

OFFICIAL COURSE STUDY GUIDE

LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive

Argument analysis drilled deep: every major Logical Reasoning question type and strategy.

TEST PREP · INTERMEDIATE · 7 MODULES · 4 HR 55 MIN

Course by LSAT Demon · Curated and published by MegaCourse

MEGACOURSE.APP

LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive: The Complete Study Guide

2026 Edition

Published by MegaCourse · megacourse.app

Learn Anything. Achieve Everything.

MegaCourse curates the world's best free courses into structured learning paths with study guides, practice material, and certificates. This guide accompanies the MegaCourse course "LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive", taught by LSAT Demon. It is designed to be read alongside the video lessons and to serve as a standalone reference for review.

Study guide text copyright © 2026 MegaCourse. Course video content remains the property of its creators. You may print this guide for personal study. Redistribution or resale is not permitted.

Enroll, track progress, and earn your certificate at
megacourse.app/courses/lsat-logical-reasoning-intensive

Contents

<i>About This Course</i>	4
CHAPTER 1 Logical Reasoning Fundamentals: Section 1	6
CHAPTER 2 Argument Foundations and Question Strategies	11
CHAPTER 3 Section 3: Mastering Argument Structure and Flaws	16
CHAPTER 4 Analyzing Arguments and Common Question Types	21
CHAPTER 5 Mastering Logical Reasoning: Strategy and Structure	29
CHAPTER 6 The Logical Reasoning Field Manual	34
CHAPTER 7 Final Assessment: Logical Reasoning Method	38
<i>Glossary</i>	41
<i>Answer Key</i>	44
<i>Where to Go Next</i>	49

INTRODUCTION

About This Course

Welcome to the official study guide for the LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive. This course offers a comprehensive approach to mastering the Logical Reasoning section of the LSAT. Success on this part of the exam requires precise argument analysis and strategic thinking. This guide, paired with the video lessons, will equip you with the tools to excel.

The LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive is a curated learning path. It features 7 modules and 43 lessons, taught by the experienced instructors at LSAT Demon. We break down every major question type and strategy, ensuring you understand the underlying logic.

MegaCourse enhances the original video series. We add structured reading materials, resource lessons, and a final knowledge-check quiz. This framework provides clear learning outcomes, tracks your progress, and culminates in a shareable certificate of completion. Our method focuses on building accuracy first, then speed, through principled drilling.

Course Facts

FORMAT	7 modules · 43 lessons
VIDEO INSTRUCTION	About 4 hr 55 min
LEVEL	Intermediate
CATEGORY	Test Prep
INSTRUCTOR	LSAT Demon
CERTIFICATE	Included with course completion on MegaCourse
COURSE HOME	megacourse.app/courses/lSAT-logical-reasoning-intensive

What You Will Learn

- Break any argument into conclusion, premises, and assumptions on sight.
- Recognize every major LR question type and its decision rule.
- Spot the classic flaw patterns the test recycles.
- Build accuracy first, then speed, with a principled drilling method.

Who This Course Is For

This course is designed for any student preparing for the LSAT, specifically those aiming to achieve a high score on the Logical Reasoning section. Whether you are encountering these question types for the first time or seeking to refine your existing skills, this intensive program will serve your needs.

You do not need prior experience with the LSAT or formal logic. This course builds Logical Reasoning skills from the ground up. We assume no prior knowledge, only a commitment to learn and practice.

Before You Start

- No prior experience is required.

How to Use This Guide

This printed study guide is your companion to the LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive video course available on megacourse.app. For best results, we recommend a structured approach. Watch the video lessons for each module first. Then, use this guide to reinforce the concepts, work through practice problems, and review key definitions.

Pacing is important for skill development. Consider dedicating a consistent amount of time each day or week to the course material. The course contains 7 modules and 43 lessons, totaling approximately 4 hours and 55 minutes of instruction. Breaking this down into manageable segments will help you absorb the information effectively.

Use the review sections and any provided glossaries in this guide to solidify your understanding. Active recall and consistent practice are crucial for long-term retention and improvement. Do not just read; engage with the material by explaining concepts in your own words and attempting every practice question.

CHAPTER 1

Logical Reasoning Fundamentals: Section 1

This chapter introduces the core principles for success on the LSAT Logical Reasoning section. You will learn to break down arguments into their essential components: conclusions and premises. We will establish a systematic approach to tackling Logical Reasoning questions, emphasizing active reading and critical thinking.

The chapter then details the powerful strategy of prediction and applies it to several common question types, including Strengthen, Evaluate, Disagree, and Paradox questions. Mastering these foundational skills is crucial for building accuracy and efficiency on the LSAT.

Deconstructing Arguments and the Systematic Approach

Covers: Solve Reasoning Questions Like Ben and Nathan · Systematically Solve Questions w/ Robert Collins · How To Find Conclusions

The LSAT Logical Reasoning section tests your ability to understand, analyze, and evaluate arguments. Every question begins with a stimulus, a short passage containing an argument or a set of facts. Your first task is to break down this stimulus into its core components.

Identifying Conclusions and Premises

An argument's conclusion is the main point the author wants to prove. It is the claim supported by other statements in the passage. These supporting statements are called premises. Premises provide reasons or evidence for believing the conclusion.

To find the conclusion, look for indicator words such as "therefore," "thus," "consequently," "so," "clearly," or "it follows that." These words often signal that the statement immediately following is the conclusion. However, conclusions are not always explicitly marked. Sometimes, the conclusion appears at the beginning of the passage, with premises following. Other times, it appears at the end, summarizing the points made. A reliable test is to ask yourself: "What is this author ultimately trying to convince me of?" The answer to that question is the conclusion.

Consider this example: "The new city park is always full of people, and its playground equipment is constantly in use. Also, local businesses near the park have reported a significant increase in sales since its opening. Therefore, the new city park has been a great success for the community." In this argument, "The new city park has been a great success for the community" is the conclusion. The statements about people in the park, playground use, and increased business sales are the premises supporting this conclusion.

The Systematic Approach to Logical Reasoning

LSAT Demon's systematic approach to Logical Reasoning questions involves three critical steps:

1. **Understand the Stimulus:** Read the passage carefully and actively. Identify the conclusion and all supporting premises. If there is no argument, simply understand the facts presented. Do not move on

until you grasp the core message and structure.

2. **Understand the Question:** Read the question stem precisely. What exactly is it asking you to do? Is it asking you to strengthen the argument, identify a flaw, find an assumption, or something else?
3. **Predict the Answer:** Before looking at the answer choices, formulate a prediction of what the correct answer must accomplish. This is perhaps the most crucial step.

This systematic approach ensures you engage with the argument on its own terms before considering external options. It builds accuracy first. Speed naturally follows as you become more adept at each step. Practice breaking down arguments and articulating their conclusions and premises in your own words. This active engagement is far more effective than passively reading.

The Power of Prediction and Strengthening Arguments

Covers: Predicting opens up the LSAT · How To Solve a Strengthen Question

Prediction is the cornerstone of success on the LSAT Logical Reasoning section. It transforms the test from a multiple-choice guessing game into an objective search for a specific piece of information. When you predict, you are actively engaging with the argument and the question, rather than passively reacting to answer choices.

Why Prediction Works

Prediction forces you to fully understand the stimulus and the question stem before you ever look at the options. This prevents you from being misled by tempting but incorrect answer choices. It makes the process objective: you are not trying to "find the best answer" among the choices, but rather "find the answer that matches my prediction." If an answer choice aligns with your prediction, it is likely correct. If it does not, it is likely incorrect. This method significantly reduces the time spent evaluating distractors.

How to Predict

After you have thoroughly understood the argument and the question, pause. Before reading answer choice (A), think about what kind of answer would fulfill the question's requirements. For example, if the question asks you to strengthen an argument, consider what additional information would make the conclusion more likely to be true. If it asks for an assumption, think about what unstated premise is necessary for the conclusion to follow from the stated premises. The more specific your prediction, the better. Even a general idea of the *type* of information needed is better than no prediction at all.

Solving Strengthen Questions

A Strengthen question asks you to identify the answer choice that, if true, would make the argument's conclusion more likely to be true. The correct answer does not need to *prove* the conclusion, only to provide some additional support.

Here is how to approach Strengthen questions:

1. **Identify the Conclusion and Premises:** Clearly understand what the author is trying to prove and the evidence provided.

2. **Identify the Gap:** Often, there is a logical gap or an unstated assumption between the premises and the conclusion. A Strengthen answer will often help bridge this gap.
3. **Predict:** Think of a piece of information that would make the conclusion more secure. This could involve providing new evidence that directly supports the conclusion, ruling out an alternative explanation for the premises, or making an implicit assumption more explicit and true.
4. **Evaluate Answer Choices:** Compare each answer choice to your prediction. Eliminate choices that are irrelevant, weaken the argument, or merely restate a premise. The correct answer will directly bolster the conclusion.

Example: *Argument:* "Our company's new training program focuses on improving communication skills. Therefore, our employees will be more productive." *Question:* Which of the following, if true, most strengthens the argument? *Prediction:* The argument assumes that improved communication skills lead to increased productivity. A good strengthener would confirm this link. *Correct Answer Type:* An answer stating that "employees with better communication skills tend to be more productive" would strongly strengthen the argument by affirming the necessary link.

Common mistakes include choosing an answer that is too weak, out of scope, or simply reiterates information already given in the stimulus. Focus on answers that add *new* information to *support* the conclusion.

Mastering Specific Question Types: Evaluate, Disagree, and Paradox

Covers: Evaluate Questions the Demon Way · How To Solve Disagree Questions · How To Solve Paradox Questions

Beyond general argument analysis, the LSAT features several distinct question types that require specific strategies. While prediction remains central, understanding the unique goal of each type is crucial.

Evaluate Questions

An Evaluate question asks you to identify the piece of information that, if known, would be most helpful in determining the logical validity or soundness of the argument. You are looking for a factor whose presence or absence significantly impacts whether the conclusion follows from the premises.

The "Variance Test" is a powerful tool for these questions:

1. Take an answer choice.
2. Imagine it is true. How does this affect the argument's conclusion?
3. Now imagine it is false (or the opposite is true). How does this affect the argument's conclusion?
4. If the answer choice is correct, the argument's conclusion will be strongly affected in *both* scenarios. If the conclusion is unaffected or only weakly affected, that answer choice is incorrect.

Example: *Argument:* "The new advertising campaign led to a 15% increase in sales last month. Clearly, the campaign was successful." *Question:* Which of the following would be most useful to evaluate the argument? *Variance Test for a potential answer:* "Whether sales typically fluctuate by more than 15% from month to month."

- If sales *do* fluctuate by more than 15% normally, then a 15% increase might not indicate success.

- If sales *do not* fluctuate by more than 15% normally, then a 15% increase strongly indicates success. This answer choice passes the Variance Test. Knowing its truth or falsity significantly changes our assessment of the campaign's success.

Disagree Questions

Disagree questions present two speakers and ask what they disagree about. The correct answer will be a statement that one speaker believes to be true and the other believes to be false.

To solve these:

1. **Identify Each Speaker's Main Point:** Read each speaker's statement and pinpoint their primary conclusion or stance.
2. **Look for Contradiction:** The correct answer will be a statement where Speaker A explicitly or implicitly affirms it, and Speaker B explicitly or implicitly denies it, or vice versa.
3. **Avoid Agreement or Irrelevance:** Eliminate answer choices that both speakers agree on, or statements that only one speaker addresses without the other offering an opinion.

Paradox Questions (Resolve the Discrepancy)

Paradox questions present a set of facts or observations that seem contradictory or surprising. Your task is to find an answer choice that explains how these seemingly conflicting facts can both be true. The correct answer will introduce new information that resolves the apparent inconsistency.

Approach these questions by:

1. **Identify the Paradox:** Clearly state the two (or more) facts that appear to conflict.
2. **Predict a Resolution:** Think about what kind of information could explain how both facts coexist. The explanation must accept both facts as true.
3. **Find the Explanation:** The correct answer will offer a plausible reason for the discrepancy, making the situation understandable. It will not challenge either of the original facts.

Example: *Facts:* "Despite a significant increase in the number of police officers on patrol, the crime rate in the city has risen over the past year." *Question:* Which of the following, if true, best helps to resolve the apparent paradox? *Prediction:* We need something that explains why more police did not lead to less crime. *Correct Answer Type:* An answer stating that "the city also experienced a sharp rise in unemployment, a factor strongly correlated with increased crime" would resolve the paradox by providing an overriding cause for the crime increase, despite increased police presence.

For all these question types, active engagement and a clear understanding of the specific task are paramount. Practice applying the specific strategies to build confidence and accuracy.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Mastering Logical Reasoning begins with accurately identifying an argument's conclusion and supporting premises.
- The systematic approach involves understanding the stimulus, understanding the question, and predicting the answer before reviewing choices.
- Prediction is a critical strategy that makes the LSAT objective and improves both accuracy and speed.
- Strengthen questions require identifying information that makes the argument's conclusion more likely to be true.
- Evaluate questions test your ability to find information that critically impacts the argument's validity, using the Variance Test.
- Disagree questions focus on finding a statement that two speakers explicitly hold opposing views on.
- Paradox questions require an explanation that reconciles two seemingly contradictory facts or observations.

CHECK YOUR UNDERSTANDING

Answer these before moving on. Model answers are in the Answer Key at the back of this guide.

1. What is the primary goal when first reading an LSAT Logical Reasoning stimulus?
2. Explain the "prediction" strategy in the context of LSAT Logical Reasoning. Why is it important?
3. How does the "Variance Test" work for Evaluate questions?
4. What is the objective when solving a Paradox question, and what should the correct answer *not* do?
5. An argument states, "All dogs bark. Fido is a dog. Therefore, Fido barks." Identify the conclusion and the premises.

CHAPTER 2

Argument Foundations and Question Strategies

This chapter builds on foundational logical reasoning skills. We will explore how to identify and analyze assumptions, including the critical distinction between sufficient and necessary assumptions. You will learn to recognize common logical fallacies, particularly those involving causation.

We then move into specific question types, mastering strategies for Flaw and Parallel Reasoning questions. Finally, we establish a robust, five-stage process for approaching any Logical Reasoning question, discussing efficient techniques like prephrasing and understanding question type nuances. This chapter equips you with the tools to dissect arguments and select correct answers with precision.

Identifying Assumptions and Causal Reasoning

Covers: Sufficient and Necessary Assumptions Made Easy | Demon Daily, Ep. 1424 · LSAT Logical Reasoning: Correlation vs. Causation (video, 4 min)

Arguments often rely on unstated information, which we call assumptions. An assumption is an unwritten premise that the arguer takes for granted. Identifying these hidden pieces of the argument is crucial for understanding its validity and spotting potential weaknesses. Logical Reasoning questions frequently test your ability to recognize and evaluate these assumptions.

There are two primary types of assumptions you will encounter: necessary assumptions and sufficient assumptions. A **necessary assumption** is an unstated premise that *must* be true for the argument's conclusion to logically follow from its stated premises. If a necessary assumption is false, the argument immediately breaks down. Think of it as a foundational support; without it, the structure collapses. To test if an assumption is necessary, use the Assumption Negation Technique. Negate the potential assumption. If negating it destroys the argument, making the conclusion no longer follow, then the original assumption was indeed necessary. For example, if an argument concludes, "The library will be quiet today," based on the premise, "All students are taking exams," a necessary assumption is "Taking exams makes students quiet." If students *don't* become quiet for exams, the conclusion fails.

In contrast, a **sufficient assumption** is an unstated premise that, if true, *guarantees* the argument's conclusion. It completely bridges any logical gap between the premises and the conclusion. If you add a sufficient assumption to the premises, the conclusion becomes absolutely certain. Sufficient assumptions often connect a new term in the conclusion back to a term in the premises. Consider the argument: "All dogs are mammals. Therefore, Fido is a mammal." This argument implicitly assumes Fido is a dog. If we state, "Fido is a dog," the conclusion "Fido is a mammal" becomes certain. This statement is a sufficient assumption because it makes the argument airtight. While a sufficient assumption makes an argument valid, it is not necessarily the *only* way to make it valid. There could be other sufficient assumptions.

A common area where assumptions are critical is in arguments involving **causation**. Many arguments mistakenly infer a cause-and-effect relationship from mere correlation. Just because two things happen together or one follows the other does not mean one caused the other. This is a fundamental logical error. For instance, if ice cream sales increase at the same time as drowning incidents, it is a correlation. Assuming ice cream causes drowning is a causal fallacy. The actual cause might be a third factor, like hot weather, which increases both ice cream consumption and swimming.

When analyzing causal arguments, always consider alternative explanations. These include:

- **Alternative Cause:** Something else entirely caused the effect. (Perhaps a new swimming hole opened, not ice cream.)
- **Reversed Causation:** The effect actually caused the supposed cause. (Unlikely for ice cream and drowning, but common in other scenarios.)
- **Third Factor:** A different underlying cause is responsible for both the supposed cause and effect. (Hot weather causes both.)
- **Coincidence:** The two events are unrelated and simply occurred together by chance.

To strengthen a causal argument, you might eliminate alternative causes or show the cause consistently precedes the effect. To weaken it, you would introduce an alternative cause or show the effect occurring without the cause. Practice identifying the specific link an arguer assumes between events. Pay close attention to language that suggests causation, such as "causes," "leads to," "results in," or "is responsible for." Your ability to dissect these relationships will significantly improve your performance on assumption and flaw questions.

Mastering Flaw and Parallel Reasoning Questions

Covers: Solving Flaw Questions | Demon Daily, Ep. 1404 · Achieve Parallel Perfection | Demon Daily, Ep. 1388

After mastering assumption identification, we turn to two other critical question types: Flaw questions and Parallel Reasoning questions. Both require a deep understanding of argument structure and logical validity.

Flaw questions ask you to identify the specific logical error or weakness in the argument presented in the stimulus. Your goal is not to disagree with the conclusion, but to pinpoint *why* the conclusion does not necessarily follow from the premises. To approach these questions, first, read the stimulus carefully. Identify the argument's conclusion and its supporting premises. Then, actively look for the gap between the premises and the conclusion. Ask yourself: What is the arguer taking for granted? What mistake are they making? Prephrase the flaw in your own words before looking at the answer choices. This prevents you from being swayed by attractive but incorrect options.

Common flaw patterns recur frequently on the LSAT. Recognizing these patterns saves time and improves accuracy. Some examples include:

- **Ad Hominem:** Attacking the person making the argument instead of addressing the argument itself.
- **Circular Reasoning:** The conclusion is merely a restatement of one of the premises, offering no independent support.

- **Equivocation:** Using a word or phrase with two or more meanings in a way that makes the argument seem valid when it is not.
- **False Dilemma:** Presenting only two options or outcomes when more possibilities exist.
- **Hasty Generalization:** Drawing a broad conclusion from a sample that is too small, unrepresentative, or atypical.
- **Part-to-Whole / Whole-to-Part:** Illegitimately inferring properties of a whole from its parts, or vice versa.
- **Absence of Evidence is Not Evidence of Absence:** Concluding something does not exist or is not true simply because there is no evidence for it.
- **Percentage vs. Quantity:** Confusing percentages with absolute numbers, or assuming a percentage increase means a quantity increase without knowing the base.
- **Causal Flaws:** As discussed previously, incorrectly inferring causation from correlation.

Practice identifying these flaws by categorizing them as you encounter them. This systematic approach will sharpen your ability to spot errors quickly.

Parallel Reasoning questions require you to find the answer choice that has the same logical structure as the argument in the stimulus. This means you are looking for an argument that commits the same type of error (if the stimulus is flawed) or follows the same valid reasoning pattern. The specific topic or content of the argument is irrelevant; only the logical form matters.

To achieve parallel perfection, follow these steps:

1. **Analyze the Stimulus Argument:** Break it down into its core components: premises, conclusion, and any logical operators (e.g., "if...then," "all," "some," "none"). Note the certainty level of the conclusion (e.g., "must be true," "probably true," "could be true").
2. **Identify the Argument's Validity or Flaw:** Determine if the argument is logically sound or if it contains a specific flaw. If it is flawed, precisely identify the nature of that flaw.
3. **Abstract the Structure:** Mentally or quickly jot down a simplified representation of the argument's form. For example, "All A are B. C is B. Therefore, C is A" (a classic invalid form).
4. **Match the Structure:** Systematically evaluate each answer choice, looking for an argument that exhibits the identical structural pattern, including the number of premises, the type of conclusion, and the presence of any flaws. The certainty level of the conclusion is particularly important to match.

A common mistake is to match arguments based on their subject matter or the superficial appearance of words. Always prioritize the underlying logical form. For instance, if the stimulus argument moves from "some" to "all," look for an answer choice that makes a similar unwarranted leap in scope. With consistent practice, abstracting argument structures will become second nature, allowing you to quickly eliminate choices that do not fit.

Strategic Approaches to Logical Reasoning

Covers: The Five Stages of Answering a Logical Reasoning Question (video, 13 min) · LSAT Logical Reasoning: Closed vs. Open Question Types (video, 7 min) · LSAT Logical Reasoning: Don't Diagram (video, 11 min) · LSAT Logical Reasoning: How to Answer

"Except" Questions (video, 7 min)

Having explored specific argument types and question categories, we now turn to overarching strategies for tackling Logical Reasoning questions effectively. A consistent, disciplined approach is key to building both accuracy and speed.

The LSAT Demon method advocates a **five-stage process** for every Logical Reasoning question:

1. **Read the Question Stem First:** Before you even look at the argument, read the question. This tells you what kind of task you need to perform (e.g., strengthen, weaken, identify flaw, infer). Knowing the task upfront helps you read the stimulus with purpose.
2. **Read the Stimulus:** With the question in mind, read the argument carefully. Your goal is to understand the argument's core message, not just to skim for keywords. Pay attention to the relationships between ideas.
3. **Identify Conclusion, Premises, and Assumptions:** Break down the argument. Clearly distinguish the main conclusion from the premises that support it. Actively look for unstated assumptions the arguer is making. This stage is where you truly analyze the logic.
4. **Prephrase an Answer:** Based on your analysis and the question stem, formulate what you expect the correct answer to say or do. This is a critical step. For a "strengthen" question, think of a statement that would make the conclusion more likely. For a "flaw" question, describe the logical error. Prephrasing guides your evaluation of the answer choices and prevents you from being misled.
5. **Evaluate Answer Choices:** Compare each answer choice to your prephrase and the argument. Eliminate choices that are clearly wrong, irrelevant, or do the opposite of what the question asks. The correct answer will align closely with your prephrase and directly address the question's task.

Understanding question types also involves recognizing the difference between **closed and open question types**. Closed questions have a very specific task, where a clear prephrase is often possible. Examples include Strengthen, Weaken, Assumption, Flaw, and Sufficient Assumption questions. The correct answer will precisely fulfill the stated condition. Open questions, conversely, are less constrained. These include "Must Be True" (inference) or "Which of the following is most strongly supported?" questions. For open questions, your prephrase might be less specific, and you will need to carefully evaluate each answer choice against the stimulus to see which one is definitively supported or inferred.

A common pitfall for many students is the temptation to **diagram** every argument. While formal logic diagrams can be useful for very specific, highly conditional arguments, they are generally inefficient and unnecessary for the vast majority of LSAT Logical Reasoning questions. The time spent drawing complex symbols is better spent on careful reading, deep comprehension, and effective prephrasing. Most arguments can be understood and analyzed in plain English. Over-reliance on diagramming can actually obscure the meaning and lead to errors, especially when arguments involve nuanced language rather than strict conditional statements. Focus on understanding the *meaning* of the argument, not just its symbolic representation.

Finally, you will encounter **"Except" questions**. These questions ask you to identify the *one* answer choice that *does not* fit a given criterion, while the other four *do*. For example, "Which of the following, if true, would strengthen the argument, EXCEPT?" The strategy here is to identify the four answers that *do* fit the criterion (in this case, strengthen the argument). The remaining answer, the outlier, will be your

correct choice. It might weaken the argument, be irrelevant, or simply fail to strengthen it. Approach these questions by systematically testing each choice against the stated condition, looking for the one that breaks the pattern. This methodical approach prevents confusion and ensures you select the correct exception.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Necessary assumptions must be true for the argument to hold, while sufficient assumptions guarantee the conclusion if true.
- The Assumption Negation Technique is a powerful tool for testing necessary assumptions.
- Correlation alone does not prove causation; always consider alternative explanations for causal claims.
- Flaw questions require you to identify the specific logical error in an argument.
- Parallel Reasoning questions demand matching the logical structure and certainty of an argument, not its topic.
- Following a five-stage process (read question, read stimulus, analyze, prephrase, evaluate) maximizes accuracy on Logical Reasoning.
- Avoid complex diagramming; focus on understanding arguments in clear, plain language.
- "Except" questions require identifying the single answer choice that *does not* fulfill the stated condition.

CHECK YOUR UNDERSTANDING

Answer these before moving on. Model answers are in the Answer Key at the back of this guide.

1. What is the primary difference between a necessary assumption and a sufficient assumption?
2. How can you effectively test whether an assumption is truly necessary for an argument?
3. When encountering an argument that claims causation based on correlation, what common alternative explanations should you consider?
4. Describe the core task in a Parallel Reasoning question and what elements you should focus on matching.
5. Outline the five stages of answering a Logical Reasoning question. Why is prephrasing a critical step?
6. Explain why excessive diagramming is often discouraged for LSAT Logical Reasoning questions.

CHAPTER 3

Section 3: Mastering Argument Structure and Flaws

Chapter 3 of your LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive study guide focuses on the foundational skills necessary for dissecting and understanding arguments. You will learn to precisely identify the core components of any argument: its conclusion and the premises offered in support. This ability is not merely academic; it is the bedrock for accurately answering every Logical Reasoning question type.

Building on this foundation, this chapter then introduces strategic approaches to argument analysis. You will learn the critical skill of predicting answer characteristics before examining the choices, significantly improving your efficiency and accuracy. We will also cover how to assess arguments for their logical soundness and identify common reasoning errors, including the frequently tested flaw of mistaking correlation for causation. Mastering these techniques will sharpen your analytical abilities and prepare you for the challenges of the LSAT.

Identifying the Argument's Core: Conclusions and Premises

Covers: LSAT Logical Reasoning: Three Ways to Find the Conclusion of an Argument · Common Wrong Answers on Conclusion Questions | LSAT Logical Reasoning

The first and most crucial step in analyzing any LSAT Logical Reasoning argument is to accurately identify its conclusion. The conclusion is the main point the author is trying to prove or convince you of. All other statements in the argument are typically premises, which are the pieces of evidence, facts, or reasons given to support that conclusion. Without correctly identifying the conclusion, you cannot properly assess the argument's structure or flaws.

There are three primary methods to reliably find an argument's conclusion:

1. **Indicator Words:** Many conclusions are signaled by specific words or phrases. Common conclusion indicators include: 'therefore,' 'thus,' 'consequently,' 'so,' 'it follows that,' 'as a result,' 'hence,' 'concludes that,' 'shows that,' and 'proves that.' Conversely, premise indicators like 'because,' 'since,' 'for,' 'given that,' and 'in light of' signal supporting statements. For example, in the argument, 'All birds have feathers. This animal has feathers. Therefore, this animal is a bird,' the word 'therefore' clearly signals 'this animal is a bird' as the conclusion.
2. **The 'Why Test':** This method involves asking 'Why?' about each statement in the argument. The statement that answers 'Why?' for another statement is a premise supporting that other statement. The true conclusion is the one statement that is supported by other statements but does not itself support any other statement within the argument. Consider this argument: 'The new bridge is unsafe. It was built with substandard materials. Also, the construction crew lacked proper training.'
- Ask: 'Why is the new bridge unsafe?' Answer: 'It was built with substandard materials' and 'the construction crew lacked proper training.' This indicates 'The new bridge is unsafe' is the conclusion.

- Ask: 'Why was it built with substandard materials?' No answer in the argument.
 - Ask: 'Why did the construction crew lack proper training?' No answer in the argument. This confirms 'The new bridge is unsafe' as the main conclusion.
3. **The Main Point Test:** For more complex arguments, or when indicator words are absent, ask yourself, 'If I had to summarize this argument in a single sentence, what would it be?' That summary is often the conclusion. This test helps you cut through extraneous detail and focus on the author's ultimate claim.

It is important to remember that the conclusion is not always the last sentence. LSAT arguments frequently place the conclusion at the beginning or in the middle of the passage.

When faced with questions specifically asking you to identify the conclusion, be wary of common wrong answer choices. These often include:

- **A Premise:** A statement that supports the conclusion but is not the main point itself.
- **A Counter-Premise:** An opposing viewpoint or piece of evidence that the author presents only to refute or acknowledge, not to endorse as their own main claim.
- **A Sub-Conclusion:** A conclusion drawn from a subset of premises, but which then serves as a premise for the overall main conclusion. It is a stepping stone, not the final destination.
- **Information Outside the Scope:** Details or claims not actually present in the argument.

Practice consistently distinguishing between these elements. Your accuracy on the LSAT hinges on this fundamental skill.

Strategic Argument Analysis: Prediction and Assessment

Covers: Specific and General Predictions · Predicting Answers in LSAT Logical Reasoning · Assessing Arguments in LSAT Logical Reasoning · Your #1 Goal on LSAT Logical Reasoning

Your number one goal on LSAT Logical Reasoning is to identify the single correct answer choice and understand precisely why it is correct, while also understanding why all other choices are definitively incorrect. A powerful strategy to achieve this is prediction. Predicting the answer *before* you look at the answer choices helps you to avoid common distractors, focus your attention, and approach the choices with a clear objective.

Prediction involves anticipating the characteristics or content of the correct answer. There are two main types of predictions:

1. **General Prediction:** For many question types, you can predict the *type* of answer needed. For example, on a 'Strengthen the Argument' question, you might predict, 'The answer will provide new information that makes the conclusion more likely given the premises.' For a 'Weaken the Argument' question, you might predict, 'The answer will introduce a factor that undermines the link between the premises and the conclusion.' This general understanding helps you categorize and quickly dismiss irrelevant answer choices.

2. Specific Prediction: For some question types, particularly 'Must Be True,' 'Main Point,' or 'Fill-in-the-Blank,' you can often predict the *exact content* of the correct answer. If an argument states, 'All A are B, and all B are C,' you can specifically predict that a 'Must Be True' answer will be 'All A are C.' The more specific your prediction, the faster and more confidently you can select the correct option.

Developing the habit of prediction requires a systematic approach to assessing arguments. After identifying the conclusion and premises, you must critically evaluate the argument's structure. This assessment involves:

- **Identifying the Conclusion:** What is the author ultimately trying to prove?
- **Identifying the Premises:** What evidence or reasons are provided to support that conclusion?
- **Identifying the Gap (Assumption):** What unstated belief, connection, or piece of information does the author rely on to get from the premises to the conclusion? This is often the most critical step, as many Logical Reasoning questions revolve around these unstated assumptions. For instance, if an argument concludes, 'We should invest in solar energy,' based on the premise, 'Solar energy is environmentally friendly,' the unstated assumption is that being environmentally friendly is a sufficient reason for investment.

Consider an argument: 'Our company's sales decreased last quarter. Therefore, our advertising campaign was ineffective.'

- Conclusion: The advertising campaign was ineffective.
- Premise: Company sales decreased last quarter.
- Gap/Assumption: The decrease in sales was *caused by* or *directly related to* the advertising campaign, and no other factors were responsible.

If the question asks to weaken this argument, your general prediction is, 'The answer will suggest another reason for the sales decrease, or show that the campaign was not ineffective.' A specific prediction might be, 'The answer will state that a major competitor launched a new product, drawing away customers.'

By consistently practicing argument assessment and prediction, you train your mind to actively engage with the logic of the passage, rather than passively reading and then searching for an answer. This proactive approach is fundamental to building both accuracy and speed on the LSAT.

Uncovering Argument Flaws: Correlation, Causation, and Beyond

Covers: Correlation vs. Causation | LSAT Logical Reasoning · Finding Flaws in the Argument on LSAT Logical Reasoning

A flaw in an argument is a weakness in its reasoning that prevents the conclusion from necessarily following from the premises. It is a logical error or an unjustified leap that the author makes. Identifying flaws is central to many Logical Reasoning question types, including 'Flaw in the Reasoning,' 'Weaken,' and 'Assumption' questions.

One of the most common and frequently tested flaws on the LSAT is mistaking **correlation for causation**.

- **Correlation** means that two events or phenomena tend to occur together or are statistically related. For example, 'Ice cream sales increase in the summer, and drowning incidents also increase in the summer.' These two events are correlated.
- **Causation** means that one event directly brings about another event. For example, 'Smoking causes lung cancer.'

The flaw occurs when an argument observes a correlation and then incorrectly concludes that one event *causes* the other. Just because two things happen at the same time or show a similar trend does not mean one is the direct cause of the other. There are several alternative explanations for a correlation when causation is falsely inferred:

1. **Reverse Causation:** Perhaps the assumed effect is actually the cause. For example, if an argument states, 'People who exercise regularly are happier; therefore, exercise causes happiness,' it could be that happier people are simply more inclined to exercise.
2. **Common Cause:** A third, unstated factor might be causing both correlated events. In the ice cream and drowning example, hot weather is a common cause for both increased ice cream consumption and increased swimming (which leads to more drownings), rather than ice cream causing drowning.
3. **Coincidence:** The correlation might be purely random, with no underlying causal link whatsoever.

When an argument presents a correlation and concludes causation, you should immediately consider these alternative explanations as potential flaws. The argument has not ruled out these other possibilities.

Finding flaws in arguments generally involves a systematic approach:

1. **Isolate Conclusion and Premises:** Clearly understand what the author is trying to prove and what evidence is provided.
2. **Identify the Assumption (Gap):** What unstated belief or connection is the author making to bridge the gap between the premises and the conclusion? The flaw often lies in the unreasonableness or lack of support for this assumption.
3. **Look for Disconnects:** Does the conclusion introduce new terms or concepts that are not fully supported or even mentioned in the premises? Is the scope of the conclusion broader than what the evidence allows? For example, moving from 'some' to 'all,' or from a specific instance to a general rule, without justification.
4. **Consider Alternative Explanations:** As with causal arguments, think about other ways the premises could be true without the conclusion necessarily being true. Are there other factors that could explain the observations?

An argument's flaw is always about the relationship between its premises and its conclusion. It is not about disagreeing with the premises themselves or introducing outside information. It is about the logical path the author takes from their evidence to their final claim. Practice articulating the specific logical error in your own words before looking at answer choices. This precise identification of the flaw is key to selecting the correct answer.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Identifying the conclusion is the first and most critical step in analyzing any LSAT Logical Reasoning argument.
- Conclusions are the main point, supported by premises, and can be found using indicator words, the 'Why Test,' or the main point test.
- Predicting the answer before reviewing choices helps to focus your attention and avoid common distractors.
- Arguments often rely on unstated assumptions, which are key to identifying strengths, weaknesses, or flaws.
- A common logical error is mistaking a correlation between two events for a direct causal relationship.
- The primary goal on LSAT Logical Reasoning is to accurately identify the correct answer and understand why all other options are incorrect.

CHECK YOUR UNDERSTANDING

Answer these before moving on. Model answers are in the Answer Key at the back of this guide.

1. What are the three primary methods for identifying the conclusion of an argument?
2. Why is predicting an answer important in LSAT Logical Reasoning?
3. Explain the difference between a general prediction and a specific prediction.
4. What is the 'correlation vs. causation' flaw, and why is it a common error?
5. What is your number one goal when approaching LSAT Logical Reasoning questions?

CHAPTER 4

Analyzing Arguments and Common Question Types

Chapter 4 builds on your foundational understanding of arguments by focusing on how to effectively break them down and recognize key patterns. We begin by sharpening your ability to identify the core components of any argument: the conclusion, premises, and unstated assumptions. This chapter then introduces you to two of the most frequently tested logical flaws on the LSAT, equipping you to spot weaknesses in reasoning. Finally, we introduce you to three distinct and common Logical Reasoning question types: Parallel Reasoning, Point of Disagreement, and Resolve the Paradox. Mastering the specific strategies for these question types is crucial for building both accuracy and efficiency.

Identifying Conclusions and Core Reasoning

Covers: Conclusion Indicators on the LSAT · Intro to Reasoning Questions | LSAT Logical Reasoning · Do the LSAT the Easy Way | LSAT Logical Reasoning

This section focuses on the fundamental components of any argument: the conclusion, the premises, and the underlying assumptions. To effectively analyze an argument, you must first precisely identify these parts. The LSAT tests your ability to do this quickly and accurately.

The **conclusion** is the main point the author is trying to prove. It is the statement for which all other statements in the argument are offered as support. Recognizing the conclusion is the single most important step in Logical Reasoning. Without it, you cannot understand the argument's purpose or evaluate its validity.

Many arguments include **conclusion indicator words**. These words signal that the statement immediately following them is the conclusion. Common indicators include:

- therefore
- thus
- so
- consequently
- hence
- it follows that
- shows that
- indicates that
- for this reason
- must be

- should be

However, not all arguments use these explicit indicators. In such cases, you must ask yourself, 'What is the author trying to convince me of?' or 'What is the main takeaway?' The conclusion is often a judgment, a recommendation, or a prediction. It is the statement that is being supported, not the statements doing the supporting.

The statements that provide reasons or evidence for the conclusion are called **premises**. Premises are the facts, claims, or data points the author uses to build their case. They are taken as given within the context of the argument. You do not need to agree with a premise to accept it as part of the author's argument. Your job is to analyze how well the premises support the conclusion.

An **assumption** is an unstated premise. It is a necessary piece of information that the argument relies on but does not explicitly state. If an assumption were false, the conclusion would likely fall apart. We will explore assumptions in greater detail in later modules. For now, focus on identifying the stated premises and the conclusion.

To approach LSAT Logical Reasoning questions the 'easy way,' focus on clarity. Do not rush. First, read the stimulus for understanding. Identify the conclusion. Then, identify the premises. Simplify the argument in your mind. Ask: 'What is the author trying to prove, and why?' This analytical approach, rather than speed reading, builds accuracy. Accuracy must precede speed.

Consider this example: 'All birds have feathers. My pet is a bird. Therefore, my pet has feathers.'

- **Conclusion:** 'My pet has feathers.' (Signaled by 'Therefore')
- **Premises:** 'All birds have feathers.' and 'My pet is a bird.'

Here is another example without an explicit indicator: 'The new vaccine significantly reduces the severity of illness. We should recommend it to all at-risk individuals.'

- **Conclusion:** 'We should recommend it to all at-risk individuals.' (This is the recommendation the author is trying to establish.)
- **Premise:** 'The new vaccine significantly reduces the severity of illness.'

Practice identifying these core components in every argument you encounter. Start with short, simple arguments. Gradually move to more complex ones. This foundational skill is critical for all other Logical Reasoning question types.

LSAT Logical Reasoning's Two Most Common Flaws

Covers: LSAT Logical Reasoning's Two Most Common Flaws

Many LSAT Logical Reasoning questions require you to identify flaws in an argument. Understanding common patterns of faulty reasoning is essential. While there are many types of logical fallacies, two appear with exceptional frequency: errors in conditional reasoning and errors in causal reasoning. Mastering these will significantly improve your ability to spot weaknesses in arguments.

Errors in Conditional Reasoning

Conditional statements connect two ideas, often using 'if...then' language. For example, 'If it rains (R), then the ground gets wet (W).' This can be diagrammed as $R - W$. A valid inference from $R - W$ is the contrapositive: If the ground does not get wet (not W), then it did not rain (not R). Diagrammed as $\neg W - \neg R$.

The LSAT frequently tests two common errors related to conditional statements:

1. **Mistaken Reversal:** This error assumes that if the sufficient condition leads to the necessary condition, then the necessary condition must also lead to the sufficient condition.
 - Argument: If it rains, the ground gets wet. The ground is wet. Therefore, it must have rained.
 - Diagram: $R - W$. W . Conclusion: R .
 - Flaw: The ground could be wet for other reasons (e.g., someone watered it). The argument incorrectly reverses the original statement. It assumes $W - R$ based on $R - W$.
2. **Mistaken Negation:** This error assumes that if the sufficient condition does not occur, then the necessary condition cannot occur either.
 - Argument: If it rains, the ground gets wet. It did not rain. Therefore, the ground is not wet.
 - Diagram: $R - W$. $\neg R$. Conclusion: $\neg W$.
 - Flaw: Even if it did not rain, the ground could still get wet (e.g., from a sprinkler). The argument incorrectly negates both parts of the statement. It assumes $\neg R - \neg W$ based on $R - W$.

Always remember: $R - W$ only guarantees $\neg W - \neg R$. It does not guarantee $W - R$ or $\neg R - \neg W$.

Errors in Causal Reasoning

Causal arguments claim that one event or factor is the cause of another. The LSAT frequently presents arguments that confuse correlation with causation. Just because two events occur together, or one follows the other, does not mean one caused the other.

Common causal flaws include:

1. **Confusing Cause and Effect:** The argument correctly identifies a relationship but reverses the direction of causation.
 - Argument: People who exercise regularly are generally happier. Therefore, exercising makes people happier.
 - Flaw: It is possible that happier people are more inclined to exercise, rather than exercise causing happiness.
2. **Ignoring a Common Cause:** The argument concludes that A causes B, when in fact both A and B are caused by a third factor, C.
 - Argument: Ice cream sales increase. Drowning incidents increase. Therefore, ice cream sales cause drowning.

- **Flaw:** Both are likely caused by a common factor, warm weather, which increases both ice cream consumption and swimming.

3. **Ignoring Alternative Causes:** The argument concludes that A is the *only* cause of B, without considering other potential causes.

- **Argument:** Since the new traffic light was installed, accidents at the intersection have decreased. Clearly, the traffic light is responsible for the reduction in accidents.
- **Flaw:** Perhaps new speed bumps were also installed, or a public safety campaign began simultaneously. Other factors could be at play.

To identify causal flaws, look for arguments that state or imply a cause-and-effect relationship based solely on correlation, temporal sequence (one event following another), or a lack of other explanations. Always consider whether an alternative cause, a reversed cause and effect, or a common cause could explain the observed relationship.

Practice with these flaw types involves carefully breaking down arguments. Identify the conclusion and premises. Then, ask whether the conclusion logically follows from the premises, or if there is a gap in reasoning. Specifically look for conditional statements and causal claims.

How to Approach Parallel Questions

Covers: How to Approach Parallel Questions | LSAT Logical Reasoning · Intro to Parallel Questions | LSAT Logical Reasoning

Parallel Reasoning questions require you to find an answer choice that has the same logical structure or the same flaw as the argument presented in the stimulus. These questions do not ask you to evaluate the argument's soundness. Instead, they test your ability to abstract the argument's form from its content. The specific topic or subject matter of the argument is irrelevant.

Strategy for Parallel Questions

1. **Isolate the Conclusion and Premises:** Start by clearly identifying the conclusion and all premises in the stimulus argument. This is the first step for nearly all Logical Reasoning questions.
2. **Identify the Argument's Type and Structure:**
 - **Deductive vs. Inductive:** Does the conclusion necessarily follow from the premises (deductive), or does it merely probably follow (inductive)?
 - **Conditional Reasoning:** If 'if...then' statements are present, diagram them. Pay attention to valid inferences (contrapositive) versus common flaws (mistaken reversal, mistaken negation).
 - **Causal Reasoning:** Is the argument making a cause-and-effect claim? Is it flawed by confusing correlation with causation?
 - **Analogy:** Does the argument draw a comparison between two things?
 - **Generalization:** Does it move from specific observations to a general rule?
 - **Strength of Conclusion:** Note the certainty level of the conclusion. Does it use words like 'must,' 'certainly,' 'always,' or softer terms like 'likely,' 'probably,' 'may,' 'could'?

3. **Identify Any Flaws:** If the stimulus argument is flawed, you must identify the specific nature of that flaw. The correct answer choice will contain an argument with an identical flaw. For example, if the stimulus commits a mistaken reversal, the answer choice must also commit a mistaken reversal.
4. **Pre-phrase the Structure:** Before looking at the answer choices, try to articulate the argument's structure or flaw in abstract terms. For instance, 'The argument concludes X based on Y, ignoring Z.' Or, 'It makes a conditional error of mistaken reversal.'
5. **Evaluate Answer Choices Systematically:**
 - **Match Conclusion Type and Strength:** The conclusion in the answer choice must be of the same type and have the same degree of certainty as the stimulus. If the stimulus concludes 'X must be true,' eliminate answers that conclude 'X might be true.'
 - **Match Number of Premises:** Typically, the number of premises should match.
 - **Match Logical Operators:** Pay attention to words like 'all,' 'some,' 'none,' 'if...then,' 'either...or.' These are crucial for structural matching.
 - **Ignore Content:** Actively disregard the subject matter. A correct answer might discuss astrophysics while the stimulus discusses gardening, as long as the logical form is identical.

Consider this example: 'All dogs are mammals. My cat is not a dog. Therefore, my cat is not a mammal.'

- **Structure Analysis:**
- Premise 1: All D are M (D - M)
- Premise 2: Not D ($\neg$ D)
- Conclusion: Not M ($\neg$ M)
- **Flaw:** This is a Mistaken Negation. From D - M, we cannot conclude $\neg$ D - $\neg$ M.

A parallel answer choice would have the same flawed structure: 'All cars have wheels. My bicycle is not a car. Therefore, my bicycle does not have wheels.'

- Premise 1: All C are W (C - W)
- Premise 2: Not C ($\neg$ C)
- Conclusion: Not W ($\neg$ W) This argument exhibits the identical flaw of mistaken negation.

Practice involves stripping arguments down to their bare logical bones. Use symbols or simple placeholders (e.g., A, B, C) to represent the components of the argument. This helps you focus purely on the relationships between statements.

Intro to Disagree Questions and Paradox Questions

Covers: Intro to Disagree Questions | LSAT Logical Reasoning · Intro to Paradox Questions | LSAT Logical Reasoning

This section introduces two distinct but common Logical Reasoning question types: Point of Disagreement questions and Resolve the Paradox questions. Each requires a specific approach to identify the correct answer.

Point of Disagreement Questions

These questions present a short dialogue between two speakers. Your task is to identify a statement about which the two speakers explicitly disagree. For an answer choice to be correct, one speaker must affirm the statement, and the other speaker must deny it, or at least have a position that directly contradicts it.

Strategy for Point of Disagreement Questions:

1. **Read Speaker 1's Argument:** Understand their main conclusion or stance on the issue. Identify any key premises they use.
2. **Read Speaker 2's Argument:** Understand their main conclusion or stance. Pay close attention to how their view relates to Speaker 1's. Do they agree, disagree, or discuss something entirely different?
3. **Identify the Point of Contention:** Look for a specific statement or claim where their opinions clash. It must be a point where one speaker would say 'yes, that is true' and the other would say 'no, that is false.'
4. **Evaluate Answer Choices:**
 - Eliminate choices where both speakers agree.
 - Eliminate choices where one speaker expresses an opinion, but the other speaker does not mention the topic at all, or their stance is unknown.
 - The correct answer will be a statement that both speakers address, and on which they hold opposing views.

Example: **Speaker 1:** 'The city should invest more in public transportation. Studies show that increased public transport use leads to a significant reduction in traffic congestion.' **Speaker 2:** 'While reducing traffic congestion is a worthy goal, public transportation is far too expensive. The city's budget cannot support such a large expenditure.'

- **Point of Disagreement:** Do they disagree on whether public transportation reduces congestion? No, Speaker 2 implicitly accepts the premise. Do they disagree on whether the city *should* invest? Yes, Speaker 1 says 'should,' Speaker 2 says 'cannot support.'
- The disagreement is about the financial feasibility of the investment, or whether the city *should* make the investment given the cost.

Resolve the Paradox Questions

Paradox questions present a set of seemingly contradictory facts or a surprising situation. Your goal is to find an answer choice that, if true, explains how both facts can be true simultaneously, or how the surprising situation makes sense. The correct answer will resolve the apparent discrepancy.

Strategy for Resolve the Paradox Questions:

1. **Identify the Paradox:** Clearly pinpoint the two (or more) facts that seem to contradict each other, or the surprising outcome that needs explanation. What is the puzzling situation?
2. **Look for a Bridge:** The correct answer will introduce new information that acts as a bridge between the seemingly incompatible facts. It will show how both can coexist.

3. Do Not Explain Away: The answer should not deny one of the facts. Both facts in the stimulus must be accepted as true. The answer simply provides a reason for their coexistence.

4. Evaluate Answer Choices:

- Eliminate choices that worsen the paradox.
- Eliminate choices that are irrelevant to the paradox.
- Eliminate choices that only explain one side of the paradox but not how it relates to the other.
- The correct answer provides a plausible explanation that makes the contradictory facts consistent.

Example: 'Despite recent efforts to promote healthy eating in schools, the average weight of students has continued to increase.'

- **Paradox:** Efforts to promote healthy eating (expected to decrease weight) coincide with increasing student weight.
- **Possible Resolution:** Perhaps the students consume significantly more unhealthy food outside of school, or the 'healthy eating' efforts are poorly implemented and ineffective.

An answer choice like, 'Many students compensate for healthier school lunches by eating larger, unhealthier dinners at home,' would resolve the paradox. It explains why weight is still increasing despite school efforts.

Practice these question types by first correctly identifying them. Then, apply the specific strategy for each. Disagree questions require comparing two viewpoints, while Paradox questions require explaining a puzzling situation.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Always identify the conclusion first, as it is the main point the author seeks to prove, supported by premises and unstated assumptions.
- Recognize common conditional reasoning flaws, such as Mistaken Reversal and Mistaken Negation.
- Be alert for causal flaws, particularly confusing correlation with causation or ignoring alternative causes.
- For Parallel Reasoning questions, focus on matching the argument's logical structure or flaw, ignoring its specific content.
- In Point of Disagreement questions, find the precise statement where one speaker affirms and the other denies.
- Resolve the Paradox questions by finding information that makes seemingly contradictory facts consistent without denying either.

CHECK YOUR UNDERSTANDING

Answer these before moving on. Model answers are in the Answer Key at the back of this guide.

1. What is the primary difference between a premise and a conclusion in an argument?
2. Describe one common flaw in conditional reasoning and provide a brief example.
3. Explain the core error in confusing correlation with causation.
4. When approaching a Parallel Reasoning question, what is the most important aspect to match between the stimulus and the correct answer choice?
5. What must be true of the correct answer in a Point of Disagreement question?
6. What is the objective of a Resolve the Paradox question?

CHAPTER 5

Mastering Logical Reasoning: Strategy and Structure

This chapter focuses on fundamental strategies for the LSAT Logical Reasoning section. It covers essential mindset principles, effective argument deconstruction techniques, and smart approaches to question types and answer choices. You will learn to engage with every question, read actively, predict answers, identify assumptions, and refine your practice methods for optimal improvement.

Core Principles for Logical Reasoning Success

Covers: LSAT Logical Reasoning | Don't Skip Questions (video, 1 min) · The Entire LSAT Is a Test of Reading Comprehension (video, 2 min) · Reviewing Specifically, Improving on the LSAT and in Life (video, 3 min)

This section lays the groundwork for a successful approach to the LSAT Logical Reasoning section. Many students approach LR with misconceptions about time management or the nature of the test itself. We address these directly, emphasizing the importance of engagement, active reading, and a structured review process.

First, consider the instruction to **not skip questions**. On the LSAT, there is no penalty for incorrect answers. This means you should always answer every question, even if it requires a guess. Skipping a question entirely is a missed opportunity for a correct answer. Instead of skipping, develop a strategy for questions that initially seem difficult. For example, if a question feels overwhelming, make a quick, educated guess and mark it for review if you have time. The goal is to maximize your chances on every item. This approach ensures you never leave points on the table.

Next, understand that **the entire LSAT is a test of reading comprehension**. This principle is paramount for Logical Reasoning. Many errors do not stem from a failure of logic, but from a failure to fully and accurately understand the argument presented. Every word matters. Pay close attention to qualifiers (for example, "some," "most," "all," "only"), modal verbs (for example, "must," "may," "could"), and conjunctions (for example, "however," "therefore," "because"). Active reading involves more than just passively absorbing information. It means identifying the conclusion, the premises that support it, and any counterarguments or background information. You should be able to articulate the argument in your own words before moving to the answer choices. If you struggle with a question, reread the stimulus carefully. Often, the solution lies in a more precise understanding of the text.

Finally, effective **reviewing specifically** is crucial for improvement, both on the LSAT and in life. Do not just check your answers. A superficial review might tell you *what* you got wrong, but not *why*. A specific review process involves several steps:

1. **Identify the question:** What was the question type? What was its decision rule?
2. **Re-read the stimulus:** Did you fully understand the argument? Were there any nuances you missed?

3. **Analyze your initial thought process:** Why did you choose your answer? What led you astray?
4. **Analyze the correct answer:** Why is it correct? How does it perfectly fit the decision rule?
5. **Analyze the incorrect answers:** Why are the tempting wrong answers incorrect? What traps did they set?
6. **Articulate the lesson:** What specific concept or strategy did you fail to apply correctly? How will you approach similar questions differently next time? This detailed review helps you identify patterns in your mistakes and build a robust understanding of the underlying logic. It transforms errors into powerful learning opportunities. This deliberate practice is far more effective than simply doing more questions without reflection.

Deconstructing Arguments and Predicting Answers

Covers: LSAT Logical Reasoning | Spotting Assumptions in the Argument (video, 1 min) · How to Predict Answers in Logical Reasoning | LSAT (video, 2 min)

To consistently select the correct answer in Logical Reasoning, you must first master the art of argument deconstruction and then use that understanding to predict the answer before examining the choices. This section focuses on these two critical skills.

A fundamental step in argument deconstruction is **spotting assumptions in the argument**. An assumption is an unstated premise that *must be true* for the conclusion to logically follow from the stated premises. It bridges the gap between the evidence provided and the claim made. Assumptions are not merely facts that *could* be true; they are necessary conditions. To find an assumption, ask yourself: "What unstated piece of information *must* be true for the author's conclusion to hold, given their premises?"

There are several techniques to identify assumptions:

- **Look for gaps:** Does the conclusion introduce new terms or concepts not present in the premises? The assumption often connects these new elements back to the premises.
- **Negation Technique:** This is a powerful tool. Take a potential assumption and negate it (make it false). If the conclusion can no longer logically follow from the premises when the assumption is negated, then you have found a necessary assumption.
- *Example:*
 - Premise: All dogs bark.
 - Conclusion: Fido is a dog, so Fido barks.
 - Obvious Assumption: Fido is a dog. (If Fido is *not* a dog, the conclusion fails.)
 - More subtle Example:
 - Premise: Our new marketing campaign increased brand awareness by 15%.
 - Conclusion: Therefore, the campaign was successful.
 - Potential Assumption: Increased brand awareness is a measure of success.
 - Negate: Increased brand awareness is *not* a measure of success.

- If the assumption is false, the conclusion ("campaign was successful") no longer holds. This confirms it is a necessary assumption.

Once you have thoroughly deconstructed the argument and identified its core components (conclusion, premises, and especially assumptions), you are ready to **predict answers in Logical Reasoning**. Predicting is not guessing. It is forming a precise idea of what the correct answer *must* look like, based on your understanding of the argument and the question type. This skill is a hallmark of high scorers.

Here is how to predict effectively:

1. **Read the stimulus carefully:** Identify the conclusion, premises, and any assumptions. Understand the argument's structure and any potential flaws.
2. **Read the question stem:** Understand precisely what the question is asking. Is it asking for a Strengthen, Weaken, Assumption, Inference, Flaw, Main Point, etc.? Each question type has a specific "decision rule" for what makes an answer correct.
3. **Formulate your prediction:** Based on the argument and the question type, mentally construct an ideal answer. For a Strengthen question, think about what additional premise would make the conclusion more likely. For an Assumption question, consider what unstated premise is necessary. For a Weaken question, think about what would undermine the conclusion.
4. **Go to the answer choices:** Compare your prediction to each answer choice. The correct answer will often be a close match or a rephrasing of your prediction.

Predicting answers helps you avoid falling for tempting distractors. It allows you to evaluate choices against a pre-established standard, rather than simply trying to find the "best" sounding option. This method saves time and significantly boosts accuracy.

Navigating Question Types and Answer Choices

Covers: LSAT Logical Reasoning Question Types (video, 3 min) · LSAT Logical Reasoning | Understanding Abstract Answer Choices (video, 1 min) · LSAT Logical Reasoning | Why You Shouldn't Drill Single Question Types (video, 2 min)

Mastering Logical Reasoning requires more than just understanding individual arguments; it demands familiarity with the various question types and the ability to interpret abstract language. This section equips you with strategies for recognizing question patterns, decoding complex answer choices, and optimizing your practice.

The LSAT features several **Logical Reasoning question types**, each with a distinct objective and a specific "decision rule" for what constitutes a correct answer. While the exact wording varies, most questions fall into categories such as:

- **Main Point:** Identifies the primary conclusion of the argument. The decision rule: The answer must accurately restate the argument's central claim.
- **Assumption:** As discussed, identifies an unstated premise necessary for the conclusion. The decision rule: The answer must be a statement that, if false, would destroy the argument.
- **Strengthen/Weaken:** Identifies information that makes the conclusion more or less likely. The decision rule: The answer must directly impact the logical force of the conclusion.

- **Flaw:** Identifies a logical error in the argument's reasoning. The decision rule: The answer must describe a specific, identifiable logical error committed by the author.
- **Inference/Must Be True:** Identifies a statement that is logically guaranteed by the premises. The decision rule: The answer must be provable solely from the information given in the stimulus.
- **Principle:** Identifies a general rule that justifies the argument or applies to a similar situation. The decision rule: The answer must be a broad statement that supports or is exemplified by the argument. Recognizing these types quickly allows you to immediately apply the correct decision rule, streamlining your approach.

A common challenge in Logical Reasoning is **understanding abstract answer choices**. The LSAT often uses general, abstract language in answer choices to test your ability to apply concepts rather than just recognize keywords. For example, instead of saying "the author failed to consider an alternative cause," an abstract answer might say, "The argument overlooks the possibility that the observed effect was produced by a different factor."

To navigate abstract answer choices:

1. **Translate to concrete terms:** When you see an abstract phrase, mentally rephrase it using the specific elements of the argument in the stimulus.
 - *Example:* If an answer choice says "draws a general conclusion from a limited number of specific instances," apply it to the argument. "Did the author conclude something about 'all X' based on 'only two examples of X'?"
2. **Focus on the function:** What logical role does the abstract phrase describe? Does it describe a premise, a conclusion, a flaw, or a piece of evidence?
3. **Match the function to the argument:** Does the argument actually perform the function described by the abstract choice? This often requires careful comparison. This translation process helps demystify complex phrasing and allows you to accurately assess whether an abstract choice applies to the specific argument before you.

Finally, regarding practice, it is crucial to understand **why you shouldn't drill single question types**. While it might seem intuitive to focus on areas of weakness by doing many questions of one type, this approach can be counterproductive. The LSAT presents a mix of question types in its Logical Reasoning sections. Your skill is not just in *solving* a particular type, but in *identifying* the type and *then* applying the correct strategy under timed conditions. Drilling single types can create an artificial environment where you know what to expect, thus bypassing the critical skill of question type recognition. Instead, practice with mixed sets of questions or, ideally, full timed sections. This simulates the actual test experience, forcing you to switch gears between different logical tasks. Your goal is to build flexibility and adaptability, not just isolated proficiency. Consistent, mixed practice, combined with specific review, is the most effective path to improvement.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Always answer every question on the LSAT Logical Reasoning section, as there is no penalty for guessing.
- Success in Logical Reasoning fundamentally relies on precise and active reading comprehension of the stimulus.
- Thoroughly reviewing your answers, especially incorrect ones, is essential for identifying patterns and improving your logical reasoning skills.
- Identifying unstated assumptions is critical for understanding an argument's structure and potential vulnerabilities.
- Predicting the correct answer before looking at the choices improves accuracy and efficiency by guiding your evaluation.
- Understanding the specific decision rule for each Logical Reasoning question type is key to selecting the correct answer.
- Translate abstract language in answer choices into concrete terms from the argument to evaluate their relevance accurately.
- Practice with mixed sets of Logical Reasoning questions or full sections to develop the crucial skill of question type recognition and adaptability.

CHECK YOUR UNDERSTANDING

Answer these before moving on. Model answers are in the Answer Key at the back of this guide.

1. Why is it recommended to answer every Logical Reasoning question, even if you have to guess?
2. How does "active reading" contribute to success in Logical Reasoning?
3. Describe the "negation technique" for identifying assumptions.
4. What is the primary benefit of predicting an answer before reviewing the answer choices?
5. Why is it generally advised against drilling single Logical Reasoning question types?
6. How should you approach an abstract answer choice in Logical Reasoning?

CHAPTER 6

The Logical Reasoning Field Manual

This chapter provides an essential field manual for navigating the Logical Reasoning (LR) section of the LSAT. We will equip you with a clear understanding of the modern test's structure, the fundamental approach to every LR question, and a taxonomy of question types in plain English. You will also learn about the common flaw patterns the test recycles.

Beyond understanding the content, this chapter details an effective drilling methodology and guides you to the official, free practice resources available. Mastering these strategies and resources is crucial for building both accuracy and speed in your LSAT preparation.

Understanding Modern LSAT Logical Reasoning

Covers: The Modern LSAT and the LR Taxonomy

The LSAT has evolved, and Logical Reasoning now forms the core of your score. Since August 2024, the scored LSAT consists of two Logical Reasoning sections and one Reading Comprehension section. An unscored experimental section is also included, but you will not be able to identify it. The Analytical Reasoning section, commonly known as 'logic games,' has been removed. This structural change means that LR skill now accounts for approximately two-thirds of your total score, making intensive study of this section the highest-impact work you can undertake for the LSAT. A separate LSAT Writing sample is completed online at your convenience; it is unscored but is sent to law schools.

Every Logical Reasoning question, regardless of its specific type, requires the same three fundamental analytical moves:

1. **Find the conclusion:** Identify the central claim the author wants you to accept. This is the main point of the argument.
2. **Find the support:** Locate the premises, which are the statements or evidence offered to back up the conclusion.
3. **Find the gap:** Determine what unstated information must be true for the premises to logically establish the conclusion. This 'gap' represents the argument's underlying assumption, and it is where the correct answer to most LR questions resides.

Understanding these three moves is your primary key to dissecting arguments. Beyond this, LR questions fall into predictable families, each with its own decision rule:

- **Assumption family:** This includes *necessary assumption* (what the argument absolutely requires to survive), *sufficient assumption* (what would guarantee the conclusion), *strengthen* and *weaken* (choices that make the gap smaller or larger), and *flaw* (identifying the logical error in the gap).
- **Conclusion family:** This covers *main point* (simply find the conclusion), *must be true / inference* (deduce what logically follows from the statements without introducing new information), and *most*

strongly supported (find the option best supported by the provided text).

- **Structure family:** Questions here include *method of reasoning* (describe how the argument proceeds), *role of a statement* (identify if a sentence is a premise, conclusion, or other part), and *parallel reasoning* (match the logical structure of an argument, ignoring its specific topic).
- **Disagreement and resolution:** These types involve *point at issue* (what two speakers disagree about) and *resolve the paradox* (find a fact that explains an apparent contradiction).

The LSAT frequently reuses a small set of common logical errors. You will learn to recognize these 'recycled flaws' as familiar patterns. Examples include treating correlation as causation, confusing necessary and sufficient conditions, using unrepresentative samples, attacking the speaker instead of the argument (ad hominem), equivocating on a key term, and assuming that what is true of parts is true of the whole. Recognizing these patterns will significantly improve your accuracy.

Your approach to reading also depends on the question type. For support-family questions (assumption, strengthen, weaken, flaw), adopt a skeptical posture: assume the argument is flawed until proven valid. For inference questions (must be true, most strongly supported), your posture flips: accept every statement as true and deduce cautiously. Knowing which posture to adopt is a critical skill.

Effective Drilling and Practice Resources

Covers: Drilling Method and Your Official (Free) Practice Arsenal

Effective LSAT preparation relies heavily on practice with authentic materials. The LSAT offers a significant advantage over many other standardized tests: thousands of retired official questions are readily available for your use. Always prioritize official questions, as they accurately reflect the test's style and difficulty.

The primary source for official LSAT practice is **LSAC LawHub**. LSAC, the organization that administers the LSAT, provides several full official PrepTests for free through its LawHub platform (<https://lawhub.lsac.org>). This platform replicates the digital interface of the actual exam, making it the ideal environment for all your timed practice. Familiarity with the interface can translate into easy points on test day. For access to a deeper archive of additional PrepTests, you can subscribe to LawHub Advantage. Be aware that Khan Academy's official LSAT prep has been retired; LawHub is now the official free path. Disregard any outdated links or resources.

This course focuses on teaching you the methods and strategies. Your actual drilling practice will take place using these real LSAC questions via LawHub. We recommend a structured drilling method to maximize your learning:

1. **Untimed accuracy phase:** Early in your preparation, work through LR questions without a clock. Focus intently on each question. For every argument, write down its conclusion, identify the gap, and articulate precisely why each incorrect answer choice is wrong. This deliberate approach to ten questions is more beneficial than rushing through forty. You are building a mental library of argument patterns and decision rules.
2. **Blind review:** After completing any timed section, and before checking your answers, re-solve every question you flagged as uncertain. Do this untimed and on a fresh page. Score both your initial timed

attempt and your blind review attempt. The difference between these scores reveals the nature of your challenge: if your blind review score is low, your problem is likely skill-based, indicating a need to revisit foundational concepts or video lessons. If your blind review score is significantly higher than your timed score, your issue is primarily speed and pacing.

3. **Type-focused sets:** When your error log consistently shows you struggling with a particular question type, dedicate a practice session to that type alone. Drill 15 to 20 questions of only that type in one sitting. This concentrated practice helps to rapidly internalize the specific decision rules for that question type. After targeted practice, integrate these types back into mixed sets to maintain your overall readiness.
4. **Full timed PrepTests:** Take a complete timed PrepTest every two to three weeks, but no more frequently. These tests serve as a diagnostic tool, providing a snapshot of your progress, rather than a primary method of improvement. They are a thermometer, not a treatment.

Regarding pacing, remember that while you have approximately 85 seconds per question for 24-26 LR questions in a 35-minute section, uniform pacing is a beginner's trap. Experienced test-takers often spend 45 seconds on easier questions, banking that time for the most challenging few, which might take three minutes or more. Your initial pass through a section should focus on quickly securing points from all the easy and medium difficulty questions. Allocate the time saved to the harder questions. If a question remains intractable, be prepared to make an educated guess and move on. Each question, regardless of its difficulty or the time spent, is worth only one point.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The modern LSAT features two Logical Reasoning sections, making LR skill central to your score.
- Every LR question requires you to find the conclusion, the support (premises), and the unstated gap (assumption) in the argument.
- LSAT LR questions fall into predictable families, each with specific decision rules and common flaw patterns.
- Adopt a skeptical reading posture for argument-based questions and an accepting posture for inference questions.
- Always use official LSAC LawHub questions for practice, as they accurately reflect the real test.
- Prioritize untimed accuracy and thorough analysis in your early drilling, focusing on understanding why answers are correct and incorrect.
- Use blind review to diagnose whether your errors stem from skill deficiencies or pacing issues.
- Develop flexible pacing, spending less time on easy questions to save time for harder ones, and be willing to guess when necessary.

CHECK YOUR UNDERSTANDING

Answer these before moving on. Model answers are in the Answer Key at the back of this guide.

1. What is the current structure of the scored LSAT in terms of Logical Reasoning sections?
2. Describe the 'three moves' to approach any Logical Reasoning question.
3. Explain the difference in reading posture for 'support family' questions versus 'inference' questions.
4. What is the purpose of the 'untimed accuracy phase' in the drilling method?
5. How does 'blind review' help diagnose whether a problem is skill-based or speed-based?
6. Where should students find official LSAT practice questions?

CHAPTER 7

Final Assessment: Logical Reasoning Method

This chapter marks the culmination of your work in the LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive course. Module 7 provides a final assessment designed to test your comprehensive understanding and application of the methods taught throughout the course. This is not just a quiz; it is a critical diagnostic tool.

Your performance here will highlight your strengths and pinpoint specific areas where further review or practice may be beneficial. Approach this assessment as an opportunity to consolidate your learning and refine your strategic approach to Logical Reasoning questions.

Approaching Your Final Assessment

Covers: Final Assessment: Logical Reasoning Method (quiz, 5 min)

The 'Final Assessment: Logical Reasoning Method' is a short, targeted quiz. It is designed to evaluate your ability to apply the core strategies you have learned: breaking down arguments, identifying question types, recognizing common flaws, and using a principled drilling method.

How to Attack the Assessment

Treat this quiz as a mini-LSAT section. Find a quiet place, set a timer for the recommended duration, and commit to the process. Focus on applying your method consistently for each question.

1. **Read the Stimulus Actively:** Identify the conclusion, premises, and any unstated assumptions. Understand the argument's structure before moving on.
2. **Identify the Question Type:** Recognize what the question is asking. Is it a Must Be True, Weaken, Strengthen, Flaw, or another type? Knowing the question type dictates your decision rule.
3. **Prephrase an Answer:** Before looking at the answer choices, predict what the correct answer *should* say. This helps you avoid trap answers and stay focused.
4. **Evaluate Answer Choices Systematically:** Eliminate choices that do not match your prephrase or violate the question's decision rule. Be wary of answers that are *plausible* but not *correct* according to the specific task.

Common Mistakes to Avoid

Many students make similar errors on timed assessments. Be mindful of these pitfalls:

- **Rushing:** Speed comes from accuracy. Do not sacrifice careful analysis for a faster pace. Focus on getting it right first.
- **Misinterpreting the Question:** A common error is answering a question other than the one asked. Always double-check the question stem.

- **Failing to Prephrase:** Without a prephrase, you are more susceptible to attractive but incorrect answer choices.
- **Ignoring Key Words:** Small words like 'only,' 'all,' 'some,' 'unless,' or 'except' can change the meaning of a statement dramatically. Pay close attention to these.
- **Overthinking or Underthinking:** Some questions require careful, nuanced analysis. Others are straightforward applications of a rule. Adjust your approach accordingly.

Interpreting Your Results

Your score on this assessment is less important than what you learn from it. Use your results for targeted improvement.

- **Review Every Question:** Look at every question, not just the ones you got wrong. Understand *why* the correct answer is correct and *why* the incorrect answers are wrong. Even if you got a question right, review your reasoning.
- **Identify Weak Areas:** Do you consistently miss a particular question type? Are you struggling with certain flaw patterns? Pinpoint these areas.
- **Revisit Relevant Lessons:** If you identify a weak area, go back to the specific lessons in earlier modules that cover that topic. Reread the material and re-watch the videos.
- **Practice with Purpose:** Use your diagnostic information to guide your future practice. Focus on drilling the question types or concepts where you need the most improvement. This assessment is a starting point for further refinement of your Logical Reasoning skills.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The final assessment tests your comprehensive understanding of Logical Reasoning methods.
- Approach the quiz with the same discipline you would a real LSAT section.
- Prioritize accurate application of your method over raw speed during review.
- Every incorrect answer reveals an opportunity to strengthen a specific skill or concept.
- Thoroughly review explanations for both correct and incorrect answers to deepen your understanding.
- Use your performance to identify specific areas for targeted practice and review.

CHECK YOUR UNDERSTANDING

Answer these before moving on. Model answers are in the Answer Key at the back of this guide.

1. What is the primary purpose of the Final Assessment module?
2. How should you approach the questions in this final quiz?
3. What are some common mistakes students make during an assessment like this?
4. Beyond simply getting questions right or wrong, how should you interpret your results?

5. If you perform poorly on the assessment, what is your next step?

REFERENCE

Glossary

Abstract answer choice

An answer choice that uses general or theoretical language rather than specific terms from the argument.

Active reading

A focused approach to reading that involves identifying argument components, questioning information, and understanding relationships between ideas.

Argument

A set of statements, one of which is the conclusion, and the others are premises intended to support that conclusion.

Assumption

An unstated premise that must be true for the conclusion to logically follow from the stated premises.

Blind review

A drilling technique where you re-solve flagged questions from a timed section, untimed and without checking answers, to diagnose skill versus speed issues.

Causal fallacy

An error in reasoning that incorrectly infers a cause-and-effect relationship from mere correlation or insufficient evidence.

Causal flaw

An error in reasoning that incorrectly infers a cause-and-effect relationship, often confusing correlation with causation.

Causation

A relationship where one event or variable directly brings about another event or variable as a result.

Conclusion

The main point an argument is trying to prove; the claim supported by the premises.

Conditional statement

An 'if...then' statement establishing a relationship where one condition is sufficient for another.

Correlation

A relationship between two variables such that when one changes, the other tends to change in a specific way, but without necessarily implying causation.

Decision rule

The specific criterion or condition that an answer choice must meet to be considered correct for a particular question type.

Diagnostic tool

An assessment used to identify specific strengths and weaknesses in a student's understanding or skill set.

Disagree question

A question type asking for a statement that two speakers explicitly hold opposing views on.

Error analysis

The process of reviewing incorrect answers to understand the underlying reasoning errors and identify areas for improvement.

Evaluate question

A question type asking for information whose truth or falsity would be most helpful in assessing an argument's validity.

Except question

A Logical Reasoning question that asks you to identify the *one* answer choice that does *not* fit a given criterion, while the other four do.

Final assessment

A comprehensive quiz designed to evaluate overall mastery of course material and application of learned strategies.

Flaw

A weakness or error in an argument's reasoning that prevents its conclusion from being fully supported by its premises.

Flaw question

A Logical Reasoning question type that asks you to identify the specific logical error or weakness in an argument.

Gap (assumption)

The unstated but necessary link or piece of information that must be true for an argument's premises to logically lead to its conclusion.

Lawhub

The official online platform provided by LSAC for accessing and practicing with retired LSAT PrepTests in the actual digital test interface.

Methodical approach

A systematic, step-by-step process for analyzing arguments and solving Logical Reasoning problems consistently.

Necessary assumption

An unstated premise that *must* be true for the argument's conclusion to logically follow from its premises.

Negation technique

A method for testing assumptions by making a potential assumption false to see if it destroys the argument's conclusion.

Pacing

The strategy of managing time across questions in a section, often involving spending less time on easier questions to allocate more to difficult ones.

Paradox

A seemingly contradictory set of facts or a surprising situation that requires an explanation to be resolved.

Paradox question

A question type asking for an explanation that resolves a seemingly contradictory set of facts or observations.

Parallel reasoning

A question type that asks for an argument with the same logical structure or flaw as a given argument.

Parallel reasoning question

A Logical Reasoning question type that asks you to select the answer choice whose argument has the same logical structure as the argument in the stimulus.

Point of disagreement

A question type asking to identify a statement about which two speakers hold opposing views.

Prediction

The act of anticipating the correct answer's content or function before reviewing the provided answer choices.

Premise

A statement or piece of evidence offered in an argument to support the conclusion.

Prephrasing

The strategic step of anticipating or formulating the correct answer before examining the given answer choices.

Strengthen question

A question type asking for information that makes an argument's conclusion more likely to be true.

Sufficient assumption

An unstated premise that, if true, *guarantees* the argument's conclusion.

REFERENCE

Answer Key

Chapter 1: Logical Reasoning Fundamentals: Section 1

1. What is the primary goal when first reading an LSAT Logical Reasoning stimulus?

The primary goal is to actively understand the stimulus by identifying the argument's conclusion and its supporting premises. If no argument is present, the goal is to understand the facts presented thoroughly. This foundational step ensures you grasp the author's main point and the evidence provided.

2. Explain the "prediction" strategy in the context of LSAT Logical Reasoning. Why is it important?

Prediction involves formulating what the correct answer should accomplish *before* looking at the answer choices. It is important because it forces active engagement with the argument and question, transforms the task into an objective search, and helps avoid distractors by providing a clear target for the correct answer.

3. How does the "Variance Test" work for Evaluate questions?

For an Evaluate question, the Variance Test involves taking a potential answer choice and considering how the argument's conclusion would be affected if that choice were true, versus if it were false. The correct answer will be one where both scenarios (true and false) significantly impact the strength or validity of the argument's conclusion.

4. What is the objective when solving a Paradox question, and what should the correct answer *not* do?

The objective of a Paradox question is to find a piece of information that explains how two seemingly contradictory facts or observations can both be true. The correct answer should introduce new information that resolves the apparent inconsistency, but it should *not* challenge or deny the truth of either of the original facts.

5. An argument states, "All dogs bark. Fido is a dog. Therefore, Fido barks." Identify the conclusion and the premises.

The conclusion is "Fido barks." The premises are "All dogs bark" and "Fido is a dog." The premises provide the reasons that logically lead to the conclusion about Fido.

Chapter 2: Argument Foundations and Question Strategies

1. What is the primary difference between a necessary assumption and a sufficient assumption?

A necessary assumption *must* be true for the conclusion to follow, meaning its negation would destroy the argument. A sufficient assumption, if true, *guarantees* the conclusion, completely bridging any logical gap.

2. How can you effectively test whether an assumption is truly necessary for an argument?

The Assumption Negation Technique is used to test necessary assumptions. You negate the potential assumption and then check if the argument's conclusion can still logically follow. If the argument falls apart, the original assumption was necessary.

3. When encountering an argument that claims causation based on correlation, what common alternative explanations should you consider?

When a causal claim is made from correlation, consider alternative causes for the effect, the possibility of reversed causation (the effect causing the supposed cause), or that a third factor might be causing both the observed correlation. Coincidence is also a possibility.

4. Describe the core task in a Parallel Reasoning question and what elements you should focus on matching.

The core task in a Parallel Reasoning question is to find an argument in the answer choices that mirrors the logical structure, certainty, and validity (or invalidity) of the stimulus argument. Focus on the number and type of premises, the conclusion's certainty, and any logical flaws.

5. Outline the five stages of answering a Logical Reasoning question. Why is prephrasing a critical step?

The five stages are: Read the question stem, read the stimulus, identify the conclusion and premises, prephrase an answer, and evaluate the answer choices. Prephrasing is critical because it forces you to deeply understand the argument and anticipate the correct answer, making answer choice evaluation more efficient and less prone to distraction.

6. Explain why excessive diagramming is often discouraged for LSAT Logical Reasoning questions.

Excessive diagramming is discouraged because it can be time-consuming and often unnecessary for understanding the core logic of most LSAT arguments. Focusing on comprehending the argument in plain English and identifying its structure and flaws is generally more efficient and effective.

Chapter 3: Section 3: Mastering Argument Structure and Flaws**1. What are the three primary methods for identifying the conclusion of an argument?**

The three primary methods are looking for conclusion indicator words (e.g., 'therefore,' 'thus'), using the 'Why Test' to see which statement is supported by others, and applying the main point test to summarize the argument's core claim. These methods help pinpoint the author's ultimate assertion.

2. Why is predicting an answer important in LSAT Logical Reasoning?

Predicting an answer before looking at the choices helps you focus on what the argument truly requires. It reduces the influence of tempting distractors and guides you toward the correct logical connection or flaw, ultimately improving both accuracy and efficiency.

3. Explain the difference between a general prediction and a specific prediction.

A general prediction anticipates the *type* of answer needed (e.g., 'the answer will strengthen the argument'). A specific prediction, however, anticipates the *exact content* of the answer (e.g., 'the answer will state that X causes Y'). Specific predictions are possible when the argument's structure or content points to a very precise answer.

4. What is the 'correlation vs. causation' flaw, and why is it a common error?

This flaw occurs when an argument incorrectly assumes that because two things are correlated (happen together), one must cause the other. It is common because correlation does not automatically imply causation; other factors like a common cause, reverse causation, or mere coincidence could be at play, making the causal leap unjustified.

5. What is your number one goal when approaching LSAT Logical Reasoning questions?

Your number one goal is to accurately identify the single best answer choice and understand precisely why it is correct, while also understanding why all other answer choices are definitively incorrect. This comprehensive understanding ensures robust logical reasoning skills.

Chapter 4: Analyzing Arguments and Common Question Types**1. What is the primary difference between a premise and a conclusion in an argument?**

A premise is a statement of fact or evidence offered as support. The conclusion is the main point that the premises are intended to prove. The conclusion is the 'what' the author wants you to believe, and the premises are the 'why'.

2. Describe one common flaw in conditional reasoning and provide a brief example.

One common flaw is Mistaken Reversal. This occurs when an argument assumes that if A leads to B, then B must also lead to A. For example, 'If a student studies, they pass. John passed. Therefore, John studied.' This ignores other ways John could have passed.

3. Explain the core error in confusing correlation with causation.

This error occurs when an argument concludes that one event causes another simply because they occur together or one follows the other. It fails to consider alternative explanations, such as a common cause for both events, a reversed cause and effect, or other independent causes.

4. When approaching a Parallel Reasoning question, what is the most important aspect to match between the stimulus and the correct answer choice?

The most important aspect to match is the logical structure of the argument or the specific flaw it contains. The specific content or subject matter of the argument is irrelevant; only the abstract logical form matters.

5. What must be true of the correct answer in a Point of Disagreement question?

The correct answer must be a statement that both speakers explicitly address, and about which one speaker clearly affirms its truth while the other speaker clearly denies its truth. Their positions must be in direct opposition.

6. What is the objective of a Resolve the Paradox question?

The objective is to find an answer choice that, if true, provides a plausible explanation for a set of seemingly contradictory facts or a surprising situation presented in the stimulus. The answer must make the disparate facts consistent without denying either of them.

Chapter 5: Mastering Logical Reasoning: Strategy and Structure

1. Why is it recommended to answer every Logical Reasoning question, even if you have to guess?

There is no penalty for incorrect answers on the LSAT. Leaving a question blank means you forfeit any chance of getting it right, while a guess always retains a statistical possibility of adding to your score. Maximizing attempts maximizes potential points.

2. How does "active reading" contribute to success in Logical Reasoning?

Active reading ensures a precise understanding of the argument's components: conclusion, premises, and any counterpoints. Many errors stem from misinterpreting the stimulus, so careful attention to detail, qualifiers, and logical structure is crucial for accurate analysis.

3. Describe the "negation technique" for identifying assumptions.

The negation technique involves taking a potential assumption and temporarily considering its opposite (negating it). If the argument's conclusion can no longer logically follow from its premises when the assumption is negated, then that statement is indeed a necessary assumption.

4. What is the primary benefit of predicting an answer before reviewing the answer choices?

Predicting an answer helps you evaluate choices against a clear, pre-established standard based on your understanding of the argument and question type. This prevents you from being misled by tempting distractors and allows for more efficient and accurate selection of the correct option.

5. Why is it generally advised against drilling single Logical Reasoning question types?

Drilling single question types does not accurately simulate the actual LSAT, which presents a mix of types. It bypasses the critical skill of identifying the question type and applying the correct decision rule on the fly. Mixed practice builds adaptability and better prepares you for the test's varied demands.

6. How should you approach an abstract answer choice in Logical Reasoning?

When encountering an abstract answer choice, you should mentally translate its general language into the specific, concrete terms and elements of the argument presented in the stimulus. This allows you to determine if the abstract description accurately applies to the particular argument's structure or flaw.

Chapter 6: The Logical Reasoning Field Manual

1. What is the current structure of the scored LSAT in terms of Logical Reasoning sections?

Since August 2024, the scored LSAT consists of two Logical Reasoning sections and one Reading Comprehension section. This means LR now comprises approximately two-thirds of the total score.

2. Describe the 'three moves' to approach any Logical Reasoning question.

The three moves are: first, find the conclusion, which is the author's main point. Second, find the support, which are the premises offered for that conclusion. Third, find the gap, which is the unstated assumption necessary for the premises to establish the conclusion.

3. Explain the difference in reading posture for 'support family' questions versus 'inference' questions.

For 'support family' questions (e.g., strengthen, weaken, assumption, flaw), you should read like a skeptic, assuming the argument has a flaw until proven otherwise. For 'inference' questions (e.g., must be true, most strongly supported), you should accept all statements as true and deduce cautiously without introducing outside information.

4. What is the purpose of the 'untimed accuracy phase' in the drilling method?

The untimed accuracy phase focuses on deep understanding over speed. Its purpose is to build a strong foundation by thoroughly analyzing each question, identifying the conclusion, gap, and reasons why each answer choice is correct or incorrect, thereby building a pattern library.

5. How does 'blind review' help diagnose whether a problem is skill-based or speed-based?

By re-solving flagged questions untimed, blind review allows you to see if you can get them right with unlimited time. If your blind review score is low, it indicates a skill gap. If your blind review score is significantly higher than your timed score, it suggests your problem is primarily with pacing and time management.

6. Where should students find official LSAT practice questions?

Students should use LSAC LawHub, which provides free official PrepTests in the actual digital exam interface. LawHub Advantage offers access to more tests. It is crucial to use only official questions to ensure authentic practice.

Chapter 7: Final Assessment: Logical Reasoning Method

1. What is the primary purpose of the Final Assessment module?

The primary purpose is to serve as a diagnostic tool. It evaluates your overall mastery of the course material and helps identify specific strengths and weaknesses in your Logical Reasoning skills.

2. How should you approach the questions in this final quiz?

You should approach the questions methodically, as if it were a real LSAT section. This involves actively reading the stimulus, identifying the question type, paraphrasing an answer, and systematically evaluating answer choices.

3. What are some common mistakes students make during an assessment like this?

Common mistakes include rushing through questions, misinterpreting the question stem, failing to paraphrase an answer, and not paying close attention to key words in the stimulus or answer choices.

4. Beyond simply getting questions right or wrong, how should you interpret your results?

Interpret your results as opportunities for learning. Focus on *why* answers were correct or incorrect, identify patterns in your mistakes, and pinpoint specific areas or question types that require further attention.

5. If you perform poorly on the assessment, what is your next step?

If you perform poorly, your next step is to conduct thorough error analysis. Revisit the relevant lessons from earlier modules, review explanations for every question, and engage in targeted practice on your identified weak areas.

CLOSING

Where to Go Next

Upon completing the LSAT Logical Reasoning Intensive, your next step is to consolidate your newly acquired skills through consistent, targeted practice. Apply the methods you have learned to official LSAT Logical Reasoning sections. Focus on understanding why correct answers are correct and why incorrect answers are wrong.

Regularly review your performance on practice questions. Identify recurring error patterns and revisit the relevant lessons in this course. Timed practice sessions are essential for building speed while maintaining accuracy. Gradually integrate full Logical Reasoning sections into your study routine.

Naturally, the skills developed here will benefit your preparation for other sections of the LSAT, particularly Reading Comprehension. Consider moving on to full-length practice tests to simulate the actual exam experience. Continued practice and review will solidify your mastery of Logical Reasoning.



MEGACOURSE

Learn Anything. Achieve Everything.

Track your progress, take the quizzes, and earn your certificate for this course at
megacourse.app/courses/lSAT-logical-reasoning-intensive