



CLAT GURUKUL | Critical Reasoning | Class 02
Answer Key & Detailed Explanations

Identifying Arguments — 20 Questions across 4 Passages

QUICK-REFERENCE ANSWER GRID

For fast scan-and-check during in-class discussion. Detailed explanations begin on the next page.

Q#	Ans	Type	Q#	Ans	Type
1	D	Main Conclusion	11	B	"Some People Claim"
2	C	Additional Premise	12	A	Main Conclusion
3	D	Indicator Recognition	13	D	Device Recognition
4	B	Weaken	14	A	Strengthen
5	C	Argument Structure	15	B	Weaken
6	D	Main Conclusion	16	B	Main Conclusion
7	C	Sub-Conclusion	17	C	Premise (No Indicators)
8	C	Complex Structure	18	D	No-Indicator Logic
9	A	Strengthen	19	A	Weaken
10	A	Assumption	20	B	Complex Structure

ANSWER DISTRIBUTION

(A) = 5 correct | (B) = 5 correct | (C) = 5 correct | (D) = 5 correct — perfectly balanced, no option bias.

SCORING BAND

≥ 18/20 — Excellent (CLAT-99+ trajectory) | 15-17 — On track | 12-14 — Revise concepts | < 12 — Book a doubt session with Anurag Sir.

PASSAGE 1 — Delhi GRAP (Qs 1-5)**Q1****Correct Answer: (D)**

The passage opens by stating the Delhi government should make GRAP permanent; everything that follows — the 312-day PM2.5 figure, the regulatory-certainty argument, the IIT-Delhi modelling, the rebuttals to construction lobbies, the public-health cost figure — supports that opening recommendation. (A) is a premise supporting the conclusion. (B) is an additional premise (after "Besides"). (C) is a premise (about industry compliance). Only (D) captures what the entire passage is structured to prove.

TAKEAWAY *Main conclusion = what is being proved, not what is proving.*

Q2**Correct Answer: (C)**

"Furthermore" is the canonical additional premise indicator. The sentence layers on a second reason (regulatory certainty) AFTER the first premise (312-day exceedance) has already been offered. It is not a conclusion — it is being offered as support. It is not a counter-premise — it agrees with and reinforces the author's view. It is not a restatement — the content is new.

TAKEAWAY *"furthermore · moreover · besides · in addition · what's more" all introduce ADDITIONAL PREMISES.*

Q3**Correct Answer: (D)**

"Admittedly" is the strongest counter-premise signal on this list. "Furthermore / Moreover / Besides" are all additional-premise indicators (they reinforce the author). Only "Admittedly" flags a concession to the opposing side — the author is acknowledging what critics say, setting them up to be rebutted.

TAKEAWAY *Counter-premise list: but · yet · however · although · even though · despite · in spite of · admittedly · on the other hand · in contrast · still · whereas · after all.*

Q4**Correct Answer: (B)**

The argument depends on the premise that industry complies with emissions upgrades ONLY when rules are permanent. If, in fact, industry already upgrades under seasonal rules (as (B) asserts), the key premise fails and the regulatory-uncertainty argument collapses. (A) strengthens, not weakens. (C) attacks only one of several premises (the modelling) — the argument survives. (D) is irrelevant to air-pollution permanence reasoning.

TAKEAWAY *Always attack the LOAD-BEARING premise. The further upstream, the bigger the dent.*

Q5**Correct Answer: (C)**

There is no intermediate sub-conclusion in the passage — every supporting sentence ties directly to the opening main conclusion. There ARE multiple additional premises (Furthermore, Moreover, Besides) and two counter-premises (Admittedly, the IIT-D critic). Hence: a simple argument (one conclusion) enriched with additional and counter-premises. Not complex (no sub-conclusion), not a fact set (clear conclusion).

TAKEAWAY *"Simple vs Complex" is about the NUMBER of conclusions — not the number of premises.*

PASSAGE 2 — Collegium Reform (Qs 6–10)**Q6****Correct Answer: (D)**

The opening sentence declares the position the rest of the passage defends — "overdue for constitutional reform". (A) is figurative language inside a premise. (B) is never advocated (NJAC revival is not what the passage calls for). (C) is the SUB-conclusion — drawn from the preceding premises and used to support the reform call.

TAKEAWAY CLAT often hides the main conclusion in sentence 1 and plants a tempting sub-conclusion later. Don't get fooled.

Q7**Correct Answer: (C)**

The "legitimacy deficit" claim is itself supported by the transparency disclosures and the Vidhi survey — so it's a conclusion. But it is also a premise for the ultimate reform call — so it's a premise. That dual role is the textbook definition of a sub-conclusion. (A) is incomplete (misses the "conclusion" half). (B) is wrong — the reform call is the main conclusion. (D) is wrong — the author endorses, not dismisses, this claim.

TAKEAWAY A sub-conclusion is a "double agent" — supported by earlier claims, supporting a later claim.

Q8**Correct Answer: (C)**

Structure: (premises: transparency disclosures + Vidhi survey) → (sub-conclusion: legitimacy deficit) → (further premise: legitimacy deficit threatens public faith) → (main conclusion: reform is overdue). Two conclusion-layers = complex argument.

TAKEAWAY Diagramming the argument is the fastest way to spot complex structures.

Q9**Correct Answer: (A)**

The author's case is that reform is overdue because the Collegium lacks legitimacy. The strongest support from outside the passage would show reform CAN actually remove the deficit while preserving independence. (A) delivers exactly that: mixed commissions work elsewhere without sacrificing independence. (B) cuts AGAINST the legitimacy-deficit claim. (C) attacks the survey. (D) is an opposite answer (would undermine the author).

TAKEAWAY Strengtheners fill gaps in the chain. Ask: "What would make the critic give up?"

Q10**Correct Answer: (A)**

For "reform is overdue" to follow from "the system has a legitimacy deficit", the author must assume reform can fix it. If reform would not actually cure the deficit, the conclusion would not follow. (B) is not required — the author never defends NJAC. (C) is stronger than required — the passage only claims a legitimacy deficit, not that judges are unqualified. (D) overstates the premise.

TAKEAWAY Assumption Negation: negate (A) — "reform CANNOT remove the deficit" — and the argument collapses. Test passed.

PASSAGE 3 — UPI & the Digital Divide (Qs 11-15)**Q11****Correct Answer: (B)**

"Many commentators insist..." is the classic "Some People Claim..." opener. The passage then pivots with "But" and spends the rest of its lines rebutting the view just raised. It is NOT the author's view — it is the view being rebutted. (A), (C), (D) all misattribute the popular view to the author.

TAKEAWAY When you see "Many people / Some argue / It is often said...", wait for the pivot before assigning any view to the author.

Q12**Correct Answer: (A)**

The author's positive thesis emerges after "Consequently": the RBI's Digital Literacy Mission is a necessary next step and abandoning further inclusion programmes would entrench the digital divide. (B) and (C) are premises. (D) is a factual observation about the popular view, not the author's conclusion.

TAKEAWAY Main conclusion = the prescriptive claim the passage defends, often signposted by "Consequently / Therefore" AFTER a pivot.

Q13**Correct Answer: (D)**

The opening move is the textbook "Some People Claim..." device: raise an opposing viewpoint at the start, pivot with "But", then defend the author's actual position for the rest of the passage. (A) is wrong — only one author speaks. (B) and (C) don't describe the rhetorical structure.

TAKEAWAY The full variant family: "Many people believe...", "Some argue...", "Defenders of X maintain...", "It is often said...", "Conventional wisdom suggests..."

Q14**Correct Answer: (A)**

The author's diagnosis is: UPI usage tracks with financial literacy, not smartphone penetration. (A) delivers direct confirming evidence — tier-3 handles with higher literacy scores behave like urban ones. (B) doesn't address the literacy claim. (C) is irrelevant to the mechanism. (D) supports the OPPOSING view.

TAKEAWAY The best strengthener confirms the author's MECHANISM — the "why" behind the data.

Q15**Correct Answer: (B)**

The author's prescription (RBI Digital Literacy Mission is necessary) assumes literacy programmes can actually fix the confidence gap. (B) attacks that linchpin directly. (A) attacks a premise but a weaker one. (C) and (D) actually support the popular view the author is already rejecting.

TAKEAWAY Weaken questions reward attacks on causal mechanisms, not on peripheral data.

PASSAGE 4 — DPDP Act & Regulator Independence (Qs 16–20)**Q16****Correct Answer: (B)**

The passage builds up to a prescriptive demand: amendments must follow, or the statute ossifies. (A) describes what others CLAIMED the Act was. (C) is a premise. (D) is a premise (the comparative standard).

TAKEAWAY "Must / should / ought to" statements late in an editorial often mark the main conclusion — especially in no-indicator passages.

Q17**Correct Answer: (C)**

(A) is the main conclusion. (D) is the warning attached to the main conclusion. (B) is a normative principle that acts as a premise AND could be read as a sub-conclusion drawn from the appointment fact. (C) — the GDPR/APPI comparison — is the purest, unambiguous premise: an independently asserted factual comparison doing no conclusion-work.

TAKEAWAY Use the "Ask WHY of each sentence" test. If nothing else in the passage answers the WHY, it's a premise.

Q18**Correct Answer: (D)**

Editorial-style argumentative prose — the dominant CLAT LR format from 2024 onwards — relies on logical flow, evidence juxtaposition and rhetorical progression rather than the explicit scaffolding of "thus / because". (A) misreads — the passage IS an argument. (B) is wrong (single author). (C) is a hasty judgement.

TAKEAWAY No indicators / no argument. Use the Conclusion Identification Method: list claims → ask WHY → test support.

Q19**Correct Answer: (A)**

The author cites GDPR and APPI as proof that parliamentary/judicial appointment layers WORK. If APPI is actually appointed near-executively, one of only two comparative pillars crumbles, and the claim that "mature regimes insulate their regulator through formal layers" loses force. (B) doesn't touch the appointment argument. (C) is irrelevant to appointments. (D) restates the Act's popular framing, which the author has already dismissed.

TAKEAWAY Weaken by attacking the comparative evidence the author is leaning on.

Q20**Correct Answer: (B)**

The passage has two premises (appointment facts + comparative regimes), a sub-conclusion (the Act is a "regulator on a leash"), and a main conclusion (amendments must follow). Two layers of conclusions = complex argument. (A) misreads (there IS a conclusion). (C) and (D) misidentify the rhetorical device and structure.

TAKEAWAY Diagram first, answer second. The diagram makes the structure obvious.

STRATEGY NOTE FROM ANURAG SIR

Three patterns to lock in from this practice set:

Pattern 1 — Conclusion Hiding

In 3 of the 4 passages (P1, P2, P4), the MAIN conclusion was NOT at the end of the passage. CLAT puts the real conclusion either in sentence 1 (P1, P2) or as a prescriptive "must" late in a no-indicator passage (P4). Sub-conclusions and restatements sit where students EXPECT the main conclusion. Train yourself to diagram first.

Pattern 2 — "Some People Claim" Traps

Passage 3 tested whether you can tell the OPPOSING view from the AUTHOR'S view. The opposing view is always stated more prominently — it's the bait. Always look for the pivot (But / However) before assigning authorship.

Pattern 3 — Counter-Premise vs Premise Support

Passage 1 had TWO counter-premises (output loss + coal-grid), both raised to be dismissed. A weakener that undoes a REBUTTAL to a counter-premise is actually a strong weakener — as in Q5. Students miss this because they look only at premises, not at the rebuttals holding the counter-premises back.

Next Class: Argument Validity — Strong vs Weak • Scope • Truth vs Validity.

Before Class 03: complete Section B, memorise indicator lists, re-read Class 02 notes.