



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Unofficial LNAT Paper 1 Commentary

---

This commentary has been produced independently and is not affiliated with or endorsed by the LNAT Consortium. The official LNAT commentary covers selected questions from this paper, and where it does so, we have indicated this clearly. What you will find here is a full worked commentary for every question that the official commentary does not address.

Across the passages in this test, a number of patterns come up repeatedly, and it is worth being aware of them before you start working through the questions.

The most common source of error is going beyond what the text actually says. Several questions are designed specifically to catch students who bring in outside knowledge, make inferences the passage does not support, or select an answer because it sounds plausible rather than because the text confirms it. When in doubt, ask yourself: where exactly in the passage does this come from?

A second recurring challenge is the use of qualifying language. Words like "reportedly," "suggests," "seemingly," and "may" appear throughout the passages and the answer choices, and they change the meaning of a sentence significantly. An answer that is almost right but uses language that is too absolute, or too weak, is still wrong.

Third, pay close attention to whose view is being expressed. Many passages present the views of critics, opponents, or third parties before offering the writer's own position, and several questions test exactly this distinction. An argument that is reported is not the same as an argument that is endorsed.

Finally, watch for questions that ask what does not do something, or what is not claimed. It is easy to read quickly and miss the negative. Underlining "not" when you see it in a question is a simple habit that will save you marks.



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Patients and Physicians

### Q1.

The word "not" in this question is easy to overlook under timed conditions, so be careful! A useful strategy here is to begin by clarifying what opposition means in this context: it means two contrasting terms where one is presented as distinct from, or in tension with, the other.

Working through the options, you can establish that (b), (c), (d) and (e) all function as oppositions. In (b), adult status is explicitly conferred on patients "whom paternalists regard as children" : the contrast is direct. In (c), "quasi-familial" relations are described as being replaced by "quasi-legal" ones. If you are replacing X **with** Y, then X and Y must be in opposition. In (d), the structure "not a patriarch, but a batterer" signals an explicit contrast between the two terms: again, the structure 'Not X, **but** Y' usually suggests a difference between property X and property Y. In (e), autonomy is described as a "challenge" to paternalism, establishing a direct opposition between the two concepts.

That leaves (a). To test it, you must locate both the "ideal physician" and the "Victorian patriarch" in the passage and examine the relationship between them. In the second paragraph, paternalistic physicians are described as resembling "Victorian patriarchs". Notably, "resemble" signals similarity, not contrast. The important thing is the determiner 'such' in the final sentence of the paragraph. This indicates that we have to look to an idea/concept/person already mentioned. If we go to the top of the paragraph, we see that the ideal physician is being criticised for being paternalistic. Therefore, 'such paternalistic physicians' actually refers to the 'ideal physician' mentioned earlier. As they resemble Victorian patriarchs, they are not in opposition.

The answer is (a).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Patients and Physicians

### Q2.

This question asks you to identify the writer's own view, and it requires you to be alert to a distinction that is easy to overlook: the difference between views presented in the passage and views endorsed by the writer.

(c) can be eliminated first. The Hippocratic oath is mentioned more than once, but at no point does the writer question its *validity* or suggest it ought to be reconsidered. It is presented as background, not subjected to critical scrutiny by the writer.

(e) is the view of what the passage calls the "unmollified critics" — those who insist that treatment choice belongs to the patient regardless. The writer reports this position; they do not endorse it.

(b) is similarly attributed to others. The criticism that some physicians are "too old-fashioned" might be inferred from the critics' arguments, but the writer does not make this claim as their own. The writer's focus is on the shift in the categories of concern, not on making a judgment about whether any group of physicians is right or wrong.

(a) presents a similar problem. While the passage discusses arguments that physicians need to change, this is not the writer's personal assertion. It belongs to the critics being described.

(d) is supported directly by the final paragraph, where the writer states that "Who is to decide?" has become more pressing than "What is to be done?" and that procedure has become as important as conclusion. This is not reported as someone else's view, it is the writer's own synthesis and conclusion.

The answer is (d).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Patients and Physicians

### Q3.

To answer this question you must locate the relevant passage of text precisely. The phrase "contra Kant" appears in the final paragraph. 'Contra' is the Latin for 'against', so what that question is really saying is: Despite Kant's opposition, does the principle [of autonomy] cover voluntary euthanasia? You are therefore looking for the reason why Kant may oppose it.

Kantian principles are mentioned in two places in the passage. In the fourth paragraph, the "principle of autonomy" is described as "traced to Kantian notions of respect for persons and inherent human dignity." **Note the language carefully:** the principle of autonomy is traced to Kantian concepts (meaning, it finds its origins there) but this does not mean that the principle of autonomy itself is a Kantian principle. So, (e) is the most tempting wrong answer, precisely because autonomy is mentioned in connection with Kantian principles. So, the principle of autonomy draws from Kant's principles, but is not one of them. Therefore, Kant is unlikely to oppose the idea that the principle of autonomy cannot support voluntary euthanasia on this basis.

Working through the remaining options, (a), (c), and (d) find no textual hook: euthanasia is not discussed as a medical procedure in the relevant sense, natural law is not mentioned, and the patient/physician relationship is not invoked as a Kantian concern. However, (b), by contrast, fits precisely: dignity is identified as a core Kantian concept in the passage and one of the principles that the principle of autonomy is rooted in. The suggestion here is that a person cannot consent to the ending of life as this undermines the inherent dignity of humans, which Kantian ethics holds to be intrinsically valuable.

The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

www.lawprepacademy.co.uk

---

## Top Civil Servants

### Q1. See Official LNAT Commentary

### Q2.

This question asks how the writer is using the word "conservative" throughout the passage. Note, this is where we need to read the passage closely.

The question does not ask what the word means in general political usage. Students who rely on external knowledge of the term rather than close reading are likely to be caught by (b). (b) can be eliminated on this basis: the passage does not define conservatism in terms of being on the political right. That may be a common usage, but it is not the writer's usage here.

(d) is wrong too: while education and class background are mentioned as contributing factors, they are not offered as a definition of conservatism in this passage.

(e) is tempting, as the "national interest" is referenced repeatedly, but close reading reveals that this is described as something conservatives define, not as a definition of conservatism itself. The writer says that the outlook of top civil servants is "bound to influence, in fact to define, their view of the 'national interest'". So, the national interest is the product of their conservatism, not its meaning. You are now left with (a) and (c). So, (c) at first appears plausible: "ideological soundness" is discussed in the second paragraph. However, on close reading, ideological soundness is introduced as a reason why civil servants are conservative allies. The sentence structure makes this clear: ideological soundness is cited alongside other reasons for the fact that civil servants are conscious or unconscious allies. This is a good passage to use to practice your argument mapping!

The phrase "conscious or unconscious allies of existing economic and social elites" appears explicitly in the first paragraph as the writer's clearest statement of what they mean by conservative. However, many students don't choose this option as it looks underinclusive mentioning only 'conscious' rather than also 'unconscious'. To understand why this is correct, the conjunction "or" is significant. To be considered conservative in the writer's sense, a person needs only satisfy one of two conditions: they are either consciously sympathetic to existing elites, or unconsciously so.

So if the writer were asked directly: "Is a conscious sympathiser with elite interests conservative, by your definition?", the answer would be "Yes." Therefore, the correct answer is (a).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Top Civil Servants

### Q3.

The recruitment procedures are discussed in two separate places in the passage, and students may be tempted by more than one answer.

(d) is the most immediately tempting, since the passage does state that recruitment and promotion are "no longer in the main determined on the basis of social provenance or religious affiliation." However, the critical phrase here is "in the main". This does not mean, contrary to the answer choice, that they 'no longer depend on religious affiliations', it just means that they are no longer the main thing that they depend on. They may still play some role, and therefore the text cannot be used as support for the claim that they do not depend (at all) on religious affiliations.

(e) is also tempting: the passage does note that security checks are applied "with different degrees of thoroughness" across countries. However, this refers to the varying rigour of checks between nations, that is, talking about the application of specific elements of the procedures, not the procedures themselves.

As for (b), it mentions that civil servants have knowledge of what is expected and required of them, but nowhere does this link to them knowing what they need to say. It appears to be referring more broadly to their ideology and political stances.

Equally, there is no evidence for (c). In fact, the thrust of the passage appears to be saying the opposite and that none of this happens by chance!

That leaves (a). The writer makes clear that the concept of a "security risk" is elastic, and can be changed to suit the situation. They are, in essence, saying that the procedures can be manipulated so that anyone whose views do not necessarily align with the prevailing conservative consensus can be labelled a 'security risk', and therefore will not pass through the recruitment procedures.

The answer is therefore (a).



# LawPrep Academy

www.lawprepacademy.co.uk

---

## A Strange New Mask for Science

### Q1.

This question asks what the writer argues in the passage. You are looking for a position that the writer actively advances, not one that is reported or attributed to others.

(a) can be eliminated. The passage does mention a "technological explosion," but it does not equate science with technology. The two are treated as distinct throughout, and the technological explosion is used as a way to collectively describe the broader wave of innovation that the writer goes on to discuss, rather than as a definition of science itself.

(b) is a position that is discussed at some length. The idea that science must be free of subjective values is presented as "the wisdom of the Enlightenment." However, the writer's argument is that this severance of knowledge from value has "terrible implications." The value-free conception of science is something the writer is examining critically, not endorsing.

(d) fails for a similar reason. The passage states that the pursuit of objective knowledge "is **no longer** the private mission of an elite." The writer is describing a historical shift, not asserting that scientific investigation currently is an elite pursuit.

(e) goes too far. While experimental tests are associated with science in general understanding, the writer never states that science must involve them in order to qualify as science. The answer cannot go further than the text supports.

(c) is confirmed by the second paragraph, where the writer states that "the pursuit of objective knowledge for its own sake" is something that science involves. Note the verb carefully: "involves" is not the same as "is defined by" or "must include." The writer is identifying a feature of science without making an absolute claim, which is exactly why (e) fails and (c) succeeds.

The answer is (c).



# LawPrep Academy

www.lawprepacademy.co.uk

---

## A Strange New Mask for Science

### Q2.

This question asks what the writer does not claim, meaning you must find the one statement that cannot be attributed to the writer's own argument.

(a), (b), (c) and (d) can each be confirmed with textual evidence. Science being "at the centre of the public realm" is stated explicitly in the first paragraph. Science having "become much more visible", is the central claim of the opening. The argument that science "requires some human input" appears in the second paragraph, where the writer states that science's success "convinced us all that science lacked some vital human input." That science has "been judged from the outside" is stated directly in the second paragraph.

(e) requires more careful handling. The statement that science "should be free of our subjective values" is presented in the passage as the position of the Enlightenment. Specifically, "according to the wisdom of the Enlightenment, knowledge must, by its very nature, be free of our subjective values." The writer reports this as the reasoning that led us to grant science dangerous autonomy, not as their own view. Indeed, the writer goes on to argue that the severance of knowledge from value has "terrible implications."

The answer is (e).

### Q3 - See LNAT Commentary



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## University of Google

### Q1.

The question asks for the main criticism in the passage of students' use of the internet. The word "main" is doing significant work here. Multiple answers could be criticisms, but we are looking specifically for the main one.

(a) is present in the passage as unsubstantiated material is mentioned, but it is presented as one example of the problem rather than its core. The passage is concerned with students' inability to distinguish between reliable and unreliable material, not simply with the existence of unreliable material.

(c) misrepresents the argument. The passage distinguishes between incorrect information and information of poor or uncertain quality. Professor Brabazon's concern is not simply that all internet information is wrong (this would be going too far!), but that students cannot assess its reliability. (e) equally takes the argument too far. Plagiarism is raised as a related concern, but the passage does not assert that internet use leads to plagiarism: this conflates correlation with causation in a way the passage does not support.

(d) refers to Andrew Keen's position, which is introduced as echoing Brabazon's concerns but is not the focus of the passage as a whole. A criticism that appears in a subordinate part of the argument is unlikely to be the main one.

However, (b) is confirmed throughout. Brabazon's central concern is that students "arrive at university unable to discriminate between anecdotal and unsubstantiated material posted on the internet and peer-reviewed scholarly research." The problem is not the material itself but students' lack of critical and interpretative skill in evaluating it. This is the argument to which she returns repeatedly, and it determines her response: we should be teaching interpretative skills before technological ones.

The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## University of Google

### Q2.

The question asks what is suggested by the final paragraph. Therefore, we are moving into inference territory.

(a) can be immediately eliminated: the volume of information on Google is not raised as an issue in the final paragraph. Similarly, (b) is a concern expressed earlier in the passage, not in the final paragraph specifically. Do not allow earlier content to bleed into your reading of a specific section.

(c) is the most tempting wrong answer. The paragraph does reveal that Google's rankings can be manipulated through commercial means, and from this we can infer that Google has some power. However, the passage does not provide any evidence that this power is excessive or problematic in a broader sense. That inference goes beyond what the text supports.

(d) focuses on accuracy, which is more a point about whether the content of the listings is correct. However, the paragraph is about the order of listings, not the content of individual results. Manipulating rankings does not necessarily alter the accuracy of the material being ranked.

(e) follows directly from the paragraph's central point. If a multimillion-pound industry exists specifically to manipulate Google's rankings, then the order of results reflects commercial interests rather than relevance. The rankings cannot, therefore be considered reliable as a guide to what is most useful or trustworthy.

The answer is (e).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## University of Google

### Q3.

The question asks which word or phrase is intended to convey approval. The word "intended" is a reminder that you must consider the writer's purpose within the context of the passage, not simply what the words might suggest in isolation.

(a) "anecdotal" is used explicitly alongside "unsubstantiated" as a descriptor of the kind of material students incorrectly rely on. Its use signals criticism, not approval.

(c) "filling" appears in the "white bread for the mind" analogy and is qualified immediately: "it does not necessarily offer nutritional content." The word is being used to suggest that Google provides the appearance of substance without genuine value. It is not, in context, a term of approval.

(d) "equally valid" requires careful attention to context. The phrase appears in Andrew Keen's criticism: "today's media is shattering the world into a billion personalised truths, each seeming equally valid." The word "seeming" is important to note as it signals that these truths are not actually equally valid, and that the appearance of equal validity is precisely the problem. Therefore, this is not, in context, used to convey approval.

(e) "tailor-made" appears in the context of the plagiarism industry, describing essays produced for students to submit as their own. The context makes clear that this is a matter of concern, not approval.

(b) "peer-reviewed" is used throughout the passage as the standard against which all other material is measured and found wanting. Brabazon provides her students with peer-reviewed printed texts specifically because she regards them as reliable and rigorous. The term is consistently used to indicate the kind of material that students should be engaging with.

The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## University of Google

### Q4.

This question asks which option comes closest to the meaning of Andrew Keen's criticism. The word "closest" signals that the match may not be perfect, so the correct answer will be the one that fits best.

So the first thing to do is to try and reformulate the criticism in your own words. Keen says that today's media is producing a vast number of personalised truths that each appear equally valid. Put plainly, there is an enormous quantity of information available to us, all of it presenting itself as true, with no clear way of knowing which to trust.

So we can immediately eliminate (e), which focuses on students not knowing how to use online information. This is closer to Professor Brabazon's argument than to Keen's specific claim and finds no grounding in his statement.

(a) focuses on amateurism and whilst this is a label Keen applies, it is not the core of his criticism. Calling something amateur describes its origin, not the specific problem it creates.

(b) focuses on easy availability. But access is not the problem, and Keen seems to be suggesting that the issue is what happens when everything that is available presents itself as equally authoritative.

So we are left with (d) and (c) as the two remaining candidates.

(c) is tempting, as 'a billion' does suggest that volume is part of the problem. However, we need to go back to the core of the criticism: these are not just a billion truths, they are a billion personalised truths. The issue is not simply that there is too much information in the world, but that the information each of us encounters has been tailored specifically to us. This means that not only can we not determine which truth to trust, we may not even be encountering the same 'truths' as one another.

This is fundamentally a problem of authority. When your information landscape is personalised and mine is different, there is no shared standard against which either of us can measure what we are being told. Nothing carries the weight of common, verifiable truth. (d) captures this most precisely, and is therefore the correct answer.



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Pilgrims and Pioneers

### Q1.

This question asks which word does not advance the argument in the first three paragraphs. It is a structural question and you're asking whether it moves the argument logically forward toward its conclusion.

Working through the options, (a) "However" signals a shift from the idealised picture of American pioneer life to a qualification of it: the lyric, we are told, substituted enthusiasm for accuracy. This contrast is a distinct logical step and moves the argument forward.

(b) "Also" introduces an additional piece of evidence: that educational facilities were fragmented and far from universal. Mapped onto the argument's structure, this is a further premise supporting the same conclusion. It advances.

(c) "Even" is doing similar work in the second paragraph, as it marks a development of the point about women's changing roles, extending the claim beyond the pioneering era itself and reinforcing the argument about self-reliance. It advances.

(d) "Yet" introduces the third paragraph's central tension: despite the gains in social standing and self-reliance described above, women's legal position remained anachronistic. This is a distinct and significant step in the argument. It advances.

(e) "Ironically" is the correct answer, but the reason requires careful thought. It provides additional detail about a point already established: that women faced entrenched male prejudice. However, it does not introduce a new premise or move us closer to the passage's conclusion. It elaborates rather than advances.

The answer is (e).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Pilgrims and Pioneers

### Q2.

This question resembles the opposition question in Passage 1. You are looking at the relationship between pairs of ideas as the writer presents them, not as you might understand them in isolation.

- (a) presents freer attitudes in direct association with escaping religious and political oppression in Europe. The passage frames these as connected: pioneers who had fled oppression developed freer attitudes as a result. The relationship is distinct and contrasting.
- (b) uses the construction "rather than", so self-reliance is presented as an alternative to over-sentimentalised femininity, with the former explicitly preferred. The opposition is direct.
- (c) uses "no longer", meaning that real partnership in marriage replaced domination, pampering, and pedestals. The relationship is one of replacement, which is a form of opposition.
- (d) requires closer attention to context. The passage describes women being hampered by restrictive clothing, and then presents the move toward functional clothing explicitly as a response to "the stupidities of dress." Functional is offered as the correction to restrictive, so the relationship is still contrasting, even though this is signalled by context, not a single word.
- (e) is the answer. The passage states that the Bloomer "became synonymous with the demand for physical and psychological emancipation." The word "and" signals not opposition but association: physical and psychological emancipation are presented as two aspects of the same thing.

The answer is (e).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Pilgrims and Pioneers

### Q3.

The word "main" is important here. Several arguments appear in the passage, and your task is not simply to find one that is present but to identify the one that runs through the passage as a whole.

(e) is eliminated first. The inability to vote is mentioned, but minimally. It does not drive the passage's argument and cannot be considered its main point.

(c) has similar problems. Restrictive clothing is discussed at length in the fourth paragraph, but this reads as an example, rather than the central argument. It also fails to account for the majority of the passage's content.

(a) appears in the third paragraph and provides support for the argument about women's legal position, but it is not itself the main argument. It functions as evidence rather than a conclusion.

(d) goes too far. The passage mentions slavery and women's suffrage as movements that were often interrelated, but it does not directly compare the position of women with the position of slaves. That is an inference the passage does not support.

(b) is confirmed by the structure of the passage as a whole. The opening paragraphs establish that women had become more self-reliant (real partners in marriage, active in pioneer life, increasingly independent in spirit), yet the third paragraph then introduces the central tension with: despite all of this, their legal position remained as anachronistic and degrading as in early Victorian England. The rest of the passage develops and supports this point.

The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Pilgrims and Pioneers

### Q4.

This question requires an extremely close reading of a single sentence.

(e) can be eliminated immediately. The word "ironically" does not appear in connection with Mrs Bloomer or the garment named after her.

(a) can be set aside quickly. The irony does not concern the location where Mrs Mott and Mrs Cady Stanton met. The fact that they met in England rather than America is incidental, not the point.

(b) is tempting but fails on close reading. Mrs Mott and Mrs Cady Stanton were the **organisers** of the Women's Rights Convention, and so they were not prevented from attending it as outsiders! They were barred from participating in the Anti-Slavery Convention in London, which is where they met. The irony is located there, not at Seneca Falls.

Now look closely at the distinction between (c) and (d). Both involve male prejudice, but they emphasise different things. (c) states simply that Mrs Mott and Mrs Cady Stanton were victims of male prejudice. This is true, but it is not the irony: being a victim of prejudice is not in itself ironic.

(d) identifies the irony precisely. The men who barred these women from participating were "sufficiently progressive to seek the abolition of slavery", yet they would not permit women to speak. The irony is structural: the very people advocating freedom for one group were simultaneously denying it to another.

The answer is (d).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Helicopter Parents

### Q1.

The question asks which passage implies but does not state that helicopter parents are financially well off. This means the wrong answers will fall into one of two categories: passages that state it explicitly, or passages that neither imply nor state it at all.

(a) passage A specifies parents who earn "at least £63,000 a year." This is a direct statement, not an implication, so (a) is eliminated.

(b) neither implies nor states financial wealth. Passage B discusses behaviour at careers fairs and university settings without any reference to the economic position of the parents involved.

(d) similarly neither implies nor states it. Passage D is written from a parent's perspective and focuses on the demands schools place on parents and financial status is not referenced or implied.

(c) is correct. Passage C does not mention money or income directly. However, the headmistress of Cheltenham Ladies' College describes sending children to boarding school as "the least selfish thing" a parent can do. By presenting boarding school as the solution to helicopter parenting, the passage assumes without stating it that the parents in question can afford to do so. The financial position of helicopter parents is implied through the nature of the advice given rather than declared outright.

The answer is (c).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Helicopter Parents

### Q2.

The most effective strategy here is to begin with the answer that makes the fewest claims. because if any single passage contradicts it, it is eliminated. Start with D.

Passage D does not mention university applications, does not suggest that children need support for everything they do. Rather, it implies that teachers assume this and contact parents accordingly. However, it does not mention loneliness, and does not mention material possessions. (d) is eliminated.

Working through the remaining options against all four passages, (a) is too specific to passages A and B. (b) is not supported by passage D. (c) equally is only found in the other passages.

(e) is the one point that can be drawn from all four passages. Passage A argues that children who are constantly overseen cannot acquire independence or coping skills. Passage B describes parents managing university applications and salary negotiations that young adults should be handling themselves. Passage C warns that helicopter parenting prevents children from becoming self-sufficient. Passage D, though written sympathetically toward parents, implies through its list of school-parent contacts that children are not being left to manage ordinary difficulties independently.

The answer is (e).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Helicopter Parents

### Q3.

(e) can be eliminated immediately as boarding school is mentioned in passage C, not in the final sentence of passage D.

(a) may be implied by the passage as a whole, but the final sentence does not make this point specifically. Restrict your attention to that sentence alone.

(c) is an inference that goes beyond what the sentence states or implies. The sentence prior raises the possibility of legal consequences for parents; not the final sentence itself.

(d) is the answer by elimination, and it is well supported on reflection. The final sentence implies that teacher behaviour has contributed to the situation. If teachers consistently contact parents over matters that could be resolved with the child directly, they are training parents to be involved at every turn. The implied argument is that if teachers resolved more issues with the child rather than the parent, the phenomenon of helicopter parenting might be less pronounced.

The answer is (d).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Helicopter Parents

### Q4.

The question asks what all three of passages A, B and C would agree with — meaning you must test each option against all three, not just the most obvious one.

(a) is stated explicitly in passage A, but is not mentioned in passage B or C. A point that appears in only one passage cannot be something all three agree on.

(c) is specific to passage C, where the headmistress discusses the trend of parents treating children as "mini-counsellors." Neither passage A nor passage B makes this point.

(d) is present in passage A but is not a claim made explicitly in passages B or C.

(e) is too narrow. Passage B focuses on careers and employment rather than education, and passage C speaks more broadly about self-sufficiency than about education in particular.

(b) is confirmed across all three. Passage A argues directly that helicopter parents fail to prepare children properly for the adult world. Passage B demonstrates this through the specific example of parents managing graduate job applications, which are tasks that represent the transition to adult independence. Passage C states that helicopter parenting prevents children from growing into healthy, self-sufficient adults, explicitly framing this as a failure of preparation.

The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Car Ownership

### Q1.

The question asks which example does not illustrate China's actual growth in car usage. The word "actual" is doing important work here, and it is easy to overlook under timed conditions. Most students will work through options (a) to (d) and leave (e) until last, assuming it obviously illustrates growth. But when you return to the passage and locate the relevant sentence, you find that the Chinese planner's statement refers to 'in 20 years time'. A prediction is not the same as evidence of something that has occurred. Option (e) is therefore the answer, but it is worth confirming this by working through the others.

(a) describes a change that has already happened, with the past tense signalling that this is a contrast between then and now. It illustrates actual growth.

(b) requires attention to context. Shanghai being compared to Lagos or Cairo might seem like a simple geographical observation, but the passage is specific: the comparison concerns traffic, noise, and air pollution. Lagos and Cairo are invoked as places known for these particular conditions, making this a description of the current state of Chinese cities. It illustrates actual growth.

(c) and (d) are described as things Chinese cities are actively doing in response to increasing car numbers. Both illustrate actual growth.

The answer is (e).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Car Ownership

### Q1.

The question asks for the main cause of the problem posed by cars today. Before working through the options, it is worth locating the problem itself in the passage: environmental harm, and specifically greenhouse gas emissions. You are looking for the primary source of that problem as the writer presents it, not a future projection or a secondary contributor.

(a) refers to the car fleets of Brazil, Indonesia, South Africa, and Nigeria. The passage describes these as growing at similar rates to India, but the figures given make clear that they remain negligible compared to Western levels. This is about future potential, not the current main cause.

(c) is promising at first glance, but the passage contextualises this immediately: even with that rate of growth, India has only one car per thousand people. Rapid growth from a very low base does not make India the main cause.

(d) can be set aside because the passage states directly that the US is "by far the greatest source" of emissions, therefore EU countries are not the main cause.

(e) faces the same difficulty as (c) and (d). The passage situates Chinese ownership at a fraction of Western levels.

(b) is confirmed by the passage's own words: "the US is by far the greatest source." The passage does not hedge this claim or qualify it, it is stated plainly as fact.

The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Car Ownership

### Q3.

The temptation with this question is to move straight to the final paragraph, where McKillop discusses the impossibility of developing countries reaching Western ownership levels. But the answer is stated more clearly and directly in the second-to-last paragraph, which reads: "this growth will be an impossibility. At the simplest level, there will not be enough oil."

That phrase "at the simplest level" is significant – the writer is telling you directly that this is the primary reason, before the more complex arguments that follow.

(b) receives little attention in the passage. There is no sustained argument about affordability, so this can be set aside.

(c) is tempting because the passage does describe car growth as "a serious threat to the global environment." However, look closely at the scope of the claim: the passage says it would be a threat, and when you trace the argument, the environmental threat is presented as a consequence of the oil demand problem, not the reason why such ownership levels are impossible. The passage's causal chain runs from car growth to oil demand to impossibility, not from car growth to environmental threat to impossibility.

(d) faces the same difficulty as (c). The threat to international stability is also presented as a consequence of the impact on oil demand, not as an independent reason why Western ownership levels cannot be reached.

(e) may seem plausible, but other than a reference to crisis in the title of McKillop's book, the passage does not actually argue that a crisis is already underway. Stick to what the text proves!

The answer is (a).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Car Ownership

### Q4.

The question asks which of the following is a fact, meaning something the passage presents as verifiably true. Each option needs to be tested against the language the passage uses to introduce it.

(a) is tempting because it is specific and numerical. However, the passage introduces it with the word "reportedly": a qualifier that signals the writer is not asserting this as a confirmed fact but relaying an unverified claim. It is not presented as fact.

(b) is introduced with "commentators suggest." A suggestion is an opinion, not a fact, however well-informed its source.

(c) is qualified by the phrase "making it unlikely." Likelihood is not certainty, and the passage does not present this as an established fact.

(d) appears twice in the passage, but on each occasion it is attributed either to Abraham's estimate or to McKillop's calculations. Both are presented as expert opinion rather than verified fact.

(e) is the answer. The passage states that "at current consumption rates, the estimate of 3.5 billion motor vehicles would increase world oil consumption by about 70%." Note where the estimation lies: it concerns the number of vehicles, not the statistic about the increase in oil consumption. The calculation (that 3.5 billion vehicles would increase consumption by approximately 70%) is presented as a derived and verifiable figure rather than a projection or opinion.

The answer is (e).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Right and Wrong Language

### Q1 + 2 - See LNAT Commentary

### Q3.

This is a writer's purpose question. You are not simply asked what the example says, but what role it plays in the wider argument. The most effective approach is to read the example in its context and then reformulate it in your own words before looking at the answer choices.

The writer's point, put plainly, is this: a foreigner who has been taught grammatically correct English often sounds strange to native speakers, because native speakers are accustomed to contractions and informal constructions that are technically incorrect but entirely normalised in everyday speech. In other words, what is grammatically wrong can be more natural-sounding than what is grammatically right. The foreigner's correct English draws attention to itself precisely because we do not actually speak the way the grammar books say we should.

With that reformulation in mind, work through the options.

(a) suggests that incorrect English is confusing. This is the opposite of the point being made: it is the foreigner's correct English that causes confusion, not their incorrect English. (a) is wrong.

(c) suggests that using "I ain't" and similar phrases is more confusing. Again, this is the reverse of the argument. The example is used to show that "I ain't" is less likely to cause confusion because it is familiar to native speakers. (c) is wrong.

(d) states that we can all agree such English is incorrect. But the passage is explicit that "some people would not be in the slightest bit upset" by forms like "I ain't". Indeed, some would find them more normal than the supposedly correct alternatives. The claim is absolute, and the passage does not support it.

(e) misreads the example entirely. The point is not that foreigners cannot speak correct English, it is that speaking correct English may actually make them harder to understand, because native speakers do not use it themselves!

(b) is confirmed by the argument as reformulated above. The example of the foreigner illustrates that using "I ain't" and similar phrases is less likely to cause confusion than a grammatically correct but unfamiliar construction. The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Right and Wrong Language

### Q4.

This is a structure question. The most effective approach is to map the second paragraph as a sequence of premises and a conclusion, and then test each option against that structure. You are looking for the step that does not advance the argument but instead provides evidence for a point already made.

Begin with (a). The sentence "But what is it that makes them mistakes or errors?" follows the writer's description of various condemned usages. The word "but" signals a move away from the previous point, and in context this sentence opens a new line of enquiry rather than providing evidence for an existing one. It advances the argument, so (a) is not the answer.

(b) follows directly from (a). The writer draws a comparison between actions we know to be illegal (driving through a traffic light, theft, harm to another person etc) and the use of incorrect language. The point being made is a distinction: we have clear punishment for those actions, but no equivalent punishment for wrong language. This is a positive step forward in the argument, not a piece of supporting evidence for something already established. (b) advances the argument.

(c) is the most promising candidate. The sentence about schoolteachers having the authority to enforce language rules within the classroom does not introduce a new step in the argument. Rather, it provides evidence for the point already made in (b) by acknowledging the one narrow context in which a form of authority does exist, only to confirm that it is limited and does not extend beyond it. It supports the previous claim rather than moving us forward. This is the answer.

(d) uses the word "even": a signal that the writer is extending and advancing the argument. The point is that even in countries where language regulators have existed, their authority was not taken seriously. This adds a new premise: P1, authorities exist; P2, even where they do, they are not taken seriously. It advances the argument.

(e) again uses "but" to signal a forward movement. We move from the existence of a hypothetical language authority to the fact that English people probably still would not accept it. This is a distinct step forward.

The answer is (c).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## A Global Dilemma

### Q1.

The temptation with this question is to consult the table about climate change that appears in the middle of the passage. But the question asks about the prisoner's dilemma table, which is set out separately in the first paragraph of the passage. Return to that paragraph first and use it to check each box in turn.

Working through the table systematically, (a) is confirmed by the passage, which states that if neither admits to the crime, both receive a short sentence for a minor charge. (a) is correct.

(b) is confirmed by the passage, which states that if one testifies for the prosecution and the other remains silent, the betrayer walks free and the other receives the full sentence. (b) is correct.

(c) follows the same logic as (b) with the positions reversed, and is equally confirmed by the passage. (c) is correct.

(d) states that both receive a few years in jail when both betray each other. The passage states that if both betray each other, they receive a medium-length sentence. A medium-length sentence sits between a short sentence and the full sentence. In other words, between less than a year and many years. A few years is a reasonable description of this middle position. (d) is correct.

Since all four individual boxes are confirmed, the answer is (e)



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## A Global Dilemma

### Q2.

The phrase "the only possible solution" appears in the paragraph directly beneath the climate change table. To identify what problem the writer is proposing a solution to, you need to work backwards through the surrounding text rather than simply selecting the most prominent theme. The sentence immediately before refers to climate change as a global issue, and the table itself is concerned throughout with the difficulty of addressing climate change when countries act in isolation rather than together. The problem, as the writer frames it, is adverse climate change itself and the proposed solution is global cooperation to address it.

(a) is too specific and is not identified in the passage as the problem to which global cooperation is the answer.

© is better understood as a contributing cause of the problem rather than the problem itself.

(d) and (e) are not presented as the core problem. Economic consequences are discussed as reasons why countries are reluctant to act, not as the problem that cooperation would solve.

(b) is confirmed by the passage's framing throughout. The table, the surrounding paragraphs, and the writer's conclusion all point to adverse climate change as the central issue.

The answer is (b).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## A Global Dilemma

### Q3.

To answer this question, use both the climate change table and the explanatory paragraph that follows it. The question asks what a rich nation that alone stopped producing emissions completely would probably do, according to the writer.

Locate the relevant scenario in the table: if Country P acts to prevent climate change but Country Q does not, P has to spend more money and its economy falls behind that of Q. The paragraph beneath the table makes this point directly: "if a lone country tries to tackle the problem on its own it will cost a lot of money and put its future at risk."

The question specifies a reduction of approximately 6% in total worldwide emissions. This is a small fraction of global output, which means the environmental impact of this single country's action would be negligible.

(a) is contradicted by the passage, which suggests that unilateral action has little impact on the global problem.

(b) uses the word "halt," which is far too strong. A 6% reduction in total emissions would not bring climate change to a stop, and the passage does not suggest that unilateral action could achieve this. Equally, © has no evidential basis in the passage. The writer's argument is in fact the opposite: that countries are unwilling to commit to cooperative action.

(d) is confirmed by both the table and the explanatory paragraph. A country acting alone would bear significant costs while others benefited without contributing, causing its economy to fall behind.

The answer is (d).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Thomas Aquinas

### Q1.

The question asks which option best sums up the idea of infinite regress, and "best sums up" is a reminder that the match may not be perfect! Before looking at the answer choices, put the idea in your own words. The passage tells us that all three arguments "involve an infinite regress - the answer to a question raises a prior question, and so on ad infinitum." In plain terms, infinite regress is the process of constantly asking "but what caused that?" and never being able to stop. Every answer simply generates another question, going backwards indefinitely.

With that reformulation in mind, work through the options.

(a) is a premise from the Cosmological Argument, not a description of infinite regress itself. Set it aside.

(b) is tempting because it mentions a first move, which sounds like the beginning of a chain. But notice the direction. Infinite regress works backwards: what caused A? B caused A. What caused B? C caused B, and so on. The idea of something making "the first move" is actually Aquinas' proposed solution to the problem of infinite regress, not a description of the regress itself. This is also where (e) falls down: the "only escape is God" is Aquinas' answer to infinite regress, not a description of what infinite regress means.

(c) captures one element of the idea, namely that the process goes on forever. But it is only part of the picture. It does not explain what is actually repeating infinitely.

(d) maps most closely onto the reformulation above. It captures the essential mechanism: every cause requires a prior cause, which requires a prior cause, which requires a prior cause. That is infinite regress.

The answer is (d).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Thomas Aquinas

### Q2.

The question narrows the scope to the first three arguments only, and asks for the main flaw. This matters because the passage does identify several problems, so your task is to locate the one the writer presents as most significant.

The key sentence is this: "Even if we allow the dubious luxury of arbitrarily conjuring up a terminator to an infinite regress and giving it a name, simply because we need one, there is absolutely no reason to endow that terminator with any of the properties normally ascribed to God."

Notice what the writer is doing here. He is conceding, for the sake of argument, that Aquinas might be right that a terminator is needed. He is granting that much. And he is still saying that even if you accept all of that, you have no grounds for then giving that terminator the qualities of God: omnipotence, omniscience, goodness, and so on. The other flaws are present in the passage, but this is the one the writer explicitly flags as the decisive point. The answer is (d).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Thomas Aquinas

### Q3.

The introduction to the Aquinas section tells us that the first three arguments "all involve an infinite regress." This means the fourth argument does not, and that is your starting point for identifying the main difference.

(a) suggests that the argument from degree deals with questions of morality. Morality is the subject matter of the example, but it is not what structurally distinguishes this argument from the first three.

(b) suggests that the argument from degree relies on an invalid comparison, and this requires care with terminology. In logic, "valid" has a specific meaning: an argument is valid if the conclusion follows from the premises, regardless of whether those premises are true. The writer is not saying the comparison is logically invalid in that sense; he is saying the argument is unsound and leads to absurd conclusions.

(c) suggests that the argument assumes we understand divine qualities. This is touched on in the passage but is not presented as the main point of difference between this argument and the first three.

(d) suggests that the argument can be used to reach fatuous conclusions. This is about the consequence of the argument rather than its structure. The writer uses the smelliness example to show that you can plug any dimension of comparison into Aquinas' logic and reach a ridiculous conclusion. That is a critique of the argument's soundness, but it is not what distinguishes it structurally from the first three.

(e) is confirmed by the introduction. The first three arguments all depend on the idea of an infinite regress that requires a terminator. The argument from degree does not work this way; it relies instead on a comparison with a maximum. The structural difference is the absence of infinite regress.

The answer is (e).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Thomas Aquinas

### Q4.

Start by breaking down the argument in the Edward Lear paragraph. The writer introduces the idea that some regresses do reach a natural terminator. Gold can only be divided so far before it is no longer gold, and the atom provides that natural stopping point. He then applies this logic to Aquinas: it is by no means clear that God provides the same kind of natural terminator to Aquinas' regresses.

(e) can be set aside. The atom as a natural terminator of physical substances is a point made in the paragraph, but it is a supporting example rather than the main argument. You would not sum up the paragraph's purpose in those terms.

(a) suggests that the idea of infinite regress is nonsense. This is not the writer's target here. He is not attacking the concept of infinite regress; he is questioning whether God is the appropriate terminator for the specific regresses Aquinas describes.

(d) suggests that Aquinas' regresses are not really regresses at all. This misrepresents the argument. The writer is not saying that Aquinas is wrong to identify a regress. He is saying that God is not necessarily the natural answer to it.

That leaves (b) and (c), and the distinction between them comes down to one word.

"Meaningless" would suggest that the concept of God as terminator makes no sense at all.

"Unnecessary" suggests that it simply is not required; the terminator does not need to be God.

When you return to the passage's closing sentence, "it is by no means clear that God provides a natural terminator," the writer is not saying the idea of God is without meaning. He is saying it is not clear that we need it.

The answer is (c).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Faith and the Theologian

### Q1.

The key word in this question is "necessary." A necessary link means that without one thing, the other cannot exist; the two are inseparable. Keep that definition in mind as you work through the options.

(e) can be set aside quickly. The first paragraph is explicit that theology "is not an esoteric subject intelligible only to a select group of believers," which rules out any suggestion that theology is necessarily limited to a particular community of faith.

(d) covers religion and faith. This is not the relationship the passage explores. The passage does mention religious faith, but it does not argue that faith is a prerequisite for religion more broadly. The direction of the argument runs the other way.

(c) covers theology and religion, and it is the most tempting wrong answer, so it is worth slowing down here. The passage states that "theology is parasitic upon religion," which sounds like a necessary link. But parasitic is not the same as necessary. In this context, parasitic means relying upon or feeding off something; it describes a dependency, but not a mutual one. More importantly, the sentence that follows is the one that matters: "if there were no religious faith, there would be no theology."

Look closely at the language. The passage does not say "if there were no religion, there would be no theology." It says religious faith, which in context means a personal belief in the doctrines of a religion, rather than religion as an organised system of attitudes and practices. And the passage goes further, stating that "faith is a prerequisite for the proper prosecution of the theologian's task." That is a direct statement of necessity between faith and theology.

The answer is (a).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Faith and the Theologian

### Q2 - See LNAT Commentary

### Q3.

Before looking at the answer choices, reformulate what the question is asking. You are looking for a quotation that supports the idea that faith is a prerequisite; in other words, that a theologian needs to have faith in the first place in order to do their job properly. The question is about whether faith is required at all, not about what kind of faith is best or how it should be held.

(a) is immediately compelling. The statement that most theologians are practising members of the religion whose theology they study directly supports the idea that faith and theology go together. It is offered as evidence of a close and necessary connection. Keep it as the leading candidate.

(b) is the quotation "this is not an easy thing to achieve, nor is it without its dangers." This is about the difficulty of maintaining detachment alongside faith. It assumes faith is already present and says nothing about whether faith is a prerequisite in the first place.

(c) is the quotation "too fanatical a faith is equally unlikely to contribute to the making of the theologian." This is about the nature and degree of faith, not about whether faith is required at all. It is a qualification, not a statement of prerequisite.

(d) is about how a theologian should hold their faith, with a capacity for detachment. Again, this assumes faith is already present. The theologian has already satisfied the prerequisite; this quotation is about what comes next.

(e) refers to uncritical religion rather than to faith, and does not speak to the question of prerequisite at all.

(a) remains the strongest answer. It directly supports the proposition that faith comes first, by observing that the overwhelming majority of theologians are themselves believers.

The answer is (a).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Theories of Colour

### Q1.

This question requires you to be particularly careful about two things: whose view is being expressed, and whether it reflects the current understanding or a historical one.

(a) suggests a wholly subjective phenomenon. This looks promising at first, but pay attention to the scope of the word "wholly." The passage does describe a subjective or mental theory of colour, but this is Goethe's theory, not the writer's. And the writer tells us explicitly that Goethe "made a great error" in proposing it.

(b) has the same problem. The description of colour as a pseudo-scientific phenomenon is again the writer's characterisation of Goethe's position, and again it is presented as wrong. It is a historical view that has been superseded, not the current one.

(d) can be set aside because the writer uses the word "illusion" as a rhetorical tool, not as a scientific conclusion. The passage does not argue that seeing colour is nothing more than an optical illusion. It argues that there is a physiological mechanism that explains what is actually happening.

(e) refers to a mysterious influence in the brain, which is closer to Goethe's intuition than to what Land and subsequent researchers established. The passage presents that era as one that lacked the physiological understanding that came later.

(c) is confirmed by the passage's account of Land's work. Goethe was "wholly ignorant of what physiological mechanisms could allow such an inference," but Land was able to provide "an objective explanation such as Goethe could not," precisely because the advances in physiology and psychophysics had by then been made. The rest of the paragraph then sets out the physiological mechanism in detail.

The answer is (c).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Theories of Colour

### Q2.

Start by ruling out what the modern theory of colour vision does not depend on. The passage makes clear that classical theories for mixing coloured lights were the starting point that Land's experiment overturned, so (a) can be set aside. Land's experiments are the means by which the mechanism was discovered, not the mechanism itself, so (b) is also not the answer.

That leaves (c), (d) and (e), all of which are drawn from the passage's account of the physiological process. However, after the breaking down of the experiment, the passage then states: "it is the brain's act of comparing these three records that forms the basis of our inference or judgement of colour." The word "basis" tells you that the comparison is the foundation of the whole process; it is what colour vision ultimately depends on. (c) describes the brain recognising different wavelengths of light, which is not quite the same thing. (e) describes perception by the retina's receptors, which is an earlier step in the process rather than the basis of the final judgement.

The answer is (d).



# LawPrep Academy

[www.lawprepacademy.co.uk](http://www.lawprepacademy.co.uk)

---

## Theories of Colour

### Q3.

This question is specifically about what Goethe realised from his observations. Not what scientists understood later, and not what we can say with the benefit of hindsight.

(a) states that Goethe realised his observations represented a physiological mystery. But the passage tells us he was "wholly ignorant of what physiological mechanisms could allow such an inference." If he was ignorant of physiology, he could not have identified his observations as a physiological mystery. (a) is wrong.

(b) suggests that Goethe thought his observations were inexplicable. But that is not quite right either. The passage does not say he found them inexplicable. He found existing theories inadequate and wrong, which is a different thing. He thought he had an explanation; it just happened to be the wrong one.

(c) suggests that he realised he needed an advance in psychophysics. This faces the same problem as (a). Goethe was unaware of what the science of his day could not yet provide. He could not have identified a need for advances he did not know were missing.

(e) can be eliminated because Goethe explicitly rejected the idea that colour was a simple sensation. The passage states that he "was intensely aware that there was not any simple equivalence of wavelength and colour." He did not suggest colour was simple; quite the opposite.

(d) is confirmed by the passage. Goethe proposed "an entire mental or subjective theory of colour," and the passage tells us he felt, intuitively, that colour was an "inference" or "act of judgement." He was right that a mental process was involved. His error was in bypassing physiology to get there.

The answer is (d).