



ABILITY TEST REPORT

Legal Critical Thinking Test

Feedback for

Sam Sample

About this report

This report gives you feedback on the Legal Critical Thinking Test you completed on 17 October 2026. It is written for you, and it is yours to keep. The organisation that invited you to take the test will let you know about the next steps in your application separately.

What the test measured

Five things that come up wherever facts, documents and arguments have to be weighed in legal work:

- Making deductions -- for example, deciding whether a conclusion must follow from a set of statements.
- Recognising assumptions -- for example, deciding whether a speaker must be taking something for granted.
- Evaluating arguments -- for example, deciding whether an argument for or against a decision is strong or weak.
- Drawing inferences -- for example, judging how likely a statement is to be true from the facts in a short passage.
- Interpreting information -- for example, deciding whether a conclusion really follows from a short summary or set of figures.

No legal knowledge was needed. Everything you needed was in the passage on the screen.

What your results suggest

Your result suggests you handle straightforward reasoning reliably. The marks that are easiest to gain are on the questions with a trap in them -- a conclusion that goes a step too far, an assumption that is plausible but not needed, a rule run backwards -- and the following page is aimed at exactly those.

Areas to develop

Whatever your result, all five of the things the test measured improve quickly with regular practice on ordinary, everyday material -- you don't need specialist resources to work on them.

The suggestions below are in order, based on your results: the first area is where you are likely to benefit most from further development.

Making deductions. A conclusion follows only if there is no way the statements could be true and the conclusion false; look for that way out before you accept it. *Try this:* take an 'if... then...' rule from everyday life -- a parking sign, a shop's returns policy -- and write down what it tells you, and what it does not, when the 'then' part has happened.

Recognising assumptions. An assumption is something the statement cannot do without -- if it were false, the statement would stop making sense. *Try this:* when you next hear a recommendation at work or in the news, ask 'what would have to be true for this to work?' and write down the one thing it most depends on.

Evaluating arguments. A strong argument is both important and directly about the decision in hand; a true statement can still be a weak argument if it is beside the point. *Try this:* pick a decision being debated in the news, write down the best argument on each side, and ask of each: is it about this decision, and would it matter if it were true?

Drawing inferences. Ask not only whether a statement is true but how sure the facts let you be; 'probably' needs a clear reason in the text, such as a stated rate or usual practice. *Try this:* take a news report and write three statements about it -- one it proves, one it makes likely, and one it does not settle -- and note the words in the report that decide each.

Interpreting information. Watch for the conclusion that goes one step further than the information -- a cause read into a link, a few cases taken as the rule, one year's finding applied to the next. *Try this:* when you read a headline built on a survey or a set of figures, ask how many cases it rests on and whether it shows a link or a cause.

These five habits -- ask how sure the facts let you be, find what is taken for granted, look for the way out of a conclusion, stop where the information stops, and weigh an argument on its relevance -- are what sound legal reasoning is built on. They are learned by doing, and they transfer to any role that calls on them. We hope this feedback is useful, and we wish you well with your application.