door, still tied**

89. The father was 'rarely surprised' by what? — **The bad news he expected**

90. What did the narrator say she was waiting for? — **A few people to come by**

91. What does 'let out' mean for trousers? — **Enlarged by releasing seam allowance**