

LSAT-TEST^{Q&As}

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.leads4pass.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

In a business whose owners and employees all belong to one family, the employees can be paid exceptionally low wages. Hence, general operating expenses are much lower than they would be for other business ventures, making profits higher. So a family business is a family's surest road to financial prosperity.

The reasoning in the argument is flawed because the argument

- A. ignores the fact that businesses that achieve high levels of customer satisfaction are often profitable even if they pay high wages
- B. presumes, without providing justification, that businesses that pay the lowest wages have the lowest general operating expenses and thus the highest profits
- C. ignores the fact that in a family business, paying family members low wages may itself reduce the family's prosperity
- D. presumes, without providing justification, that family members are willing to work for low wages in a family business because they believe that doing so promotes the family's prosperity
- E. presumes, without providing justification, that only businesses with low general operating expenses can succeed

Correct Answer: C

The alleged chain of phenomena (low family wages lower operating expenses higher profits greater family prosperity) hits a snag early on. Since a reasonable definition of "a family's financial prosperity" would have to touch on, at least, how much money the members of the family possess, there is a strong likelihood that running a family business in the way the author suggests would weaken the family's prosperity.

QUESTION 2

Some philosophers find the traditional, subjective approach to studying the mind outdated and ineffectual. For them, the attempt to describe the sensation of pain or anger, for example, or the awareness that one is aware, has been surpassed by advances in fields such as psychology, neuroscience, and cognitive science. Scientists, they claim, do not concern themselves with how a phenomenon feels from the inside; instead of investigating private evidence perceivable only to a particular individual, scientists pursue hard data—such as the study of how nerves transmit impulses to the brain—which is externally observable and can be described without reference to any particular point of view. With respect to features of the universe such as those investigated by chemistry, biology, and physics, this objective approach has been remarkably successful in yielding knowledge. Why, these philosophers ask, should we suppose the mind to be any different?

But philosophers loyal to subjectivity are not persuaded by appeals to science when such appeals conflict with the data gathered by introspection. Knowledge, they argue, relies on the data of experience, which includes subjective experience. Why should philosophy ally itself with scientists who would reduce the sources of knowledge to only those data that can be discerned objectively?

On the face of it, it seems unlikely that these two approaches to studying the mind could be reconciled. Because philosophy, unlike science, does not progress inexorably toward a single truth, disputes concerning the nature of the mind are bound to continue. But what is particularly distressing about the present debate is that genuine communication between the two sides is virtually impossible. For reasoned discourse to occur, there must be shared assumptions or beliefs. Starting from radically divergent perspectives, subjectivists and objectivists lack a common context in which to consider evidence presented from each other's perspectives. The situation may be likened to a debate between adherents of different religions about the creation of the universe. While each religion may be confident that its

cosmology is firmly grounded in its respective sacred text, there is little hope that conflicts between their competing cosmologies could be resolved by recourse to the texts alone. Only further investigation into the authority of the texts themselves would be sufficient.

What would be required to resolve the debate between the philosophers of mind, then, is an investigation into the authority of their differing perspectives. How rational is it to take scientific description as the ideal way to understand the nature of consciousness? Conversely, how useful is it to rely solely on introspection for one's knowledge about the workings of the mind? Are there alternative ways of gaining such knowledge? In this debate, epistemology—the study of knowledge—may itself lead to the discovery of new forms of knowledge about how the mind works.

Which one of the following most accurately summarizes the main point of the passage?

- A. In order to gain new knowledge of the workings of the mind, subjectivists must take into consideration not only the private evidence of introspection but also the more objective evidence obtainable from disciplines such as psychology, neuroscience, and cognitive science.
- B. In rejecting the traditional, subjective approach to studying the mind, objectivists have made further progress virtually impossible because their approach rests on a conception of evidence that is fundamentally incompatible with that employed by subjectivists.
- C. Because the subjectivist and objectivist approaches rest on diametrically opposed assumptions about the kinds of evidence to be used when studying the mind, the only way to resolve the dispute is to compare the two approaches' success in obtaining knowledge.
- D. Although subjectivists and objectivists appear to employ fundamentally irreconcilable approaches to the study of the mind, a common ground for debate may be found if both sides are willing to examine the authority of the evidence on which their competing theories depend.
- E. While the success of disciplines such as chemistry, biology, and physics appears to support the objectivist approach to studying the mind, the objectivist approach has failed to show that the data of introspection should not qualify as evidence.

Correct Answer: D

This Global question invites us to restate the main idea, though the hugely long answer choices are hardly inviting. Yet there's a bright side. Don't forget that "more text" = "more opportunity to go wrong." After predicting that the right answer must both viewpoints as well as the author's attempts at reconciling the two, you can proceed confidently into the choices in any order you like. And the moment a choice goes bad or cockeyed—and that could be soon—you must abandon it in search of the one you know is there: the one that does the job.

QUESTION 3

A pesticide producing company states that their unused pesticide that is dumped does not pose a threat to the aquatic life in the surrounding area. If this is correct, then why have local fish been dying in this region? Due to the fact that the pesticide company is not located in a highly fish populated area, they implicitly admit that the pesticides they produce are relatively dangerous to the nearby aquatic life.

Of the following statements listed below, which one would be most likely to weaken the argument of the author if it were true?

- A. The possibility of pesticides filtering into the local water region was underestimated in the past.
- B. Funds for environmental company clean-up, which concern waste dumps that are poorly run, are reserved for rural regions only.

C. It would be pointless to locate chemical dumps where they would be most harmful, unless they can be 100% proven safe.

D. Dumps that are located in areas without large fish populations have fewer government interventions and are also less expensive.

E. City people are most probable to sue the company if the dumps cause them health problems.

Correct Answer: D

QUESTION 4

Passage

(1)

[1] Positive thinking sounds useful on the surface. [2] But "positive thinking" is also a soft and fluffy term that is easy to dismiss. [3] But those views may be changing. [4] Research is beginning to reveal that positive thinking is about much more than just being happy or displaying an upbeat attitude. [5] Positive thoughts can actually create real value in your life and help you build skills that last much longer than a smile. [6] The impact of positive thinking on your work, your health, and your life is being studied by researchers, one of whom is Barbara Fredrickson. [7] Fredrickson is a positive psychology researcher at the University of North Carolina, and she published a landmark paper that provides surprising insights about positive thinking and its impact on your skills. [8] Her work is among the most referenced and cited in her field, and it is surprisingly useful in everyday life.

(2)

[9] What do negative thoughts do to your brain? [10] Let's say that you're walking through the forest and suddenly a tiger steps onto the path ahead of you. [11] When this happens, your brain registers a negative emotion—in this case, fear. [12] Researchers have long known that negative emotions program your brain to do a specific action. [13] When that tiger crosses your path, for example, you run. [14] The rest of the world doesn't matter. [15] You are focused entirely on the tiger, the fear it creates, and how you can get away from it. [16] In other words, negative emotions narrow your mind and focus your thoughts. [17] At that same moment, you might have the option to climb a tree, pick up a leaf, or grab a stick—but your brain ignores all of those options because they seem irrelevant when a tiger is standing in front of you.

(3)

[18] This is a useful instinct if you're trying to save life and limb, but in our modern society, we don't have to worry about stumbling across tigers in the wilderness. [19] The problem is that your brain is still programmed to respond to negative emotions in the same way—by shutting off the outside world and limiting the options, you see around you. [20] For example, when you're in a fight with someone, your anger and emotion might consume you to the point where you can't think about anything else. [21] Or, when you are stressed out about everything you have to get done today, you may find it hard to actually start anything because you're paralyzed by how long your to-do list has become. [22] In each case, your brain closes off from the outside world and focuses on the negative emotions of fear, anger, and stress—just like it did with the tiger. [23] Negative emotions prevent your brain from seeing the other options and choices that surround you. [24] It's your survival instinct.

(4)

[25] Now, let's compare this to what positive emotions do to your brain. [26] This is where Barbara Fredrickson returns to the story. [27] Fredrickson tested the impact of positive emotions on the brain by setting up a little experiment. [28] During this experiment, she divided her research subjects into five groups and showed each group different film clips. [29] The first two groups were shown clips that created positive emotions. [30] Group 1 saw images that created feelings of joy. [31] Group 2 saw images that created feelings of contentment. [32] Group 3 was the control group. [33] They saw

images that were neutral and produced no significant emotion. [34] The last two groups were shown clips that created negative emotions. [35] Group 4 saw images that created feelings of fear. [36] Group 5 saw images that created feelings of anger. [37] Afterward, each participant was asked to imagine themselves in a situation where similar feelings would arise and to write down what they would do. [38] Each participant was handed a piece of paper with 20 blank lines that started with the phrase, "I would like to..." Participants who saw images of fear and anger wrote down the fewest responses. [39] Meanwhile, the participants who saw images of joy and contentment, wrote down a significantly higher number of actions that they would take, even when compared to the neutral group.

(5)

[40] In other words, when you are experiencing positive emotions like joy, contentment, and love, you will see more possibilities in your life. [41] These findings were among the first that suggested positive emotions broaden your sense of possibility and open your mind up to more options. [42] But that was just the beginning. [43] The benefits of positive emotions don't stop after a few minutes of good feelings subside. [44] In fact, the biggest benefit that positive emotions provide is an enhanced ability to build skills and develop resources for use later in life. [45] Let's consider a real-world example. [46] A child who runs around outside, swinging on branches and playing with friends, develops the ability to move athletically (physical skills), the ability to play with others and communicate with a team (social skills), and the ability to explore and examine the world around them (creative skills). [47] In this way, the positive emotions of play and joy prompt the child to build skills that are useful and valuable in everyday life. [48] These skills last much longer than the emotions that initiated them. [49] Years later, that foundation of athletic movement might develop into a scholarship as a college athlete or the communication skills may blossom into a job offer as a business manager. [50] The happiness that promoted the exploration and creation of new skills has long since ended, but the skills themselves live on. [51] Fredrickson refers to this as the "broaden and build" theory because positive emotions broaden your sense of possibilities and open your mind, which in turn allows you to build new skills and resources that can provide value in other areas of your life.

(6)

[52] All of this research begs the most important question of all: If positive thinking is so useful for developing valuable skills and appreciating the big picture of life, how do you actually get yourself to be positive? [53] Recent research by Fredrickson and her colleagues has revealed that people who meditate daily display more positive emotions than those who do not. [54] As expected, people who meditated also built valuable long-term skills. [55] For example, three months after the experiment was over, the people who meditated daily continued to display increased mindfulness, purpose in life, social support, and decreased illness symptoms.

(7)

[56] Secondly, a study published in the Journal of Research in Personality examined a group of 90 undergraduate students who were split into two groups. [57] The first group wrote about an intensely positive experience each day for three consecutive days. [58] The second group wrote about a control topic. [59] Three months later, the students who wrote about positive experiences had better mood levels, fewer visits to the health center, and experienced fewer illnesses.

(8)

[60] Positive thinking isn't just a soft and fluffy feel-good term. [61] Yes, it's great to simply "be happy," but those moments of happiness are also critical for opening your mind to explore and build the skills that become so valuable in other areas of your life. [62] Periods of positive emotion and unhindered exploration are when you see the possibilities for how your past experiences fit into your future life, when you begin to develop skills that blossom into useful talents later on, and when you spark the urge for further exploration and adventure.

According to the passage, which one of the following is a tool that the author recommends to build positive thinking?

- A. Pursuing one's interests
- B. Doing charitable works

C. Maintaining strong and meaningful relationships

D. Penning optimistic thoughts

E. Spending time with family regularly

Correct Answer: D

From sentences 52-59, the author discusses two tools to help people develop positive thinking ?meditating and writing about positive thoughts.

Understanding the passage In paragraph (1), the author introduces the topic of the essay. He states that positive thinking, though sounds like a fluffy term, is much beyond that. Researcher Barbara Fredrickson has done research on this topic and her studies find several insights about positive thinking.

In paragraph (2), the author discusses the impact of negative thoughts on the human brain ?that they narrow one\\'s mind and reduce the options that the brain can see. He gives the example of a tiger to reinforce the same.

In paragraph (3), the author gives further examples to strengthen the fact that negative emotions make one shut off from the outside world and limit one\\'s options.

In paragraph (4), the author discusses the impact that positive emotions can have on a person. He elaborates on an experiment conducted by Barbara Fredrickson to reinforce the same. Fredrickson divided her subjects into five groups. Group 1 and 2 were shown pictures that evoked positive emotions ?joy and contentment respectively. Group 3 was the control group and was shown pictures that produced no significant emotion. Group 4 and 5 were shows pictures that evoked negative emotions ?fear and anger. After the experiment, it was found that participants of Group 1 and 2 saw more possibilities in their lives whereas participants of Group 4 and 5 saw fewer possibilities.

In paragraph (5), the author explains that the benefits of positive emotions last for a lifetime. Positive thinking helps to build skills and develop resources for use later in life. He explains the same using the example of a child playing; the skills that a child learns while playing could help him develop valuable social, physical, and creative skills later in life.

In paragraphs (6) and (7), the author discusses two skills that could help people develop a positive outlook ? meditating and writing positive thoughts in a journal.

Main point: Research and science supports that positive thinking has numerous benefits.

QUESTION 5

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.

Which one of the following most accurately expresses the main idea of the passage?

- A. Some legal scholars defend a morally questionable view that defense lawyers' sole obligation to their clients is to provide the best defense, while it is the court's job to determine guilt or innocence.
- B. Defense lawyers should put aside personal judgments about their clients' guilt when determining how best to proceed when representing a client.
- C. In a democracy, all persons accused of crimes have a right to an attorney who will state the facts, construct sound arguments, and identify flaws in the arguments of opposing counsel.
- D. Lawyers should be mindful of their duty to society as well as to their clients and base the decision as to whether, and how, to defend a client on the facts of the case.
- E. Defense attorneys are obligated to defend clients who request their professional services, especially when the attorney is absolutely convinced of the client's innocence.

Correct Answer: D

The main idea of this passage has to be the answer to the question posed at 1st paragraph, and it's a tossup as to whether that answer is better articulated by last paragraph.

[LSAT-TEST PDF Dumps](#)

[LSAT-TEST Practice Test](#)

[LSAT-TEST Exam Questions](#)