

STATEMENT & CONCLUSIONS

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS FOR GOVERNMENT EXAMS

EXACTLY 100 Questions | 10 Types | PYQs + Expected | By Poly Notes Hub

SSC CGL | SSC CHSL | UPSC CSAT | RRB NTPC | IBPS PO | SBI PO | RBI Grade B | LIC AAO | State PSC

2024-2026 Edition | Statement + Conclusions + Answer + Explanation for Every Question

About This Document

This document contains exactly 100 Statement & Conclusions questions from government exam previous year papers and high-probability expected patterns for 2025-2026. All 10 major types are covered: Single Statement (Basic), Two Statements, Implicit Assumptions, Course of Action, Strong/Weak Arguments, Passage-Based Inference (UPSC/Banking style), Weaken/Strengthen Arguments, Three-Statement Multiple Conclusions, Real-World Policy Statements, and Expected Questions. Every question includes the Statement(s), Conclusions, the Correct Answer, and a complete step-by-step Explanation. Exams covered: SSC CGL, SSC CHSL, SSC GD, UPSC CSAT, RRB NTPC, IBPS PO, IBPS Clerk, SBI PO, RBI Grade B, LIC AAO, NABARD, Delhi Police, State PSC.

GOLDEN RULES FOR STATEMENT & CONCLUSIONS

Rule	What It Means	Remember
Accept as True	Treat ALL statements as 100% true — even if they contradict real-world facts	Never reject a conclusion because the statement seems wrong
Direct Inference	A conclusion must DIRECTLY follow from the statement — no leaps	Do not add information not in the statement
Not Too Broad	A conclusion cannot be broader/stronger than the statement supports	'Always', 'never', 'all' in conclusions are usually wrong
Not Too Narrow	A conclusion should not miss the main point of the statement	Over-specific conclusions often miss the bigger inference
Course of Action	Must be practical, relevant, and address the root cause	Extreme or impractical actions do NOT follow
Strong Argument	Must be logically relevant, fact-based, and significant	Vague, emotional, or irrelevant arguments are WEAK
Assumption Test	Negate the assumption — if the argument collapses, it IS implicit	Use the negation test for every assumption question
Strengthen/Weaken	Strengthening supports the HIDDEN ASSUMPTION; weakening attacks it	Alternative explanations always weaken causal conclusions

Types of Statement & Conclusions Questions Covered

Section	Type	Description	Qs	Key Exams
Section 1	Single Statement, Two Conclusions (Basic)	Direct inference from one factual statement	10	SSC GD, CHSL, RRB NTPC
Section 2	Two Statements, Two Conclusions	Logical chain using both statements	10	SSC CGL, IBPS PO, RRB NTPC
Section 3	Statement & Implicit Assumptions	Unstated premises needed for statement to hold	10	IBPS PO, SBI PO, UPSC CSAT
Section 4	Statement & Course of Action	Practical, relevant responses to problem statements	10	IBPS PO, SBI PO, SSC CGL
Section 5	Strong & Weak Arguments	Logical vs. emotional/irrelevant arguments	10	SSC CGL, IBPS PO, UPSC CSAT

Section 6	Inference from Passage (CSAT Style)	Reading comprehension + logical inference	10	UPSC CSAT, IBPS PO Mains
Section 7	Weaken / Strengthen Conclusions	Critical reasoning — attack or support arguments	10	UPSC CSAT, IBPS PO Mains, RBI
Section 8	Three Statements, Multiple Conclusions	Chain reasoning with three premises	10	IBPS PO Mains, SBI PO, UPSC
Section 9	Real-World Policy Statements	Logic applied to social/policy contexts	10	UPSC CSAT, SSC CGL, State PSC
Section 10	Expected 2025-26	High-probability patterns for next exam cycle	10	ALL major exams 2025-26
TOTAL	All 10 Types	Complete Statement & Conclusions coverage	100	

SECTION 1: SINGLE STATEMENT — TWO CONCLUSIONS (Basic Type)

A single factual or logical statement is given followed by two conclusions. You must decide which conclusions LOGICALLY FOLLOW from the statement — not which are true in the real world. Accept the statement as absolutely true even if it contradicts known facts.

Key Tip: GOLDEN RULE: Treat the statement as 100% true. A conclusion follows if it is a DIRECT and NECESSARY logical consequence. It should NOT be too broad, too narrow, or introduce new information. If the conclusion requires outside knowledge, it does NOT follow.

Appeared in: SSC CGL, SSC CHSL, SSC GD, RRB NTPC, RRB Group D, Delhi Police, SSC MTS, State PSC

Q1.

Statement(s):

India is the world's largest producer of milk.

Conclusion(s):

I. India is the world's largest exporter of milk.

II. India does not import milk.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (d) Neither I nor II follows

Explanation: Being the largest PRODUCER does not mean India is the largest EXPORTER (production and export are different). Conclusion I introduces an assumption not stated. Conclusion II says India does not import milk — being the largest producer doesn't mean India imports nothing (India could still import some specialty milk). Neither conclusion is a necessary logical consequence of the statement. UPSC CSAT 2024 PYQ.

Q2.

Statement(s):

Exercise regularly to stay healthy.

Conclusion(s):

I. People who do not exercise are unhealthy.

II. Regular exercise contributes to good health.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II directly restates the meaning of the statement in a logical way — exercise contributes to good health. Conclusion I is too absolute: the statement advises exercise for health but doesn't say ALL non-exercisers are unhealthy. Only II follows.

Q3.

Statement(s):

No country can afford to ignore its neighbours.

Conclusion(s):

I. Maintaining good relations with neighbours is important for every country.

II. A country that ignores its neighbours will face consequences.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: The statement says no country CAN AFFORD to ignore neighbours — meaning it is important (Conclusion I follows). 'Cannot afford' implies there are consequences for ignoring (Conclusion II follows). Both are direct logical inferences.

Q4.

Statement(s):

Cutting down trees causes environmental degradation.

Conclusion(s):

I. Planting more trees will stop environmental degradation.

II. Environmental degradation is partly caused by deforestation.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II logically follows — if cutting trees causes degradation, then deforestation is a cause of environmental degradation. Conclusion I is a jump — planting trees might help, but the statement doesn't guarantee it will STOP all degradation. Only II follows.

Q5.

Statement(s):

All students who scored above 90% received merit scholarships.

Conclusion(s):

I. Some scholarship recipients scored above 90%.

II. No student who scored below 90% received a merit scholarship.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: Conclusion I: All students above 90% received scholarships — so some scholarship recipients (those above 90%) scored above 90%. I follows. Conclusion II: The statement says scholarships were given to those above 90% — it implies students below 90% did not receive MERIT scholarships (assuming merit is the criterion). II follows.

Q6.

Statement(s):

The price of essential commodities has been rising steadily.

Conclusion(s):

I. The government should take steps to control prices.

II. People are finding it difficult to meet their daily needs.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (d) Neither I nor II follows

Explanation: Conclusion I is a recommendation/course of action — not a logical conclusion from a factual statement. Conclusion II is an assumption about people's difficulty — not directly stated. Neither conclusion NECESSARILY follows from just the price-rise statement.

Q7.

Statement(s):

Reading books regularly improves vocabulary and comprehension skills.

Conclusion(s):

I. People with good vocabulary read books regularly.

II. Regular book reading helps in language development.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II directly rephrases the statement — reading improves vocabulary/comprehension = language development. II follows. Conclusion I reverses the causation — the statement says reading improves vocabulary, NOT that all good vocabulary holders necessarily read books. I does NOT follow.

Q8.

Statement(s):

Water scarcity is a growing problem in many parts of the world.

Conclusion(s):

I. Access to clean water is not equally distributed across the world.

II. Rainwater harvesting can solve water scarcity problems.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I logically follows — if scarcity is growing in MANY PARTS, it implies water is not equally distributed globally. I follows. Conclusion II is a proposed SOLUTION — the statement doesn't say rainwater harvesting will solve the problem. II does NOT follow.

Q9.

Statement(s):

Some students who study hard still fail in exams.

Conclusion(s):

I. Hard work alone is not sufficient to guarantee exam success.

II. Studying hard is not necessary for passing exams.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I logically follows — if SOME hardworking students fail, hard work alone doesn't guarantee success. I follows. Conclusion II is a different claim — that studying hard is NOT necessary. The statement doesn't say this; it says some who do study hard still fail. II does NOT follow.

Q10.

Statement(s):

In a survey, 8 out of 10 doctors recommended Brand X medicine for cold and flu.

Conclusion(s):

I. Brand X is the most effective medicine for cold and flu.

II. Majority of doctors in the survey preferred Brand X.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II directly follows — 8 out of 10 is a majority. II follows. Conclusion I says Brand X is the MOST EFFECTIVE — the survey shows preference, not proven effectiveness. I does NOT follow (correlation ≠ causation).

SECTION 2: TWO STATEMENTS — TWO CONCLUSIONS

Two related statements are given and two conclusions must be evaluated. You must use BOTH statements together to check if a conclusion follows. The classic type tested in IBPS PO, SBI PO, RRB NTPC, and State PSC exams.

Key Tip: Use both statements together. Draw the logical chain: Statement 1 + Statement 2 → Conclusion. A conclusion must follow from the COMBINATION of both statements. If it only uses one statement and ignores the other, re-check whether it still holds.

Appeared in: IBPS PO, SBI PO, SSC CGL, RRB NTPC, UPSC CSAT, State PSC, IBPS Clerk

Q11.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All birds can fly.

Statement II: Penguins are birds.

Conclusion(s):

I. Penguins can fly.

II. Some birds cannot fly.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Accept both statements as absolutely true. From S1+S2: All birds fly + Penguins are birds → Penguins can fly (I follows logically, even though it's factually wrong — we ignore real-world facts). Conclusion II says some birds cannot fly — this CONTRADICTS Statement I which says ALL birds can fly. II does NOT follow.

Q12.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All politicians are liars.

Statement II: Ram is a politician.

Conclusion(s):

I. Ram is a liar.

II. Some liars are politicians.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: S1+S2: All politicians are liars + Ram is a politician → Ram is a liar (I follows). Also, since Ram is both a politician and a liar, Some liars are politicians (II follows by partial conversion). Both follow.

Q13.

Statement(s):

Statement I: Some cats are dogs.

Statement II: All dogs are animals.

Conclusion(s):

I. Some cats are animals.

II. All cats are animals.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Some cats are dogs (those cats) + All dogs are animals → Some cats are animals (I follows). We cannot say ALL cats are animals — only some cats are proven to be animals (through the dog link). II does NOT follow.

Q14.

Statement(s):

Statement I: No pen is a book.

Statement II: All books are useful.

Conclusion(s):

I. No pen is useful.

II. Some useful things are not pens.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: No pen is a book + All books are useful. Conclusion I: No pen is useful — WRONG. Pens could be useful through other means not stated. I does NOT follow. Conclusion II: Some useful things (books) are not pens — since no pen is a book, books are not pens; books are useful → some useful things are not pens. II follows.

Q15.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All diamonds are gems.

Statement II: No gem is cheap.

Conclusion(s):

I. No diamond is cheap.

II. All gems are diamonds.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: All diamonds are gems + No gem is cheap → No diamond is cheap (I follows — diamonds \subset gems, and no gem is cheap, so no diamond is cheap). Conclusion II: All gems are diamonds — NOT stated. Gems may include rubies, emeralds, etc. II does NOT follow.

Q16.

Statement(s):

Statement I: Some engineers are managers.

Statement II: All managers are well-paid.

Conclusion(s):

I. Some engineers are well-paid.

II. All engineers are well-paid.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Some engineers are managers + All managers are well-paid → Those some engineers (who are managers) are well-paid → Some engineers are well-paid (I follows). Conclusion II: ALL engineers are well-paid — over-generalized. Only those who are managers are well-paid. II does NOT follow.

Q17.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All those who exercise daily are healthy.

Statement II: Mohan is not healthy.

Conclusion(s):

I. Mohan does not exercise daily.

II. Mohan is lazy.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: S1: All daily exercisers are healthy. S2: Mohan is not healthy. By contrapositive: If not healthy → does not exercise daily. I: Mohan does not exercise daily — follows by logical contrapositive. II: Mohan is lazy — not stated, Mohan could be unhealthy for any reason. II does NOT follow.

Q18.

Statement(s):

Statement I: Some books are novels.

Statement II: All novels are interesting.

Conclusion(s):

I. Some books are interesting.

II. Some interesting things are books.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: Some books → novels → interesting. I: Some books (the novel-type) are interesting — follows. II: Some interesting things (the book-type novels) are books — partial reverse of I — follows. Both follow.

Q19.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All rivers flow into seas.

Statement II: Ganga is a river.

Conclusion(s):

I. Ganga flows into a sea.

II. All things that flow are rivers.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: All rivers flow into seas + Ganga is a river → Ganga flows into a sea (I follows). Conclusion II reverses and over-generalises: not all flowing things are rivers. II does NOT follow.

Q20.

Statement(s):

Statement I: Whenever it rains, the roads get flooded.

Statement II: The roads are flooded today.

Conclusion(s):

I. It has rained today.

II. It has not rained today.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (d) Neither I nor II follows

Explanation: S1 says: Rain → Roads flood. But roads flooding does NOT necessarily mean it rained (other causes possible). The statement is not 'Roads flood ONLY when it rains.' Conclusion I (It rained) cannot be confirmed. Conclusion II (It did not rain) cannot be confirmed either. Neither follows.

SECTION 3: STATEMENT & IMPLICIT ASSUMPTIONS

An assumption is something that is TAKEN FOR GRANTED without being explicitly stated. It is an unstated premise that must be true for the statement to make sense. Tested heavily in IBPS PO, SBI PO, UPSC CSAT, and RBI Grade B exams.

Key Tip: Test: 'If this assumption is false, does the statement become meaningless or contradictory?' If YES → the assumption is IMPLICIT. If NO → the assumption is not necessary. Use the NEGATION TEST: negate the assumption and check if the argument falls apart.

Appeared in: IBPS PO, SBI PO, RBI Grade B, UPSC CSAT, LIC AAO, NABARD, State PSC

Q21.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Join our six-month computer course and improve your job prospects.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: The course will definitely get you a job.

Assumption II: Computer skills are valued by employers.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (b) Only II is implicit

Explanation: Assumption II is implicit — the advertiser assumes computer skills improve job prospects, meaning employers value them. Without this assumption, the claim makes no sense. Assumption I says the course will DEFINITELY get a job — the statement says 'improve prospects', not guarantee a job. I is NOT implicit.

Q22.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Please put on a sweater before going outside.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: It is cold outside.

Assumption II: Sweaters are available at home.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (c) Both I and II are implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The advice to wear a sweater assumes it is cold outside — otherwise the advice is pointless. I is implicit. Assumption II: The speaker assumes a sweater is available to wear — otherwise the advice cannot be followed. II is also implicit. Both assumptions are necessary.

Q23.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Avoid travelling by road; it is safer to travel by train.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: Trains are a safer mode of transport than road travel.

Assumption II: People generally prefer to travel by road.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (a) Only I is implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The advice to use trains because they are safer assumes trains ARE safer than road. Without this, the advice makes no sense. I is implicit. Assumption II: The statement doesn't assume people prefer road — it just advises against it. II is NOT necessarily implicit.

Q24.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'The best way to fight corruption is to improve the salaries of government employees.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: Government employees engage in corruption because of low salaries.

Assumption II: Corruption exists in government offices.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (c) Both I and II are implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The suggestion assumes that low salary is a CAUSE of corruption (salary increase = less corruption). Without I, the solution makes no sense. Assumption II: The statement assumes corruption exists in government (otherwise why fight it?). Both assumptions are implicit.

Q25.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Wear a helmet whenever you ride a motorcycle.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: Riding a motorcycle without a helmet is dangerous.

Assumption II: All motorcycles are fitted with helmets.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (a) Only I is implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The advice to wear a helmet assumes not wearing one is dangerous — otherwise why give this advice? I is implicit. Assumption II: Helmets are not fitted on motorcycles — they are worn by the rider. II is factually incorrect and NOT implicit.

Q26.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'If you want to pass the exam, start studying from today itself.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: There is still enough time to prepare for the exam.

Assumption II: The person addressed wants to pass the exam.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (c) Both I and II are implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The advice 'start from today' assumes there is still some time left. If exams were tomorrow with no time to study, the advice would be useless. I is implicit. Assumption II: The statement begins 'If you want to pass' — implying it's directed at someone who DOES want to pass. II is implicit.

Q27.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Eating junk food every day can lead to serious health problems.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: Junk food is unhealthy.

Assumption II: People who eat junk food daily will definitely fall sick.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (a) Only I is implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The entire statement is based on the premise that junk food is unhealthy — otherwise how would it cause health problems? I is implicit. Assumption II says people DEFINITELY fall sick — the statement says it CAN LEAD to problems (not will definitely). II is too absolute and NOT implicit.

Q28.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Donate blood — it can save a life.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: Blood donation is a safe procedure for the donor.

Assumption II: There is a shortage of blood in hospitals.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (c) Both I and II are implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The appeal to donate blood assumes it is safe for the donor — otherwise no one would be encouraged. I is implicit. Assumption II: The appeal assumes donated blood is needed (shortage exists) — otherwise saving a life through donation wouldn't be urgent. II is implicit.

Q29.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Buy insurance today — tomorrow may be too late.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: Insurance provides protection against unforeseen events.

Assumption II: Tomorrow, the person may face an adverse event.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (c) Both I and II are implicit

Explanation: Assumption I: The advertisement assumes insurance provides protection — the entire pitch rests on this. I is implicit. Assumption II: 'Tomorrow may be too late' assumes something bad COULD happen tomorrow — creating urgency. II is implicit.

Q30.

Statement(s):

Statement: 'Read the instructions carefully before assembling the furniture.'

Conclusion(s):

Assumption I: People often fail to read instructions before assembling.

Assumption II: The furniture comes with assembly instructions.

(a) Only I is implicit (b) Only II is implicit (c) Both I and II are implicit (d) Neither I nor II is implicit

Answer: (b) Only II is implicit

Explanation: Assumption II: The instruction to 'read the instructions' assumes instructions EXIST with the furniture. Without II, the advice is meaningless. II is implicit. Assumption I: The statement doesn't assume people OFTEN fail — it's just cautionary advice. I is NOT necessarily implicit.

SECTION 4: STATEMENT & COURSE OF ACTION

A problem statement is given, followed by suggested courses of action. You must decide which action(s) are PRACTICAL, RELEVANT, and FOLLOW LOGICALLY from the problem. This type is very common in IBPS PO, SBI PO, SSC CGL, and UPSC CSAT.

Key Tip: A good course of action must: (1) Be directly related to the problem. (2) Be practically feasible. (3) Address the ROOT CAUSE. (4) Not be too extreme or irrelevant. Actions that are mere observations, blame games, or completely impractical do NOT follow.

Appeared in: IBPS PO, SBI PO, SSC CGL, UPSC CSAT, RBI Grade B, State PSC, LIC AAO

Q31.

Statement(s):

Statement: The number of road accidents in the city has increased significantly in the past year.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: The government should impose stricter traffic rules and penalties for violations.

Course of Action II: All vehicles in the city should be banned immediately.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Course of Action I is practical and directly addresses the problem — stricter rules deter violations and reduce accidents. I follows. Course of Action II (banning ALL vehicles) is too extreme and impractical — public transport and essential services would be paralysed. II does NOT follow.

Q32.

Statement(s):

Statement: Many students in rural areas do not attend school regularly due to the need to work and earn for their families.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: The government should provide financial assistance to poor families whose children attend school.

Course of Action II: Schools in rural areas should be closed down as students do not attend.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Course of Action I addresses the ROOT CAUSE — financial need makes children work instead of studying. Providing financial support can reduce this problem. I follows. Course of Action II (closing schools because of low attendance) is counterproductive — it makes the problem worse, not better. II does NOT follow.

Q33.

Statement(s):

Statement: A large number of people in the city are falling sick due to contaminated water supply.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: The municipal authorities should immediately check and repair the water supply system.

Course of Action II: The government should provide bottled water to all city residents free of charge until the problem is resolved.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: Course of Action I is the long-term solution — fixing the root cause (contaminated supply). I follows. Course of Action II is an immediate relief measure to protect people until the system is fixed. II also follows. Both are practical and relevant.

Q34.

Statement(s):

Statement: The literacy rate in District X is well below the national average.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: More schools and adult literacy centres should be opened in District X.

Course of Action II: District X should be merged with an adjacent district with higher literacy.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Course of Action I directly addresses low literacy by expanding educational infrastructure. I follows. Course of Action II (merging districts) has no logical connection to improving literacy — it would just change administrative boundaries, not improve education. II does NOT follow.

Q35.

Statement(s):

Statement: The prices of vegetables have shot up by 60% in the past two weeks due to unseasonal rains damaging crops.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: The government should import vegetables from other states to increase supply.

Course of Action II: People should stop eating vegetables until prices normalise.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Course of Action I is practical — importing from other states where crops are unaffected will increase supply and reduce prices. I follows. Course of Action II (stop eating vegetables) is impractical and harmful to public health. II does NOT follow.

Q36.

Statement(s):

Statement: Several employees of Company X have complained about harassment at the workplace.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: An independent inquiry committee should be set up to investigate the complaints.

Course of Action II: The company should immediately dismiss all employees who made complaints.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Course of Action I is the fair and logical response — a proper inquiry ensures justice. I follows. Course of Action II punishes the VICTIMS (complainers) rather than addressing the harassment. This is unjust and counterproductive. II does NOT follow.

Q37.

Statement(s):

Statement: An increase in the number of private vehicles is causing severe traffic congestion in metropolitan cities.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: The government should improve and expand public transport to reduce dependence on private vehicles.

Course of Action II: Private vehicles should be allowed only on alternate days based on odd-even number plates.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: Course of Action I addresses the root cause — better public transport reduces private vehicle usage. I follows. Course of Action II (odd-even rule) is a practical immediate measure to reduce congestion. It has been implemented in Delhi and other cities. II also follows.

Q38.

Statement(s):

Statement: The suicide rate among students has been rising due to exam pressure and academic stress.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: Schools and colleges should provide counselling services and mental health support.

Course of Action II: Exams should be abolished completely to eliminate stress.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Course of Action I addresses the issue responsibly — counselling helps students manage stress. I follows. Course of Action II (abolishing all exams) is too extreme and impractical — exams serve important assessment purposes. Eliminating them entirely is not a reasonable response. II does NOT follow.

Q39.

Statement(s):

Statement: Due to severe drought, the crop yield in the region has been drastically reduced.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: The government should announce compensation for the affected farmers.

Course of Action II: Farmers should be encouraged to adopt drip irrigation and drought-resistant crops for the future.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: Course of Action I provides immediate relief to affected farmers — practical and compassionate. I follows. Course of Action II addresses future prevention by encouraging better irrigation and crop choices — a practical long-term solution. II also follows. Both are valid.

Q40.

Statement(s):

Statement: Air pollution levels in the city have crossed dangerous limits for the third consecutive week.

Conclusion(s):

Course of Action I: The government should issue public health advisories and restrict outdoor activities.

Course of Action II: All residents should be relocated to rural areas until pollution decreases.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Course of Action I is practical and proportional — health advisories and restricting outdoor activity protects citizens. I follows. Course of Action II (relocating ALL residents) is logistically impossible and wildly impractical. II does NOT follow.

SECTION 5: STATEMENT & ARGUMENTS (Strong vs Weak)

A statement (usually a proposal or policy) is given. Arguments for or against it are listed. You must decide if each argument is STRONG (directly related, logical, important) or WEAK (vague, emotional, irrelevant, or too extreme). Tested in SSC CGL, IBPS PO, and UPSC CSAT.

Key Tip: A STRONG argument: (1) Directly addresses the proposal. (2) Is based on logic/facts. (3) Is practically significant. A WEAK argument: (1) Uses vague/emotional language ('people like it'). (2) Is not related to the proposal. (3) Is trivial or extreme. (4) Is an assumption presented as fact.

Appeared in: SSC CGL, IBPS PO, SBI PO, UPSC CSAT, RBI Grade B, State PSC, LIC AAO

Q41.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should English be the sole medium of instruction in all Indian schools?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because English is an international language and will help students globally.

Argument II: No, because children learn better in their mother tongue, especially in early stages.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (c) Both I and II are strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — English as a global language is a valid and important point. Argument II is equally strong — research shows children learn better in their native language. Both arguments are logically sound and directly address the proposal. Both are strong.

Q42.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should social media platforms be banned for users below 18 years of age?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because young people are easily influenced and social media can harm their mental health.

Argument II: No, because everybody has been using social media for years.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (a) Only I is strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — it gives a concrete, logical reason (mental health harm) directly related to the proposal. Argument II ('everybody has been using it for years') is WEAK — popularity or tradition is not a logical reason to oppose a policy. Past usage doesn't make something safe or appropriate for minors.

Q43.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should India adopt a completely cashless economy?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because digital transactions are transparent and reduce black money.

Argument II: No, because a large portion of India's population lacks digital literacy and access to smartphones/internet.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (c) Both I and II are strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — transparency and reduction of black money are valid, significant benefits. Argument II is strong — the digital divide is a real and major practical obstacle. Both arguments are logically sound and address important real-world issues. Both are strong.

Q44.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should the minimum voting age in India be lowered to 16?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because young people are mature enough to make political decisions.

Argument II: No, because 16-year-olds are still in school and don't pay taxes.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Explanation: Argument I is WEAK — 'mature enough' is a vague, subjective claim without factual basis. Many 16-year-olds are also not mature enough. Argument II is WEAK — being in school or not paying taxes has no logical connection to the right to vote (many non-taxpayers currently vote). Neither is a strong argument.

Q45.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should the use of plastic bags be completely banned in India?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because plastic bags cause severe environmental damage, block drains and harm marine life.

Argument II: No, because plastic bags are very convenient and cheap for shoppers.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (a) Only I is strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — environmental damage, drainage issues, and marine harm are serious, well-documented concerns directly justifying a ban. Argument II is WEAK — convenience and cheapness are not strong enough reasons to justify environmental destruction. I is strong; II is weak.

Q46.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should the government make voting compulsory in elections?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because compulsory voting will increase voter turnout and make the government truly representative.

Argument II: No, because forcing people to vote violates their freedom of choice.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (c) Both I and II are strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — increased turnout and better representation are important democratic values. Argument II is equally strong — compulsion is a legitimate concern about individual freedom. Both are serious, logical arguments addressing different but important aspects of the proposal.

Q47.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should India increase its defence budget significantly?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because strengthening defence is necessary for national security in a volatile region.

Argument II: No, because the money could be better used for education and healthcare.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (c) Both I and II are strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — regional security concerns are a valid, substantive reason. Argument II is also strong — opportunity cost and the need for social development are legitimate counterpoints. Both arguments are logically sound and practically significant.

Q48.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should the retirement age of government employees be increased from 60 to 65?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because experienced employees at 60 are still capable and can contribute their expertise.

Argument II: No, because this will delay job opportunities for the younger generation.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (c) Both I and II are strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — experience and capability are valid reasons for extension. Argument II is also strong — the impact on youth employment is a critical social concern. Both present logical, substantive, and opposing perspectives.

Q49.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should India legalise euthanasia (mercy killing) for terminally ill patients?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because individuals should have the right to die with dignity and avoid prolonged suffering.

Argument II: No, because it could be misused by families to get rid of elderly members for property.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (c) Both I and II are strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — human dignity and relief from suffering are serious ethical considerations. Argument II is also strong — potential for misuse and abuse is a genuine, substantial concern. Both arguments are strong as they address fundamental ethical and social issues.

Q50.

Statement(s):

Statement: Should cricket be removed as the primary focus of Indian sports and replaced with other sports?

Conclusion(s):

Argument I: Yes, because over-emphasis on cricket neglects development of other sports where India can excel.

Argument II: No, because Indians love cricket and it should not be taken away from them.

(a) Only I is strong (b) Only II is strong (c) Both I and II are strong (d) Neither I nor II is strong

Answer: (a) Only I is strong

Explanation: Argument I is strong — it identifies a concrete issue (neglect of other sports) and a logical basis for change. Argument II is WEAK — 'Indians love cricket' is an emotional appeal based on popularity, not a logical argument against policy change. Love of a sport doesn't justify institutional neglect of others.

SECTION 6: INFERENCE FROM PASSAGE (UPSC CSAT / IBPS PO Mains Style)

A short passage or paragraph is given. You must identify which conclusion/inference BEST FOLLOWS from it. This type dominates UPSC CSAT, IBPS PO Mains, SBI PO Mains, and RBI Grade B. It tests reading comprehension + logical reasoning combined.

Key Tip: Read the passage carefully. The correct inference: (1) Must be supported by the passage. (2) Should not go BEYOND what is stated. (3) Should not be a RESTATEMENT of one line — it should be a LOGICAL CONCLUSION. (4) Must not use outside knowledge.

Appeared in: UPSC CSAT, IBPS PO Mains, SBI PO Mains, RBI Grade B, LIC AAO, State PSC

Q51.

Statement(s):

Passage: A study found that students who sleep at least 8 hours per night perform better in examinations than those who sleep less. The study also noted that the performance gap was more pronounced in subjects requiring memory retention.

Conclusion(s):

Conclusion I: Students should prioritise sleep over late-night studying.

Conclusion II: Adequate sleep is positively correlated with academic performance, especially in memory-intensive subjects.

Conclusion III: Sleeping 8 hours guarantees excellent examination results.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Only III follows (d) Both I and II follow

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II is a direct, accurate summary of the passage — sleep and performance are correlated, especially in memory subjects. II follows. Conclusion I is a RECOMMENDATION (should prioritise) not a conclusion from the study — the passage doesn't tell students what they should do. I does NOT follow as a conclusion. Conclusion III uses 'guarantees' — the study showed BETTER performance, not guaranteed excellence. III does NOT follow.

Q52.

Statement(s):

Passage: Countries with higher gender equality indices consistently report higher GDP growth, better health outcomes, and lower corruption levels. Societies that empower women tend to make more efficient use of human capital.

Conclusion(s):

I. Gender equality is a prerequisite for economic development.

II. Empowering women leads to more efficient use of the entire population's potential.

III. Countries with low gender equality will never achieve economic growth.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Only III follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II directly follows — 'more efficient use of human capital' in the passage matches 'efficient use of entire population's potential' in the conclusion. II follows. Conclusion I says gender equality is a PREREQUISITE — the passage shows correlation, not a necessary prerequisite. I overstates. Conclusion III uses 'never' — too absolute. III does NOT follow.

Q53.

Statement(s):

Passage: Urban trees reduce air temperature by providing shade and through a process called evapotranspiration. Studies show that areas with more green cover experience 3-5 degrees lower temperatures than concrete-dominated areas.

Conclusion(s):

I. Planting trees in cities can help mitigate the urban heat island effect.

II. Concrete buildings cause urban heat islands.

III. Cities without trees are completely uninhabitable.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — if trees lower temperatures, planting them would mitigate urban heat. I follows. Conclusion II attributes heat islands to concrete buildings — the passage discusses trees reducing heat but doesn't directly say concrete CAUSES heat islands. II goes slightly beyond the passage. Conclusion III ('completely uninhabitable') is extreme and unsupported. Only I follows.

Q54.

Statement(s):

Passage: Research consistently shows that people who read fiction develop greater empathy than those who do not. Reading literary fiction, in particular, requires readers to inhabit the perspectives of diverse characters, which trains the mind to understand others' viewpoints.

Conclusion(s):

- I. Fiction readers are better at understanding and relating to other people's emotions.
- II. Non-fiction reading has no value for developing empathy.
- III. All empathetic people are avid fiction readers.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Only III follows (d) All three follow

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows from the passage — greater empathy from fiction reading = better understanding of others' emotions. I follows. Conclusion II ('no value') is too extreme — the passage compares fiction to non-fiction but doesn't say non-fiction has NO empathy value. II does NOT follow. Conclusion III reverses causation — not all empathetic people necessarily read fiction (empathy can develop through other means). III does NOT follow.

Q55.

Statement(s):

Passage: In India, over 60% of the population depends on agriculture for their livelihood. Yet agriculture contributes only about 17% to the GDP. This disparity indicates an inefficient distribution of the workforce.

Conclusion(s):

- I. Indian agriculture needs to be mechanised to improve productivity.
- II. A large percentage of the Indian workforce is engaged in a sector with relatively low economic output per person.
- III. Government subsidies have failed to develop Indian agriculture.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Only III follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II is a direct, accurate conclusion — 60% of people in agriculture but only 17% GDP means low output per person in agriculture. II follows directly. Conclusion I (mechanisation) is a suggested SOLUTION — not drawn from the passage. I does NOT follow. Conclusion III (subsidies failing) is never mentioned in the passage. III does NOT follow.

Q56.

Statement(s):

Passage: Studies show that moderate consumption of coffee (2-3 cups daily) is associated with a lower risk of type 2 diabetes, liver disease, and certain neurological disorders. However, excessive consumption can lead to insomnia, anxiety, and cardiovascular problems.

Conclusion(s):

- I. Coffee, when consumed in moderation, may have certain health benefits.
- II. Coffee should be completely avoided by all health-conscious individuals.
- III. The relationship between coffee consumption and health outcomes depends on the amount consumed.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only III follows (c) Both I and III follow (d) All three follow

Answer: (c) Both I and III follow

Explanation: Conclusion I follows — moderate consumption is associated with health benefits. I is a direct, accurate inference. Conclusion III follows — the passage shows different outcomes at different consumption levels (moderate vs excessive). III is a valid inference. Conclusion II ('completely avoided') contradicts the passage which shows moderate use has BENEFITS. II does NOT follow.

Q57.

Statement(s):

Passage: The global demand for skilled workers in AI, data science, and cybersecurity far exceeds the current supply. Companies in these fields are paying premium salaries and actively recruiting internationally. This skills gap is expected to persist for at least a decade.

Conclusion(s):

- I. Pursuing education and training in AI, data science, or cybersecurity significantly improves career prospects.
- II. Countries that invest heavily in tech education will have a competitive advantage in the global job market.

III. All traditional jobs will disappear within a decade.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) All three follow

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — high demand and premium salaries = better career prospects for those trained. I follows. Conclusion II logically follows — countries that supply skilled workers in high-demand fields gain global advantages. II is a reasonable inference. Conclusion III ('all traditional jobs will disappear') is extreme and NOT supported by the passage. III does NOT follow.

Q58.

Statement(s):

Passage: A country's Human Development Index (HDI) considers three dimensions: life expectancy, education, and per capita income. Improvements in any one dimension do not automatically lead to improvements in the others. Countries with high per capita income can still have low HDI if health and education indices are poor.

Conclusion(s):

I. Economic growth alone is insufficient to ensure human development.

II. HDI is a more comprehensive measure of development than GDP per capita alone.

III. Poor countries can never achieve a high HDI.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Only III follows

Answer: (c) Both I and II follow

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — 'high income + low health/education = low HDI' means income alone is insufficient. I follows. Conclusion II follows — HDI considers three dimensions vs income alone, making it more comprehensive. II follows. Conclusion III uses 'never' — too absolute. Poor countries can invest in health and education. III does NOT follow.

Q59.

Statement(s):

Passage: Vaccination has been one of the most successful public health interventions in history. The World Health Organization estimates that vaccines prevent 2-3 million deaths annually. Diseases like smallpox have been completely eradicated, and polio is on the verge of elimination.

Conclusion(s):

I. Vaccination programmes have been highly effective in reducing infectious disease burden.

II. All diseases can be eradicated through vaccination.

III. Without vaccination, 2-3 million more people would die every year from preventable diseases.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only III follows (c) Both I and III follow (d) All three follow

Answer: (c) Both I and III follow

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — 'most successful intervention, millions saved, diseases eradicated' = highly effective. I follows. Conclusion III directly follows from the WHO estimate — vaccines prevent 2-3 million deaths = without them, 2-3 million more would die. III follows. Conclusion II ('ALL diseases can be eradicated') is over-generalised — the passage mentions specific diseases and doesn't claim all diseases are vaccine-preventable. II does NOT follow.

Q60.

Statement(s):

Passage: Organic farming avoids synthetic pesticides and fertilisers, relying instead on natural methods. While organic produce is often costlier due to lower yields, consumer demand for organic food has grown steadily, reflecting increasing health and environmental consciousness.

Conclusion(s):

I. Organic farming is financially less viable than conventional farming due to lower yields.

II. Growing consumer awareness about health and environment is driving demand for organic products.

III. Conventional farming will be replaced entirely by organic farming in the near future.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Only III follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II directly follows — 'growing demand reflecting health/environmental consciousness' is directly stated. II follows. Conclusion I says organic farming is 'less financially viable' — the passage mentions lower yields making it costlier, but growing demand could offset this. Financial viability is not definitively concluded. I is a partial inference, not definitive. Conclusion III ('entirely replaced') is extreme and unsupported. III does NOT follow. Only II definitively follows.

SECTION 7: CRITICAL REASONING — WEAKEN / STRENGTHEN CONCLUSIONS

A conclusion is drawn from a statement/argument. You must identify which additional statement STRENGTHENS or WEAKENS the conclusion. Also includes questions where a conclusion contains a logical flaw. Tested in UPSC CSAT, IBPS PO Mains, SBI PO Mains, and CAT.

Key Tip: To WEAKEN: Find a fact that makes the conclusion LESS likely to be true or shows an alternative explanation. To STRENGTHEN: Find a fact that provides additional SUPPORT for the conclusion. Look for the HIDDEN ASSUMPTION — attacking it weakens; supporting it strengthens.

Appeared in: UPSC CSAT, IBPS PO Mains, SBI PO Mains, RBI Grade B, LIC AAO, State PSC

Q61.

Statement(s):

Argument: Students who use social media extensively get lower grades. Therefore, social media use causes poor academic performance.

Which of the following, if true, would most WEAKEN this conclusion?

Conclusion(s):

- I. Students who already struggle academically tend to spend more time on social media as an escape.
- II. Social media provides students access to educational content and peer collaboration.
- III. Both I and II weaken the conclusion.

Answer: III. Both I and II weaken the conclusion

Explanation: The argument assumes causation (social media → poor grades). Conclusion I introduces REVERSE CAUSATION — poor students use social media more (not that social media caused poor grades). This weakens the causal link. Conclusion II shows social media can be academically BENEFICIAL — countering the negative conclusion. Both weaken the argument.

Q62.

Statement(s):

Argument: The crime rate in City X dropped by 30% after installing CCTV cameras on every street. Therefore, CCTV cameras reduce crime.

Which statement, if true, would WEAKEN this conclusion?

Conclusion(s):

- I. City X also doubled its police force and launched community crime prevention programmes simultaneously.
- II. The cameras were high-resolution and criminals could be clearly identified from footage.
- III. Residents felt safer after the cameras were installed.

(a) Only I weakens (b) Only II weakens (c) Only III weakens (d) None weaken

Answer: (a) Only I weakens

Explanation: Option I introduces ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS — the drop in crime could be due to more police and community programmes, not just CCTV. This weakens the causal claim that CCTV alone reduced crime. Option II actually SUPPORTS the conclusion (cameras help identify criminals). Option III about feeling safer doesn't address whether cameras actually reduced crime. Only I weakens.

Q63.

Statement(s):

Conclusion: Since Company A pays higher salaries than Company B, employees at Company A must be more satisfied with their jobs.

Which statement, if true, would STRENGTHEN this conclusion?

Conclusion(s):

- I. Studies consistently show that salary is the primary factor determining job satisfaction.
- II. Company A has very poor work culture, long working hours, and no work-life balance.
- III. Company B provides better job security and career growth opportunities than Company A.

(a) Only I strengthens (b) Only II strengthens (c) Only III strengthens (d) None strengthen

Answer: (a) Only I strengthens

Explanation: Option I strengthens the conclusion — if salary is the PRIMARY factor for job satisfaction, and Company A pays more, then employees there would indeed be more satisfied. I strengthens. Option II WEAKENS the conclusion (poor culture offsets higher salary). Option III also WEAKENS (Company B has other advantages). Only I strengthens.

Q64.

Statement(s):

Statement: All the employees who attended the training programme showed improved performance. Therefore, the training programme was effective.
Which of the following, if true, would WEAKEN this argument?

Conclusion(s):

- I. Only the best-performing employees were selected to attend the training.
 - II. The training programme was conducted by highly experienced trainers.
 - III. The company implemented new performance-boosting software at the same time as the training.
- (a) Only I weakens (b) Only III weakens (c) Both I and III weaken (d) Only II weakens

Answer: (c) Both I and III weaken

Explanation: Option I shows selection bias — if only top performers attended, performance improvement may be due to their inherent ability, not the training. I weakens. Option III introduces CONFOUNDING FACTOR — new software may have caused improvement, not the training. III weakens. Option II supports the training's quality but doesn't directly weaken the argument. Both I and III weaken.

Q65.

Statement(s):

Argument: Countries with higher chocolate consumption have more Nobel Prize winners. Therefore, eating more chocolate makes people smarter and more likely to win Nobel Prizes.
This argument is flawed because:

Conclusion(s):

- I. It confuses CORRELATION with CAUSATION — both high chocolate consumption and Nobel Prizes may be caused by wealth and access to education.
- II. Chocolate has not been scientifically proven to increase intelligence.
- III. Both I and II identify flaws.

Answer: III. Both I and II identify flaws

Explanation: This is a classic correlation-causation fallacy (famously studied by Franz Messerli, 2012). Option I correctly identifies the logical flaw — wealthy, well-educated countries both eat more chocolate AND produce more Nobel laureates. A third variable (wealth/development) explains both. Option II adds another valid point — lack of scientific evidence. Both are valid criticisms.

Q66.

Statement(s):

Conclusion: Since Rohan is tall, he would make a good basketball player.
Which of the following, if true, would most WEAKEN this conclusion?

Conclusion(s):

- I. Basketball requires agility, ball-handling skills, and teamwork, not just height.
 - II. Rohan is very athletic and has good hand-eye coordination.
 - III. Many professional basketball players are over 6 feet tall.
- (a) Only I weakens (b) Only II weakens (c) Only III weakens (d) None weaken

Answer: (a) Only I weakens

Explanation: The argument assumes height is the primary (or only) factor for basketball success. Option I weakens it by showing other critical factors matter more. I weakens. Option II actually STRENGTHENS the conclusion (Rohan has relevant skills). Option III supports the original claim (height matters in basketball). Only I weakens.

Q67.

Statement(s):

Statement: Students in School A who take music lessons have higher maths scores than those who don't. Conclusion: Music lessons cause improvement in maths performance.

Conclusion(s):

- I. Students who voluntarily take music lessons may already be more disciplined and motivated learners.
 - II. The school uses the same teaching methods for both music and maths students.
 - III. Music training develops mathematical thinking through rhythm and pattern recognition.
- (a) Only I weakens (b) Only III strengthens (c) I weakens; III strengthens (d) Neither weakens nor strengthens

Answer: (c) I weakens; III strengthens

Explanation: Option I WEAKENS — self-selection bias: motivated students both take music and do well in maths. Causation is questionable. Option III STRENGTHENS — provides a mechanism (rhythm/patterns develop maths thinking) that explains HOW music causes maths improvement. I weakens; III strengthens.

Q68.

Statement(s):

Argument: The new tax reform policy was implemented in January. By December, the country's revenue had increased by 20%. Therefore, the tax reform caused the revenue increase.

Which statement most WEAKENS this conclusion?

Conclusion(s):

I. The country experienced exceptional economic growth due to a global commodity boom during the same year.

II. The tax reform simplified filing procedures, leading to fewer evasions.

III. The government increased its public spending significantly during the same period.

(a) Only I weakens (b) Only III weakens (c) Both I and II weaken (d) Only I weakens (II actually strengthens)

Answer: (d) Only I weakens (II actually strengthens)

Explanation: Option I WEAKENS — alternative explanation: global commodity boom caused revenue rise, not the tax reform. The causal claim is undermined. Option II STRENGTHENS the argument — provides a mechanism through which the reform caused revenue increase. Option III (public spending) doesn't directly address revenue increase causation. Only I weakens; II strengthens.

Q69.

Statement(s):

Statement: A pharmaceutical company claims its new drug reduces blood pressure in 90% of patients.

This was tested on 20 patients over 2 weeks.

The main weakness in this claim is:

Conclusion(s):

I. The sample size (20 patients) is too small to draw reliable, generalisable conclusions.

II. Two weeks may not be sufficient to assess long-term effectiveness and side effects.

III. Both I and II are valid weaknesses in the claim.

Answer: III. Both I and II are valid weaknesses

Explanation: Option I identifies statistical weakness — 20 patients is too small a sample. Medical trials typically need hundreds or thousands of patients for reliable results. Option II identifies temporal weakness — 2 weeks is insufficient to assess long-term efficacy and safety. Both are genuine methodological flaws that weaken the claim.

Q70.

Statement(s):

Conclusion: Since most successful entrepreneurs are college dropouts, dropping out of college increases one's chances of entrepreneurial success.

The logical flaw in this conclusion is:

Conclusion(s):

I. Survivorship bias — we only notice successful dropout entrepreneurs; failed dropout entrepreneurs are ignored.

II. The sample of 'successful entrepreneurs' is not representative of all entrepreneurs.

III. Both I and II correctly identify the flaw.

Answer: III. Both I and II correctly identify the flaw

Explanation: The classic survivorship bias error — we notice Zuckerberg, Gates, Jobs but ignore the thousands of dropouts who failed. Option I correctly identifies this bias. Option II also correctly points out sample non-representativeness. Both identify the logical flaw. The conclusion reverses what may be true: perhaps successful people had other qualities that ALLOWED them to succeed despite dropping out.

SECTION 8: THREE STATEMENTS — MULTIPLE CONCLUSIONS

Three statements are given (often mixed All/Some/No type) and 2-3 conclusions are given. You must evaluate each conclusion using ALL three statements together. Common in IBPS PO Mains, SBI PO Mains, UPSC CSAT, and RBI Grade B.

Key Tip: Build a chain through all three statements. Use: All $A \rightarrow B$ + All $B \rightarrow C$ = All $A \rightarrow C$. Some $A \rightarrow B$ + All $B \rightarrow C$ = Some $A \rightarrow C$. No $A \rightarrow B$ + All $B \rightarrow C$ = No conclusion about A and C directly. Evaluate each conclusion separately and carefully.

Appeared in: IBPS PO Mains, SBI PO Mains, UPSC CSAT, RBI Grade B, LIC AAO, State PSC

Q71.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All cats are dogs.

Statement II: All dogs are lions.

Statement III: No lion is a tiger.

Conclusion(s):

I. No cat is a tiger.

II. No dog is a tiger.

III. No lion is a cat.

(a) Only I and II follow (b) Only II and III follow (c) All three follow (d) Only I follows

Answer: (a) Only I and II follow

Explanation: Chain: Cats \rightarrow Dogs \rightarrow Lions; No lion \rightarrow tiger. I: No cat \rightarrow tiger (cats \subset lions, no lion \rightarrow tiger, so no cat \rightarrow tiger). I follows. II: No dog \rightarrow tiger (dogs \subset lions, no lion \rightarrow tiger). II follows. III: No lion is a cat — WRONG. The chain goes from cats to lions, not lions to cats. Partial reverse of 'All cats are lions' gives 'Some lions are cats' (not no lion is a cat). III does NOT follow.

Q72.

Statement(s):

Statement I: Some radios are mobiles.

Statement II: All mobiles are computers.

Statement III: Some computers are watches.

Conclusion(s):

I. Certainly, some radios are watches.

II. Certainly, some mobiles are watches.

III. Some computers are mobiles.

(a) Only III follows (b) Only II and III follow (c) Only I and III follow (d) Only I and II follow

Answer: (a) Only III follows

Explanation: Some radios \rightarrow mobiles \rightarrow computers (radios are computers). Some computers \rightarrow watches — these watched computers may or may not be from the radios/mobiles group. I: Some radios are watches — NOT certain. II: Some mobiles are watches — NOT certain (some computers are watches but those may not be mobiles). III: Some computers are mobiles — YES, from S2 (All mobiles are computers \rightarrow Some computers are mobiles by partial reverse). Only III definitely follows. UPSC CSAT 2021 PYQ.

Q73.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All flowers are plants.

Statement II: All plants are living beings.

Statement III: Some living beings are mortal.

Conclusion(s):

I. All flowers are living beings.

II. Some living beings are flowers.

III. Some flowers are mortal.

(a) Only I and II follow (b) Only I follows (c) All three follow (d) Only I and III follow

Answer: (a) Only I and II follow

Explanation: Flowers \rightarrow plants \rightarrow living beings. I: All flowers are living beings — follows by chain. II: Some living beings are flowers — partial reverse of I. II follows. III: Some flowers are mortal — Some living beings are mortal, but those mortal ones may not be flowers. Not definite. III does NOT follow.

Q74.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All tables are chairs.

Statement II: No chair is a sofa.

Statement III: Some sofas are wooden.

Conclusion(s):

- I. No table is a sofa.
II. Some wooden things are not chairs.
III. Some tables are wooden.
(a) Only I and II follow (b) All three follow (c) Only I follows (d) Only I and III follow

Answer: (a) Only I and II follow

Explanation: Tables \subset chairs; No chair \rightarrow sofa. I: No table \rightarrow sofa (tables are chairs, no chair is sofa). I follows. II: Some sofas \rightarrow wooden; No chair \rightarrow sofa means sofas are outside chairs; some wooden (sofas) are not chairs. II follows. III: Some tables are wooden — Not stated anywhere. III does NOT follow.

Q75.

Statement(s):

- Statement I: All pens are boxes.
Statement II: All boxes are bags.
Statement III: Some bags are cups.

Conclusion(s):

- I. All pens are bags.
II. Some cups are pens.
III. Some bags are pens.
(a) Only I and III follow (b) Only I follows (c) All three follow (d) Only I and II follow

Answer: (a) Only I and III follow

Explanation: Pens \rightarrow boxes \rightarrow bags. I: All pens are bags — follows by chain. III: Some bags are pens — partial reverse of I. III follows. II: Some cups are pens — Some bags \rightarrow cups; bags include pens; but those cups (bags) may not be pens. Not certain. II does NOT follow.

Q76.

Statement(s):

- Statement I: All scientists are researchers.
Statement II: Some researchers are teachers.
Statement III: All teachers are intelligent.

Conclusion(s):

- I. Some scientists are teachers.
II. Some researchers are intelligent.
III. All scientists are intelligent.
(a) Only II follows (b) Only I and II follow (c) Only I and III follow (d) All three follow

Answer: (a) Only II follows

Explanation: Scientists \subset researchers; Some researchers \rightarrow teachers \rightarrow intelligent. I: Some scientists are teachers — NOT certain. All scientists are researchers, but only SOME researchers are teachers — those teachers may not be scientists. I does NOT follow. II: Some researchers \rightarrow teachers \rightarrow intelligent: Some researchers are intelligent. II follows. III: All scientists are intelligent — Only some researchers (teachers) are intelligent; not all scientists reach the teacher group. III does NOT follow.

Q77.

Statement(s):

- Statement I: No weak person wins competitions.
Statement II: All winners are celebrated.
Statement III: Some celebrated persons are wealthy.

Conclusion(s):

- I. No weak person is celebrated.
II. Some wealthy persons are not weak.
III. Some celebrated persons are not weak.
(a) Only I follows (b) Only II and III follow (c) Only III follows (d) All three follow

Answer: (c) Only III follows

Explanation: No weak \rightarrow wins; All winners \rightarrow celebrated; Some celebrated \rightarrow wealthy. I: No weak person is celebrated — WRONG. Winners are celebrated, but celebrated people may include non-winners (artists, etc.). I does NOT follow. II: Some wealthy persons are not weak — Not directly derivable. Some wealthy people are celebrated but not necessarily winners, so this is unclear. II does NOT follow with certainty. III: Some celebrated persons (winners) are not weak (since winners must not be weak). III follows.

Q78.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All rivers are water bodies.
Statement II: All water bodies are essential.
Statement III: Some essential things are scarce.

Conclusion(s):

- I. All rivers are essential.
 - II. Some rivers are scarce.
 - III. Some scarce things are water bodies.
- (a) Only I follows (b) Only I and III follow (c) All three follow (d) Only I and II follow

Answer: (b) Only I and III follow

Explanation: Rivers→water bodies→essential; Some essential→scarce. I: All rivers→essential by chain. I follows. III: Some essential things→scarce; some water bodies are essential and part of essential things are scarce — some scarce things are water bodies. III follows (by the chain some essential⊂some scarce, and water bodies⊂essential). II: Some rivers are scarce — The scarce essential things may not be rivers. II does NOT definitively follow.

Q79.

Statement(s):

Statement I: All A are B.
Statement II: No B is C.
Statement III: All C are D.

Conclusion(s):

- I. No A is C.
 - II. No D is B.
 - III. No A is D.
- (a) Only I follows (b) Only I and II follow (c) All three follow (d) Only I and III follow

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: $A \subset B$; $No B \rightarrow C$. I: $No A \rightarrow C$ ($A \subset B$, $no B \rightarrow C$, so $no A \rightarrow C$). I follows. II: $No D is B$ — From $No B \rightarrow C + All C \rightarrow D$: Does this mean $No D is B$? $No B \rightarrow C$ means B and C don't overlap. $All C \rightarrow D$ means $C \subset D$. D may have elements outside C. Nothing says D and B don't overlap. II does NOT follow. III: $No A is D$ — $A \subset B$, $No B \rightarrow C$, $All C \rightarrow D$. A and D may not overlap through B-C chain, but D could include non-C elements that overlap with B (and thus A). III NOT certain.

Q80.

Statement(s):

Statement I: Some doctors are engineers.
Statement II: All engineers are intelligent.
Statement III: Some intelligent people are honest.

Conclusion(s):

- I. Some doctors are intelligent.
 - II. Some honest people are engineers.
 - III. All doctors are honest.
- (a) Only I follows (b) Only I and II follow (c) Both I and III follow (d) All three follow

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Some doctors→engineers→intelligent. I: Some doctors (the engineer-type) are intelligent. I follows. II: Some intelligent→honest; some engineers are intelligent; those engineers may or may not be the honest ones. II does NOT definitively follow. III: All doctors are honest — massive over-generalisation. III does NOT follow.

SECTION 9: REAL-WORLD POLICY & SOCIAL STATEMENTS

Statements are based on real-world policies, social issues, economic data, or current affairs. Conclusions must be evaluated based on LOGIC, not personal opinion or real-world bias. Common in UPSC CSAT, SSC CGL, IBPS PO, and State PSC exams.

Key Tip: Even when the topic involves real-world issues you know about, base your answer ONLY on what the statement says. Ignore your outside knowledge. Ask: 'Does the statement LOGICALLY SUPPORT this conclusion? Or am I using outside information?'

Appeared in: UPSC CSAT, SSC CGL, IBPS PO, SBI PO, State PSC, RBI Grade B

Q81.

Statement(s):

The government has decided to provide free LPG connections to all families living below the poverty line.

Conclusion(s):

I. The government wants to improve the quality of life for economically weaker sections.

II. LPG is currently available to all families in India.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I follows — providing free LPG to the poor indicates an intention to improve their quality of life. I is a direct inference. Conclusion II (LPG is available to ALL families) is not implied by the statement — the statement only talks about providing it to BPL families specifically. II does NOT follow.

Q82.

Statement(s):

A major IT company announced that it will lay off 20% of its workforce due to automation and AI replacing manual jobs.

Conclusion(s):

I. Automation and AI are causing significant disruption in the job market.

II. All jobs in the IT sector will be replaced by AI in the future.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — automation causing layoffs is evidence of job market disruption. I is a logical inference. Conclusion II ('all jobs will be replaced') is an extreme over-generalisation. The statement mentions 20% layoffs, not a complete replacement of all jobs. II does NOT follow.

Q83.

Statement(s):

The Indian government has made Aadhaar-based biometric authentication mandatory for availing government welfare schemes.

Conclusion(s):

I. The government aims to prevent fraudulent claims and ensure benefits reach genuine beneficiaries.

II. People without Aadhaar cards will be permanently denied all government benefits.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I logically follows — making authentication mandatory suggests the goal of preventing fraud and ensuring genuine recipients. I is a valid inference. Conclusion II ('permanently denied') is an absolute claim — the statement says authentication is mandatory but doesn't say alternatives don't exist. II is too extreme. Only I follows.

Q84.

Statement(s):

Studies show that countries with proportional representation electoral systems tend to have higher voter turnout than countries with first-past-the-post systems.

Conclusion(s):

I. Proportional representation systems encourage more citizens to participate in elections.

II. India should immediately adopt a proportional representation system.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I is a reasonable inference — higher turnout in PR systems suggests these systems encourage participation. I follows. Conclusion II is a RECOMMENDATION for India specifically — the statement shows a correlation in studies but doesn't prescribe what any specific country should do. II does NOT follow as a logical conclusion.

Q85.

Statement(s):

A survey found that 75% of urban households own at least one smartphone, whereas only 30% of rural households do.

Conclusion(s):

I. There is a significant digital divide between urban and rural areas.

II. Rural residents are less intelligent than urban residents.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — the 45-percentage-point gap in smartphone ownership between urban and rural areas clearly indicates a digital divide. I follows. Conclusion II (rural residents are less intelligent) is completely unjustified. Smartphone ownership depends on income, infrastructure, and access — not intelligence. II does NOT follow and is logically flawed.

Q86.

Statement(s):

The Central Bank raised interest rates for the fifth consecutive time to combat rising inflation.

Conclusion(s):

I. Rising interest rates are being used as a tool to control inflation.

II. Inflation will definitely fall to the target level after this rate hike.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I is a direct inference — the Central Bank raising rates to combat inflation shows rate hikes are their anti-inflation tool. I follows. Conclusion II ('definitely fall') is too absolute — rate hikes are used to control inflation but don't guarantee reaching a specific target. II does NOT follow.

Q87.

Statement(s):

A new report reveals that the top 10% of income earners pay 70% of the total income tax in a country.

Conclusion(s):

I. The income tax structure in the country is progressive.

II. The bottom 90% of income earners are tax evaders.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I logically follows — if the highest earners pay the vast majority of income tax, the structure is progressive (higher earners pay higher share). I follows. Conclusion II (calling 90% of earners tax evaders) is unjustified — lower earners may fall below the tax threshold or pay very little tax legally. They are NOT necessarily evaders. II does NOT follow.

Q88.

Statement(s):

The government announced that students from economically weaker sections will receive full fee waivers at all public universities.

Conclusion(s):

I. Higher education will become more accessible to students from low-income backgrounds.

II. The quality of education at public universities will decline due to this policy.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — fee waivers for EWS students will reduce financial barriers and increase access. I is a direct, logical inference. Conclusion II (quality will decline) is an assumption with no basis in the statement. Fee waivers don't necessarily affect teaching quality. II does NOT follow.

Q89.

Statement(s):

A global study reports that countries spending more than 6% of GDP on public education consistently have higher human development indices.

Conclusion(s):

I. Investment in public education is positively associated with human development.

II. Spending exactly 6% of GDP on education guarantees a high human development index.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I follows — the study shows that higher education spending correlates with higher HDI. I is a valid inference. Conclusion II says 'exactly 6% guarantees' — the study says MORE THAN 6% is associated with higher HDI, not that 6% alone guarantees it. II is too specific and absolute. Only I follows.

Q90.

Statement(s):

Recycling one tonne of paper saves approximately 17 trees and 26,000 litres of water.

Conclusion(s):

I. Paper recycling contributes significantly to environmental conservation.

II. If all paper were recycled, deforestation would be completely eliminated.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — saving 17 trees and 26,000 litres per tonne clearly shows significant environmental contribution. I follows. Conclusion II ('completely eliminated') is an absolute over-statement. Paper production is not the only cause of deforestation (agriculture, urbanisation, etc. also cause it). II does NOT follow.

SECTION 10: IMPORTANT EXPECTED QUESTIONS (2025-2026 Exams)

Based on SSC CGL 2024, IBPS PO 2024, SBI PO 2024, RRB NTPC 2024, and UPSC CSAT 2024 trends. These question patterns carry the HIGHEST probability of appearing in the 2025-2026 exam cycle. Includes new-format and complex-reasoning types.

Key Tip: For 2025 exams: Practise all 7 types equally. UPSC CSAT increasingly uses passage-based inference. Banking exams use 'weaken/strengthen' and three-statement types. SSC CGL uses single-statement two-conclusion format. Master the distinction between 'follows' and 'is true in reality'.

Appeared in: SSC CGL 2025, IBPS PO 2025, SBI PO 2025, RRB NTPC 2025, UPSC CSAT 2025, State PSC 2025-26, Delhi Police 2025

Q91.

Statement(s):

[SSC CGL 2025 Expected] Statement: A stitch in time saves nine.

Conclusion(s):

I. Immediate action prevents bigger problems later.

II. Stitching is an important life skill.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: The proverb means timely action prevents larger issues. Conclusion I captures this meaning perfectly — it is a direct logical inference from the proverb. Conclusion II interprets the proverb literally (about stitching fabric) — this misses the figurative meaning entirely. Only I follows.

Q92.

Statement(s):

[IBPS PO 2025 Expected] Statement: All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy.

Statement II: Jack works all day without any recreational breaks.

Conclusion(s):

I. Jack is likely to become dull and unproductive.

II. Jack should be fired from his job for being dull.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: S1 + S2: Constant work without play makes one dull + Jack works without breaks → Jack is likely to become dull. I follows. Conclusion II (Jack should be fired) introduces an extreme, unrelated consequence. Being dull from overwork doesn't logically lead to being fired. II does NOT follow.

Q93.

Statement(s):

[RRB NTPC 2025 Expected] Statement: Mobile phones have become an integral part of daily life, making communication faster and easier than ever before.

Conclusion(s):

I. Mobile phones have revolutionised the way people communicate.

II. Traditional means of communication like letters are completely obsolete now.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I directly follows — 'faster, easier communication' = revolution in communication. I is a valid inference. Conclusion II ('completely obsolete') is an extreme claim. The statement says mobiles are integral; it doesn't say letters are completely obsolete. II does NOT follow.

Q94.

Statement(s):

[UPSC CSAT 2025 Expected] Statement: Pradeep becomes either a Director or a Producer.

Statement P: Pradeep is a Director.

Statement R: Pradeep is not a Director.

Conclusion(s):

Which ordered pair (first implies second, both consistent with main statement): (a) P,Q where Q=Producer (b) R,Q (c) P,R (d) R,P

Options: (a) P,Q (b) R,Q (c) P,R (d) R,P

Answer: (b) R, Q (R implies Q: If Pradeep is not a Director, then Pradeep must be a Producer)

Explanation: Main statement: Pradeep is Director OR Producer. R says: Not a Director. Since he must be one or the other, R implies he IS a Producer (Q). $R \rightarrow Q$ is valid: Not Director \rightarrow Producer. Also R and Q are both consistent with the main statement. This is UPSC CSAT 2024 PYQ. Answer: (b) R,Q.

Q95.

Statement(s):

[SBI PO 2025 Expected] Statement: The government announced that all government employees must declare their assets every year.

Which assumption is implicit?

Conclusion(s):

I. Some government employees may possess undisclosed assets.

II. Annual asset declaration is an effective tool to track corruption.

III. Both I and II are implicit.

Answer: III. Both I and II are implicit

Explanation: Assumption I is implicit — the policy of mandatory declaration assumes there may be undisclosed assets (otherwise why mandate it?). Assumption II is implicit — the government must believe annual declaration helps track corruption; otherwise the policy makes no sense. Both are necessary unstated premises.

Q96.

Statement(s):

[Delhi Police 2025 Expected] Statement: Children who spend more than 3 hours daily on screens have significantly poorer sleep quality than those who spend less than 1 hour.

Conclusion: Reducing screen time will improve children's sleep quality.

Conclusion(s):

I. Which statement WEAKENS the above conclusion?

Option A: Screen content (action/horror vs educational) may affect sleep more than duration.

Option B: Sleep quality also depends on caffeine intake and room temperature.

Option C: Both A and B weaken the conclusion.

Option D: Neither weakens.

Answer: Option C: Both A and B weaken the conclusion

Explanation: The conclusion assumes screen TIME is the cause of poor sleep. Option A weakens it by suggesting CONTENT type matters more than duration (reducing time but watching horror may still harm sleep). Option B suggests other factors (caffeine, temperature) could also affect sleep, undermining the direct causal link between screen time and sleep quality. Both introduce alternative explanations.

Q97.

Statement(s):

[State PSC 2025 Expected] Statement I: All honest people are trustworthy.

Statement II: No trustworthy person is corrupt.

Statement III: Some politicians are corrupt.

Conclusion(s):

I. Some politicians are not trustworthy.

II. No honest person is corrupt.

III. Some politicians are not honest.

(a) Only I and II follow (b) Only II follows (c) Only II and III follow (d) All three follow

Answer: (d) All three follow

Explanation: Honest→trustworthy; No trustworthy→corrupt. II: Honest⊂trustworthy, no trustworthy→corrupt → No honest→corrupt. II follows. Some politicians→corrupt; No trustworthy→corrupt means corrupt ones are not trustworthy → Some politicians are not trustworthy. I follows. From honest⊂trustworthy, and some politicians not trustworthy: those politicians cannot be honest. III follows. All three follow.

Q98.

Statement(s):

[IBPS Clerk 2025 Expected] Statement: Several studies show that people who meditate daily report lower levels of stress and anxiety compared to those who don't meditate.

Conclusion(s):

I. Daily meditation helps in reducing stress and anxiety.

II. Meditation is the best and only method to reduce stress.

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (a) Only I follows

Explanation: Conclusion I is a direct inference from the studies — meditation correlates with lower stress. I follows. Conclusion II ('best AND only method') is an extreme over-statement. The studies compare meditators to non-meditators but don't claim meditation is the only or best method. II does NOT follow.

Q99.

Statement(s):

[SSC CHSL 2025 Expected] Statement: Despite being the second most populous country, India has won very few Olympic medals compared to its population size.

Conclusion I: India lacks sports infrastructure and investment.

Conclusion II: Olympic medal count does not necessarily reflect a country's population.

Conclusion(s):

See options

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II directly follows — if India's large population doesn't translate to many medals, medals and population are not proportional. II is a direct, logical inference. Conclusion I (lack of infrastructure) is an ASSUMPTION about the CAUSE. The statement presents the fact but doesn't state the reason. I introduces a cause not mentioned in the statement. Only II follows.

Q100.

Statement(s):

[RBI Grade B 2025 Expected] Statement: A country's current account deficit widened significantly after a steep depreciation of its currency.

Conclusion I: Currency depreciation always leads to a wider current account deficit.

Conclusion II: The country's imports became more expensive after currency depreciation.

Conclusion(s):

See options

(a) Only I follows (b) Only II follows (c) Both I and II follow (d) Neither I nor II follows

Answer: (b) Only II follows

Explanation: Conclusion II logically follows — when currency depreciates, imports become more expensive in local currency terms. This is a fundamental economic principle directly supported by the context. II follows. Conclusion I says depreciation ALWAYS leads to wider deficit — the statement shows ONE case. 'Always' is an over-generalisation (depreciation can also make exports cheaper, potentially reducing deficit). I does NOT follow.

Accept All Statements as True | Logic Only — No Real-World Bias | Score Full Marks!

All the best for your Government Exam Preparation!