

LSAT Mock Exam - Answer Key and Detailed Explanations for Logical Reasoning

Mastering the LSAT requires understanding *why* an answer is correct and why the others are wrong. Use these explanations to strengthen your core reasoning skills.

SECTION I: LOGICAL REASONING (Q1-Q5)

Question	Correct Answer	Question Type
1	C	Flaw in the Reasoning
2	D	Necessary Assumption
3	C	Strengthen the Argument
4	D	Main Point
5	C	Parallel Reasoning

Question 1 (Flaw in the Reasoning)

- **Argument Core:** Tax implemented $\rightarrow$ No reduction in sales $\rightarrow$ Tax is not an effective tool for combating obesity.
- **Flaw:** The argument confuses the *lack of an intermediate effect* (reduced sales) with the *failure of the ultimate goal* (reduced obesity). A policy might have a slow effect, or it might reduce sales later, or it might reduce consumption while sales remain high due to panic-buying. The economist incorrectly assumes that because the effect didn't materialize within **six months**, the entire long-term policy is a failure.
- **Correct Answer: (C)** The economist fails to consider the possibility that the *intended causal chain* (tax $\rightarrow$ reduced sales $\rightarrow$ reduced obesity) requires a longer time frame for the final effect (reduced obesity rates) to manifest.

Question 2 (Necessary Assumption)

- **Argument Core:** Exclusivity (limited production/distribution) $\rightarrow$ High Profitability (maintaining social cachet/high margins).
- **Analysis:** The argument presumes that the brand can survive the restriction in sales

volume. If limiting accessibility makes the demand for the watch drop dramatically, the brand will fail even if the exclusivity is maintained. A Necessary Assumption must defend the argument against this possibility.

- **Correct Answer: (D) The demand for the brand's watches will not drop significantly if the watches are made less accessible.** If demand *did* drop significantly, the plan to maximize profitability would fail, thus undermining the entire argument.

Question 3 (Strengthen the Argument)

- **Argument Core:** Happiness is a trainable skill rooted in cognitive flexibility. (Conclusion) $\rightarrow$ People who practice problem-solving games (which train flexibility) are happier (Evidence).
- **Analysis:** The argument is based on a **correlation** between a proxy for the skill (problem-solving games) and the result (happiness). To strengthen, we need to show a direct **causal link** that connects the proposed mechanism (cognitive flexibility) to the final result (happiness).
- **Correct Answer: (C) The cognitive flexibility developed through these games is a mental process central to adapting a positive outlook on adverse events.** This provides the missing mechanism: it explains *how* the skill gained from the games (cognitive flexibility) actually causes or leads to happiness (by allowing a positive outlook).

Question 4 (Main Point)

- **Stimulus Summary:** Technologies change the *method* of distribution, but they **do not change the fundamental economic tension** (creators vs. public access) that IP law must resolve.
- **Conclusion Signal:** Therefore...
- **Conclusion:** The **core principles guiding copyright and patent legislation remain surprisingly constant.**
- **Correct Answer: (D) The primary function of intellectual property law is to resolve a fundamental economic tension that is independent of technological advancements.** This captures the argument that the enduring purpose (resolving the tension) is the reason the principles (the rules) remain constant.

Question 5 (Parallel Reasoning)

- **Stimulus Structure (Flaw of Denying the Antecedent):**
 - If **Curfew** $\rightarrow$ **Revenue Decrease**
 - **Not Curfew** (because crime stats dropped)
 - Therefore, **Not Revenue Decrease**
 - **Flaw:** The argument assumes a curfew is the *only* thing that could cause a decrease in late-night revenue. It moves from "If P, then Q" to "If Not P, then Not Q," which is invalid.
- **Correct Answer: (C)** exhibits the identical flaw:
 - If **Paprika** $\rightarrow$ **Flavor Ruined**

- **Not Paprika**
- Therefore, **Not Flavor Ruined**
- *Flaw:* It assumes paprika is the *only* ingredient that could ruin the flavor.

SECTION I: LOGICAL REASONING (Q6-Q10)

Question	Correct Answer	Question Type
6	B	Weaken the Argument
7	B	Main Point
8	C	Flaw in the Reasoning
9	A	Sufficient Assumption
10	E	Role/Function

Question 6 (Weaken the Argument)

- **Argument Core:** High helmet sales $\rightarrow$ Significant reduction in serious injuries.
- **Analysis:** This is a causal argument. The spokesperson assumes the *benefits* of the product will be realized without any negative consequences. To weaken the argument, we must introduce an overlooked factor that counteracts the helmet's intended benefit.
- **Correct Answer: (B)** This answer introduces a "counter-effect" or "risk compensation." If riders with advanced gear feel safer and therefore engage in **high-risk behaviors**, the protective effect of the helmet may be entirely canceled out, thus weakening the claim that there will be a *significant reduction* in injuries.

Question 7 (Main Point)

- **Argument Core:** Hostile architecture (HA) does not address root causes (affordable housing, mental health). It only displaces and marginalizes.
- **Conclusion Signal:** The policy is **fundamentally flawed**.
- **Correct Answer: (B)** This option captures the full scope of the author's critique: the policy is **flawed** (the main conclusion) because it **fails to address the underlying issues** (the primary evidence). The other options capture premises or supporting details, but not the overall conclusion.

Question 8 (Flaw in the Reasoning)

- **Argument Core:** Good Novelist (Imaginary World) vs. Good Scientist (Real World)
 $\rightarrow$ Impossible for a scientist to be a good novelist (incompatible mindsets).
- **Flaw:** The argument defines the *requirements* of two professions and concludes that a *person* cannot meet both because the definitions conflict. This assumes that the skills

and mindset required for one professional role must be constantly applied and cannot be segmented or adopted for a different role (i.e., a person can be realistic during the day and imaginative at night).

- **Correct Answer: (C)** The argument uses the word "good" to define two different, specialized **mindsets** necessary for two different **tasks** and then illicitly concludes that the mindsets are **mutually exclusive** within the same person.

Question 9 (Sufficient Assumption)

- **Premise:** Best Picture Nominated $\rightarrow$ Production Budget $>$ \$100M. (P $\rightarrow$ Q)
- **Conclusion:** 'Starlight's End' was Not Nominated. (Not P)
- **Analysis:** To logically guarantee the conclusion (Not P), we must apply the contrapositive of the premise: Not Q $\rightarrow$ Not P. This requires assuming that the necessary condition (Budget $>$ \$100M) was not met.
- **Correct Answer: (A)** The production budget for 'Starlight's End' was \$100 million or less. This is the statement Not Q. If the film's budget was *not* over \$100M, then it logically *cannot* have been nominated for Best Picture, guaranteeing the conclusion.

Question 10 (Role/Function)

- **Main Conclusion:** The claim that the rise of the internet is as revolutionary as the printing press **is a clear exaggeration** (First sentence after the opposing claim).
- **Bolded Statement:** It explains *why* the claim is an exaggeration: the internet only speeds up a process (distribution) that the printing press created (change in *kind*).
- **Correct Answer: (E)** The claim about the printing press (it fundamentally altered the *structure*) supports the bolded statement (that the internet is merely an acceleration), making the bolded statement an **intermediate conclusion**. This intermediate conclusion then serves as the primary premise supporting the **main conclusion** that the initial claim of "revolution" is an exaggeration.