COMPLETE FICTIONAL SAMPLE - not client work or measured results

20-minute activity: does polished writing make a claim trustworthy?

A complete activity linked to published episode 8, with facilitator guidance, a participant sheet and a worked example.

Scenario data and numbers in this sample are synthetic illustrations. The sample is free to read; tailored work requires a context review and agreement on scope, timing and fees.

01 / Audience, preparation and aim

Suggested audience: university students or educators in groups of 3-4. Aim: distinguish a claim from its evidence and identify checks before sharing. This activity alone does not measure long-term behaviour change.

Source: published episode 8, “Did a human write what you saw?”. Preview it and choose an excerpt of no more than two minutes, or the full video if shorter. Prepare the synthetic cards below and a sheet with four boxes.

02 / Synthetic exercise cards

Card A - Fictional promotional post: “This tool raises every student’s concentration by 80% in one week.” It has polished copy and an attractive image, but no study link, definition of concentration or measurement method. Do not attribute it to a real organization.

Card B - Synthetic methods note for this exercise: ten volunteers rated their perceived focus after using a tool. There was no comparison group, equivalent baseline or performance test. This is not a published study.

Card C - Verification prompt: where is the original source, what does the number mean, who was observed, is there a comparison, and what interest might the publisher have? Polished language cannot answer these questions.

COMPLETE FICTIONAL SAMPLE - not client work or measured results

03 / Facilitator guide: a 20-minute run

0-2: ask “What makes this post believable?” and collect two reasons without revealing a verdict. 2-4: show the selected episode excerpt.

4-7: groups read Card A and isolate the exact claim. 7-12: distribute B and C; each group completes its participant sheet.

12-16: two groups exchange sheets and challenge an inference that exceeds the evidence. 16-19: discuss whether to share or pause, and what is needed before relying on the claim. 19-20: complete the exit card.

04 / Participant sheet with a worked example

Box 1 - Claim: every student’s focus improves by 80% in a week. Box 2 - Available evidence: promotional wording and a synthetic self-report from ten volunteers; the cards provide no inspectable original source.

Box 3 - Missing: a definition of focus, suitable measure, baseline, comparison and participant-selection method. Box 4 - Provisional action: do not rely on or share the number as fact; request the source and methods and explain that current evidence is insufficient.

For use: give groups a fresh sheet with the four box headings and ask them to complete it in their own words. More than one justified action is possible; guessing that content is AI-generated is not the learning target.

05 / Review, exit and follow-up

Facilitator checks: is the claim precise, is evidence separate from impression, is there a feasible verification question, and is the action proportionate? Record descriptive feedback for each criterion without ranking individuals.

Exit card: “Before sharing a similar claim I will check…; if the source is missing I will…”. At a later meeting, discuss a public example selected by participants without collecting their accounts, messages or personal data.

Published source

https://tareqabushawish.com/podcast/did-a-human-write-what-you-saw