**Activity 1.2: The Comparison Test**

**Objective**

To develop critical observation skills by analyzing side-by-side content and distinguishing between human-written work (characterized by nuance and genuine insight) and AI-generated content (characterized by pattern recognition and stylistic conformity).

**Timeline**

~10 minutes

**Materials**

Please refer to the Activity 2 material sheet.

**Instructions**

1. **Form Groups:** Groups (3-5 people) remain together.
2. **Analyze Content Pairs:** The facilitator displays a series of content pairs (e.g., a short article, a product description, a market summary). In each pair, one piece was written by a human expert and the other was generated by a Generative AI model.
3. **Identify the Author:** For each pair, groups must decide which piece is Human (H) and which is AI (A).
4. **List the Clues:** The critical step is for groups to list **3 specific, observable clues** that led them to their conclusion for each piece. (Examples of clues include: unique phrasing, use of clichés, emotional tone, depth of historical context, structural predictability.)

**Example Content Pairs (Facilitator Material)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pair Type** | **Clue Set 1 (AI Example Clues)** | **Clue Set 2 (Human Example Clues)** |
| **Short Article/Blog Post** | Overly generalized vocabulary (e.g., "seamless integration," "unprecedented opportunities"), predictable sentence structure, safe/neutral tone. | Strong, unique voice; a niche observation or specific, non-obvious example; complex syntax or a deliberate style choice. |
| **Market Analysis Summary** | Focuses heavily on summarizing easily-found statistics; uses vague qualifiers (e.g., "many experts agree"); lacks true forward-looking prediction. | Includes an opinion or judgment call based on tacit, unstated industry knowledge; uses industry-specific jargon correctly; provides a clear, biased recommendation. |
| **Company Bio/About Us** | Reads like a list of achievements; uses the same transition phrases repeatedly; sounds generic and easily adaptable to another company. | Shows genuine passion or a specific founding story; contains a subtle, self-deprecating humor; has a clear sense of internal culture or values. |

**Debrief Questions**

* Which specific content characteristic was the most reliable indicator of AI authorship? (e.g., predictable structure, use of common filler phrases)
* Were there any instances where the AI-generated content was *better* than the human content? If so, why (e.g., superior organization, clarity)?
* How does the need to look for these subtle **"tells"** impact your trust in unverified content you encounter daily?
* Now that you've seen the difference, how will you use a **human lens** to review AI-generated drafts in your own work?

**Key Take-away:**

AI systems excel at synthesis and structure (patterns), but they often lack the unique voice, genuine insight, and specific context that characterize high-value human communication. Critical thinking is required to bridge that gap.