



CLAT GURUKUL · CLAT 2027

CRITICAL REASONING

Validity, Scope & the Author's Mind

Truth vs Validity · Strong vs Weak · Scope · Inferences vs Assumptions · Indicator Words

Class 03 · Duration: 2 hours · Anurag Sir

CLASS 02 (Done)

- Premises & Conclusions
- Additional Premise indicators
- Counter-Premises & rebuttals
- Complex Arguments — sub-conclusions
- The "Some People Claim..." device
- Conclusion Identification Method

CLASS 03 (Today)

- **Truth vs Validity**
- **Strong vs Weak arguments**
- **Scope — narrow vs wide**
- **Inferences vs Assumptions**
- **Quantity & Probability indicators**

Class 02 taught you to MAP an argument. Today you learn to JUDGE it.

STEP 1

Is it **VALID**?

Does the conclusion follow from the premises — regardless of whether the premises are true in the real world?

STEP 2

Is it **STRONG**?

How tightly do the premises support the conclusion? Tight = strong. Loose = weak.

STEP 3

Is it **IN-SCOPE**?

Do the premises and the conclusion talk about the **SAME** thing? Or has the author quietly shifted ground?

Today's questions: Will it survive scrutiny? Where would I attack? What is the author quietly assuming?

*Validity asks whether the conclusion **FOLLOWS** from the premises. Truth asks whether the premises match the world.*

TRUTH

Real-world correspondence. Is the statement actually true?

VALIDITY

Logical follow-through. Given the premises, does the conclusion hold?

CLAT TESTS

VALIDITY ALMOST ALWAYS. Accept premises as given; judge the link.

A passage with FALSE premises but VALID logic = correct CLAT answer. A passage with TRUE premises but a logical leap = wrong CLAT answer.

PASSAGE

Every Supreme Court judge has presided over a Constitution Bench. Justice Y has presided over a Constitution Bench. Therefore, Justice Y is a Supreme Court judge.

VALIDITY CHECK

All SC judges → Constitution Bench.

Justice Y → Constitution Bench.

Does Y have to be SC?

NO. Mistaken Reversal — High Court judges sit on Constitution Benches too.

TRUTH CHECK

Are the premises factually true?

Maybe — Justice Y's record can be checked.

But TRUTH does not save an INVALID argument.

Verdict: INVALID, regardless of truth.

STRENGTH measures HOW TIGHTLY the premises support the conclusion. Validity is binary; STRENGTH is a slider.

THE STRENGTH SLIDER



Four questions to grade an argument

- 1 Are there UNSTATED steps the conclusion needs?
- 2 Are the premises representative — sample size, geography, time?
- 3 Could a SINGLE counterexample destroy the conclusion?
- 4 Has the author SHIFTED scope (talking about A then concluding about B)?

PASSAGE

A 2026 NCAER survey of 240 SMEs in Gujarat reported that monthly GST compliance time fell from 14 hours to 6 hours after the Council's rate-rationalisation. Therefore, India's entire MSME ecosystem has benefited from the GST simplification.

STRENGTH RATING

VERY WEAK

Why?

- 240 SMEs — tiny sample
- ONE state (Gujarat) — not all-India
- "Compliance time" ≠ all benefits
- 8-month window ≠ "ecosystem"

Scope leap: data covers a slice; conclusion claims the whole.




Validity asks: did the train arrive? Truth asks: was the train scheduled? CLAT asks only the first.

— *Critical Reasoning, Class 03*

PART 2

SCOPE



Narrow vs Wide. The single most common reason students get a CLAT LR question wrong.

SCOPE

Scope is the RANGE of ideas, people, places, time-periods or conditions that a premise — or a conclusion — actually covers.

Two kinds of scope problem on CLAT

1. NARROW PREMISE → WIDE CONCLUSION

Premise covers Bihar; conclusion claims India. The author has shifted from a slice to the whole.

2. WIDE PREMISE → NARROW CONCLUSION

Global trend is offered as evidence for a claim about a single Indian state — the global premise rarely binds the local case.

CLAIM

Delhi recorded 49°C in May 2026. Therefore, India must immediately mandate climate adaptation in every state's building code.

PREMISE — narrow scope

Geography: 1 city (Delhi)

Time: 1 month (May 2026)

Metric: peak temperature

Covers: ONE data point.

CONCLUSION — wide scope

Geography: every state

Time: indefinite future

Metric: building code mandate

Covers: 28 STATES + 8 UTs.

62%

of LR wrong-answer-traps in CLAT 2022-26 are scope shifts

1 in 4

students pick a wider conclusion when the premise is narrow

45 sec

extra time spent on a Q where scope was missed on first read

-3.2

average mark gap between top quartile and median due to scope errors

Train your eye: in every passage, before answering, ask "What's the scope of the conclusion? Do the premises actually cover that scope?"

CITY → COUNTRY

A study in Mumbai used to claim "all India".

WEEK → DECADE

One election win cited as a "long-term mandate".

SOME → ALL

"Several students" → "every CLAT aspirant".

CASE → POLICY

One landmark case cited to justify a sweeping rule.

OPINION → FACT

Editorial endorsement reframed as established truth.

CORRELATION → CAUSE

X happened with Y → "X caused Y".

III

INFERENCES vs ASSUMPTIONS

What FOLLOWS from the argument vs what the argument NEEDS to hold up.

*An **INFERENCE** is a statement that **MUST** be true if the argument is true. It comes **AFTER** the argument — it is what you can fairly draw out.*

Three tests for a valid inference

1

The MUST Test

Could the argument still be true while this candidate inference is false? If yes — not a valid inference.

2

The Stay-In-Scope Test

Does the candidate stay within the people/places/times the passage covered? Goes wider → not an inference.

3

The No-New-Info Test

Does it bring in fresh facts (statistics, comparisons, conditions)? If yes — that's outside knowledge, not an inference.

An ASSUMPTION is an UNSTATED premise — something the argument NEEDS to be true to work, but never says aloud. It comes BEFORE/DURING the argument.

Two flavours of assumption

SUPPORTER

Bridges a gap between premise and conclusion.

Fills in a missing logical step.

Usually easy to rephrase.

DEFENDER

Rules OUT a possible objection.

Protects the conclusion from a counterexample.

Hard to rephrase — many possible.

DIMENSION	INFERENCE	ASSUMPTION
Direction	Comes AFTER the argument	Comes BEFORE/DURING
Function	What you draw OUT	What is taken FOR GRANTED
Test	Must be true given the argument	Argument fails if this is false
Stem	"Which can be inferred...?"	"The argument depends on..."
Effect of negation	Argument unaffected	Argument collapses

Memorise this grid. Half the marks lost in CLAT LR come from confusing these two.

PASSAGE

NEET aspirants who attend morning revision classes show a 19% higher rank improvement than peers who skip them. Coaching institutes should make morning revision compulsory for all enrolled students.

VALID INFERENCE

"Morning-class attendees outperform morning-class skippers by 19%."

This **MUST** be true if the passage is true. It is just a restatement of the data.

(It is **NOT** an inference that compulsion will produce the same gain — that would jump scope.)

NECESSARY ASSUMPTION

"Students who self-select INTO morning classes are not already higher performers for unrelated reasons."

Negate it: if morning attendees were already toppers, the policy would do nothing.

The argument needs this to hold — even though the passage never says so.

Inference looks ahead. Assumption looks within. Both must be tested before you mark the option.

— CR Class 03

PART 4

READ THE FINE PRINT

Quantity & Probability indicators are tiny words that flip an argument's strength.

QUANTITY

*all · most · many · some ·
few · none*

PROBABILITY

*must · will · always · likely ·
could · never*

all · every

100%. No exceptions.

most

Majority. 51%-100%.

many

A large number — but
not a defined %.

some · several · a few

≥ 1 , possibly all.

few

A small number —
usually $<$ majority.

sole · only

Exactly one.

not all

≥ 1 is not. Equivalent
to "some are not".

none

Zero. No instance.

"Some" includes ALL — never assume "some" = "only some". This catches CLAT students every year.

must · will

Certainty. 100%.

always

Every time. Universal claim.

should · ought to

Strong expectation, not certainty.

probably · likely

> 50%. Stronger than "could".

could · might · may

Possibility. $\geq 1\%$ but no commitment.

not necessarily

Defeats a "must" claim. Says "no compulsion".

rarely

Low frequency. Closer to "almost never".

never

0%. Strongest negative claim.

CLAT trick: stem says "must"; correct option waters down to "could". Or vice-versa. Watch the slider.

Read the stem strength

Now scan each option

OPTION SAYS "must / always / never"

Eligible only if STEM also says "must / always / never". Otherwise — too strong, eliminate.

OPTION SAYS "could / might / sometimes"

Safer claim. Often the answer when stem asks "What can be inferred / supported?"

Match the option's certainty to the stem's wording. A mismatch is the wrong answer.

PASSAGE

Most first-time voters in the 2024 General Election ranked unemployment as their top issue. The Election Commission's post-poll survey found this pattern across 12 of 18 sampled states.

"Which can be inferred?"

TRAP OPTION

"Every first-time voter cared most about unemployment."

Why wrong: passage said "most" — quantity-shift to "every". Goes wider than the data.

SAFER OPTION

"More than half of first-time voters in the sampled states ranked unemployment first."

Why right: stays at "most" + stays in scope of "12 of 18".

PASSAGE

CRISIL's 2025 outlook says cement-sector capex could rise 8-10% next year if monsoon turns favourable. Government infra orders may further accelerate the cycle.

"What does the passage support?"

TRAP OPTION

"Cement capex **WILL** rise 8-10% next year."

Why wrong: passage said "could rise IF monsoon favourable". Drops the conditional + upgrades "could" → "will".

SAFER OPTION

"Cement capex **MAY** rise next year, conditional on monsoon."

Why right: keeps "may" + retains the conditional. Stays at the slider position the passage offered.

A consistent shorthand turns 4 minutes per passage into 2.

P	Premise	Underline once. Number it P1, P2, P3 ...
C	Main Conclusion	Underline twice and bracket. Mark with [MC].
SC	Sub-Conclusion	Single bracket. Mark with [SC].
CP	Counter-Premise	Strike-through diagonally and write "CP" above.
?	Indicator word	Circle the word. Annotate +AP / +CP / →C in the margin.
!	Quantity / Probability	Box the word. Recheck the option later for a slider mismatch.

PASSAGE

In 2025, India's gig-economy workforce crossed 9 million. A NITI Aayog working paper said the figure "could double" by 2030 if e-commerce penetration in tier-3 towns grows as projected. The paper recommends extending health-cover schemes to gig workers — without which, it warns, India's informal-sector welfare gap will widen.

Q. The argument requires which of the following assumptions?

- | | | |
|------------|--|--|
| (A) | Gig workers earn less than formal-sector workers. | WRONG · brings new fact |
| (B) | India's gig-economy will grow at the same rate as e-commerce. | WRONG · stem says "could", not "will" |
| (C) | Health-cover schemes can reach gig workers without major redesign. | CORRECT · DEFENDER assumption |
| (D) | NITI Aayog's projections always materialise. | WRONG · too strong |

1

Validity \neq truth. CLAT cares about the LINK, not the real-world.

2

Argument STRENGTH is a slider — measured by tightness of premise \rightarrow conclusion.

3

SCOPE shifts cause more wrong answers than any other error.

4

Inferences come AFTER the argument. Assumptions come BEFORE/DURING.

5

Quantity & Probability words flip claims silently — circle them every time.

6

Negate an assumption — if argument collapses, that's the right one.

01 • Mixing truth with validity

Picking the option that "feels right" in the world rather than the one the passage logically supports.

02 • Missing a scope shift

Premises about Bihar; conclusion about India. Students mark "supports" without spotting the leap.

03 • Confusing inference with assumption

Picking what FOLLOWS when stem asks what is REQUIRED, or vice versa.

04 • Quantity creep

Reading "most" but accepting an option that says "every" / "all".

05 • Probability creep

Reading "could" but accepting an option that says "will" / "must".

NOW — 25 MINUTES OF SILENCE. NO PHONES. NO DISCUSSION.

Attempt Section A (Passages 1 & 2, Questions 1 – 15). Tag every sentence in the margin.

Apply the Class 03 framework on every question:

- Tag P / AP / CP / SC / MC in the margin first — before reading the question.
- Circle every quantity / probability word.
- Box the conclusion. Ask: what is the SCOPE of the conclusion?
- Eliminate two options first. Then choose between the remaining two.
- If stuck for over 90 seconds, mark "*" and move on.

1. Show your tags

For each passage, volunteers read aloud HOW they labelled each sentence. Class debates disagreements.

2. Walk the logic

For one question per passage, why did you eliminate (A)? What made (C) better than (B)? Reasoning, not just answer.

3. Name the error

When someone got it wrong, name WHICH of today's 5 errors they fell into. Precision prevents repetition.

4. Your question first

Stuck on any Section A question? Raise your hand. Crowd-solve before I give the official explanation.

MANDATORY — DUE NEXT CLASS

Complete Section B of the practice sheet (Passages 3 & 4, Qs 16-30). 35 min.

For each passage, write a 3-line analysis: SCOPE of conclusion + one assumption + one inference.

Memorise both indicator lists from Slides 21 and 22. Pop quiz next class.

Bring your answer sheet signed by parent / guardian.

RECOMMENDED — FOR TOPPERS

Read 2 The Hindu editorials. For each: identify SCOPE + one assumption + one quantity/probability word.

Pick one Live Law opinion piece. Apply the Class 03 framework end-to-end.

Read your own Class 02 notes — confirm you can still tag P/AP/CP without looking.

Watch Anurag Sir's video on YouTube — "Validity, Strength, Scope: 1 Hour, 1 Editorial".



CLASS 03 — COMPLETE

Next Class

The 13 Question Types

Question Stems · The 4 Question Families · Prephrasing Answers

Before Class 04, complete Section B (Qs 16-30)
and memorise the indicator lists.

clatgurukul.com · Sri Krishna Puri, Patna · +91 70330 05444

Critical Reasoning · Class 03 of 30