

# 22 Complete a passage with a warranted inference

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ **Total: 13 marks**

**KEY WORDS** warranted inference • transition • inference  
• evidence

## Objective

- Combine stated facts to draw a supported conclusion
- Distinguish necessary support from a plausible outside explanation
- Preserve uncertainty and avoid causal overstatement

Original public practice; marks below are classroom self-check points, not official criteria.

## 1 Key knowledge and worked examples


Separate the facts stated from the connection you must infer. If two observations establish a contrast, the conclusion should preserve that contrast. Write a short bridge linking the evidence before reading the options; this makes an attractive but unrelated explanation easier to detect.

An inference need not copy a sentence verbatim, but each essential step must be supported. A passage saying a tool detects a feature missed by another supports a difference in detection, not that the first tool is superior for every purpose. Domain knowledge cannot fill an unstated requirement.

Track qualifiers and alternative explanations. A pattern can suggest a possibility rather than establish certainty. If the passage acknowledges several possible causes, a completion blaming one cause exclusively is too strong. Check whether an option introduces new people, settings, motives or time periods.

For a conclusion at the end of a short passage, inspect the logical transition : therefore requests a consequence, while however may introduce a limitation. A grammatically smooth continuation can still be logically unsupported. Prefer the option whose claims require the fewest unsupported assumptions while fully answering the task.

A warranted inference connects supplied facts without importing a cause. “Short labels helped beginners; experts preferred detailed labels” supports a benefit depending on reader experience. It does not support “short labels are always best” or “experts dislike museums”.



*Original diagram of the worked relationship; read the full wording and qualifications.*

Worked example from the native lesson: Original passage: “Two sensors monitored the same bridge. Sensor A recorded brief vibrations that Sensor B did not register, but Sensor B operated successfully during colder periods when A stopped recording.” Warranted conclusion: the sensors had complementary strengths under the observed conditions. It does not follow that either is universally more accurate or that temperature caused every difference in detection.

### ■ Complete original case context

Original passage: A workshop offered a printed diagram and an animated demonstration of a folding process. Participants using the animation began the first fold sooner on average. However, when asked to repair a mistake later, participants using the diagram more often returned to the correct earlier step without help. The groups were small, and the organisers did not report whether participants had equal experience. They concluded that choosing a teaching aid should take account of the stage of the task.

## 2 Practice

**2.1** Original passage: “Rare requests took longer with the new system, although common requests were processed faster.” What follows? [1]

- **A** Users stopped making rare requests.
- **B** Rare requests caused the system’s creation.
- **C** Its speed advantage depended on the request type.
- **D** It was faster for every request.

**2.2** Which phrase best preserves uncertain evidence? [1]

- **A** The findings prove the only cause.
- **B** The findings settle every future case.
- **C** The findings eliminate all alternatives.
- **D** The findings suggest a possible connection.

**2.3** An inference should follow from the passage’s \_\_\_\_\_. [1]

**2.4** A plausible outside explanation is enough for a passage-based inference. [1]

**3 Exam-style questions**

Use the complete original case context in section 1.

**3.1** Complete the conclusion with a warranted inference about the two aids. [3]

**3.2** Explain why “animations prevent mistakes” and “diagrams are useless for starting” are both unsupported. [3]

**3.3** A new study balances prior experience and finds equal correction rates. Explain how this affects the earlier conclusion without claiming the first observations were fabricated.[3]

## Solutions

---

Authored self-check guidance: accept equivalent correct methods and supported interpretations. The points check reasoning, not an official grade.

**2.1 C** – The contrast supports a conditional advantage, not a universal one. A invents changed demand; B invents the reason for creating the system; D contradicts slower rare requests.

Correct response linked to the given case.

**2.2 D** – Suggest and possible retain uncertainty. A claims unique causation; B extends certainty to every future case; C rules out alternatives without evidence. All exceed uncertain findings.

Correct response linked to the given case.

**2.3** evidence – The conclusion must be connected to supplied information.

Correct response linked to the given case.

**2.4** False – Plausibility alone does not show support in the text.

Correct response linked to the given case.

**3.1** The animation may help people begin, while the diagram may help them revisit earlier steps during correction. The evidence supports different observed advantages, qualified by the small, potentially unequal groups.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.

**3.2** The study reports correction performance, not the absence of mistakes. Starting sooner with animation does not establish that diagram users cannot start. Both statements replace relative observations with absolute claims.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.

**3.3** It weakens a general claim of diagram superiority for correction and raises experience as a possible explanation of the earlier difference. Different samples or methods can yield different results without making the first observations false.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.