



# LSAT-TEST<sup>Q&As</sup>

Law School Admission Test: Logical Reasoning, Reading  
Comprehension, Analytical Reasoning

**Pass LAST LSAT-TEST Exam with 100% Guarantee**

Free Download Real Questions & Answers **PDF** and **VCE** file from:

<https://www.geekcert.com/lSAT-test.html>

100% Passing Guarantee  
100% Money Back Assurance

Following Questions and Answers are all new published by LAST  
Official Exam Center

- ⚙️ **Instant Download** After Purchase
- ⚙️ **100% Money Back** Guarantee
- ⚙️ **365 Days** Free Update
- ⚙️ **800,000+** Satisfied Customers





### QUESTION 1

A nationwide poll of students, parents, and teachers showed that over 90 percent believe that an appropriate percentage of their school's budget is being spent on student counseling programs. It seems, then, that any significant increase in a school's budget should be spent on something other than student counseling programs.

Which one of the following describes a flaw in the reasoning of the argument above?

- A. The argument confuses a mere coincidence with a causal relationship.
- B. The argument confuses the percentage of the budget spent on a program with the overall amount spent on that program.
- C. The argument fails to justify its presumption that what is true of a part of the budget is also true of the total budget.
- D. The argument fails to consider the possibility that money could be saved by training students as peer counselors.
- E. The argument fails to consider that if more money is spent on a program, then more money cannot also be used for other purposes.

Correct Answer: B

Why should any additional cash be applied to some area other than student counseling? Because almost everyone concerned believes that the right percentage of the budget is already going there. But percentage and amount are two different things, as option [The argument confuses the percentage of...] points out. If budget dollars were to go up but the percentage allotted to counseling were to remain the same, then fewer dollars would be spent on counseling, a state of affairs that might not please anybody. No causality, confused or otherwise, is described in the argument of [The argument confuses a mere...]. The author makes no such claim such as [The argument fails to justify its presumption that...] describes; to argue that a part of a whole is adequate is not necessarily to commit a part to whole fallacy. Option [The argument fails to consider the possibility...] raises a couple of issues irrelevant to the argument, namely saving money and the content of counseling programs. As for option [The argument fails to consider that if more money...], the argument pretty much does consider that money spent in one area takes money away from another, and anyway, that point isn't central to the logical error.

### QUESTION 2

During a single week, from Monday through Friday, tours will be conducted of a company's three divisions -- Operations, Production, Sales. Exactly five tours will be conducted that week, one each day. The schedule of tours for the week must conform to the following restrictions:

Each division is toured at least once.

The Operations division is not toured on Monday.

The Production division is not toured on Wednesday.

The Sales division is toured on two consecutive days, and on no other days.

If the Operations division is toured on Thursday, then the Production division is toured on Friday.

If in the week's tour schedule the division that is toured on Tuesday is also toured on Friday, then for which one of the following days must a tour of the Production division be scheduled?



- A. Monday
- B. Tuesday
- C. Wednesday
- D. Thursday
- E. Friday

Correct Answer: A

We're told, in the abstract, that the same division is toured on Tuesday and Friday. Well, don't be satisfied with that. Make it concrete. Which division is it? Can't be S, since the consecutive "SS" is all we're allowed. Can't be P either, because "PS S P" would leave O for Monday, a violation of Rule 2. No, the division the question is talking about must be O, and the insertion of "SS" yields "\_ O S S O." Production's day is therefore Monday.

### QUESTION 3

Editorial: This political party has repeatedly expressed the view that increasing spending on education is a worthy goal. On other occasions, however, the same party has claimed that the government should not increase spending on education. So this party's policy is clearly inconsistent.

The argument in the editorial depends on assuming which one of the following?

- A. It is inconsistent for a legislator both to claim that increasing spending on education is a worthy goal and to vote against increasing spending on education.
- B. A consistent course of action in educational policy is usually the course of action that will reduce spending on education in the long run.
- C. Even if a goal is a morally good one, one should not necessarily try to achieve it.
- D. A consistent political policy does not hold that an action that comprises a worthy goal should not be performed.
- E. Members of one political party never have inconsistent views on how to best approach a political issue.

Correct Answer: D

Another Assumption question to chew on, and not surprisingly, there's a scope shift that needs to be cleared up before the conclusion that the party's policy is inconsistent is viable. Why the inconsistency, according to the editorialist? Because the party has said that increasing spending on education is a good thing, yet at other times has claimed that the government shouldn't increase education spending. But noting the worthiness of a cause and suggesting it be acted upon are two different things; it's possible that despite thinking that the cause is worthy, other considerations cause the party to claim the government shouldn't do anything about it. In order for these positions to be truly inconsistent, as the editorialist contends, we need a more precise definition of inconsistency that shows these two positions to be mutually exclusive. Option [A consistent political policy does not hold that...] accomplishes this, by implying that a political policy is not consistent if it holds that a worthy action should not be done. The editorialist doesn't actually say this, but must assume this is the case in order for the conclusion to stand. If you weren't able to rephrase this answer, don't fret -- this was a tough one. But hopefully you saw the merits of option [A consistent political policy does not hold that...]. When you got to it, or even confirmed it using the Denial Test (see second bullet point below).



#### QUESTION 4

Is it necessary for defense lawyers to believe that the clients they defend are innocent of the charges against them? Some legal scholars hold that lawyers' sole obligation is to provide the best defense they are capable of, claiming that in democratic societies all people accused of crimes are entitled to the best possible legal representation. They argue that lawyers have no right to judge defendants because it is the job of the courts to determine guilt or innocence and the job of the lawyer to represent the defendant before the court. They believe that the lawyer's responsibility is to state those facts that will assist each client's case, construct sound arguments based on these facts, and identify flaws in the arguments of opposing counsel. According to these scholars, the lawyer's role is not to express or act on personal opinions but to act as an advocate, saying only what defendants would say if they possessed the proper training or resources with which to represent themselves.

But such a position overlooks the fact that the defense lawyer's obligation is twofold: to the defendant, certainly, but no less so to the court and, by extension, to society. For this reason, lawyers, great as their obligation to defendants is, should not, as officers of the court, present to the court assertions that they know to be false. But by the same principle, lawyers who are convinced that their clients are guilty should not undertake to demonstrate their innocence. Guilty defendants should not be entitled to false or insincere representation. When lawyers know with certainty that a defendant is guilty, it is their duty not to deny this. Rather, they should appraise the case as much as possible in their client's favor, after giving due consideration to the facts on the other side, and then present any extenuating circumstances and argue for whatever degree of leniency in sentencing they sincerely believe is warranted. In cases where it is uncertain whether the client is guilty but the lawyer sincerely believes the client may well be innocent, the lawyer should of course try to prove that the client is innocent.

The lawyer's obligation to the court and to society also ultimately benefits the defendant, because the "best defense" can only truly be provided by an advocate who, after a careful analysis of the facts, is convinced of the merits of the case. The fact that every client is entitled to a defense does not mean that defense lawyers should take every case they are offered. Lawyers should not be mere mouthpieces for a defendant but instead advocates for the rights of the defendant given the facts of the case.

According to the passage, the legal scholars mentioned at the end of 1st paragraph believe that it is a defense lawyer's role to be

- A. a source of legal information that can help a jury to reach decisions that are fair and equitable
- B. a thorough investigator of all relevant evidence
- C. a diligent representative of the client's position
- D. a facilitator and expediter of the cause of justice
- E. an energetic advocate of the client's right to legal representation

Correct Answer: C

The categorical language of the stem, and the "According to the passage," signal a Detail question, and the line reference sends us to a particular spot. So let's read the Detail, in full.

#### QUESTION 5

On each of exactly seven consecutive days (day 1 through day 7), a pet shop features exactly one of three breeds of kitten -- Himalayan, Manx, Siamese -- and exactly one of three breeds of puppy -- Greyhound, Newfoundland, Rottweiler.



The following conditions must apply:

Greyhounds are featured on day 1.

No breed is featured on any two consecutive days.

Any breed featured on day 1 is not featured on day 7.

Himalayans are featured on exactly three days, but not on day 1.

Rottweilers are not featured on day 7, nor on any day that features Himalayans.

If Himalayans are not featured on day 2, which one of the following could be true?

- A. Manx are featured on day 3.
- B. Siamese are featured on day 4.
- C. Rottweilers are featured on day 5.
- D. Himalayans are featured on day 6.
- E. Greyhounds are featured on day 7

Correct Answer: B

So there are no Himalayans on day 2, eh? Well, that should be helpful: We have three non-consecutive h's to place, and day 1 was already forbidden to them, so you might suspect that their placement is now pretty much of a done deal, and so it is. There's only one way to insert them: 1234567 m/s \_\_\_h\_\_\_h\_\_\_h So let's check our choices.

[LSAT-TEST PDF Dumps](#)

[LSAT-TEST Practice Test](#)

[LSAT-TEST Exam Questions](#)