I - Compréhension guidée (15 points) — Vous répondrez aux questions en reformulant les propos des documents. Des réponses précises et concises sont attendues.

A) "AI slop is warping our view of history – our schools need a lesson in information literacy" — Adapted from *The Observer*, July 26th, 2026

The video on my screen purports to teach me about man's pre-civilisational past. The caption immerses the viewer in history: "POV: You wake up as a caveman in 40BC." Soon the screen is showing me a roughened hand – my own, supposedly – reaching out to greet a woolly mammoth. Soon after that, I'm taming a sabre-toothed tiger. I meet a fellow hunter, who shows up on screen with the glistening white teeth that can only denote an American of the 21st century. We eat something that looks suspiciously like a KFC chicken drumstick.

This is all, of course, not a possible vision of 40BC. The term "caveman", popular rather than academic, very loosely refers to humans who lived in the Paleolithic era, which ended in about 12000BC. The last woolly mammoths disappeared in approximately 4000BC and sabre toothed-tigers in 9000BC. In 40BC, Mark Antony left Cleopatra and wed the sister of his rival Octavian, and he didn't shack up in a cave with either woman. Although he probably had worse teeth than my caveman friend.

If your digital trail shows the slightest interest in history, AI history slop has started to populate your social media feeds. When the inaccuracies are as obvious and comical as a caveman wandering around in 40BC, the damage is limited. But what happens when Facebook starts trying to show you video recreations of the Cultural Revolution, the Great Famine in Ireland or the barracks at Auschwitz? What happens when the video it purports to show you of that history is a lie?

Trashy reimaginings of historical stories are not new, of course: they used to be called period drama. The release of any Hollywood historical blockbuster would be incomplete without a row over accuracy which can be a superb opportunity for a mass audience to grapple intelligently with the ways in which most history remains contested – as it should be. Christopher Nolan's The Odyssey, the movie of the summer, is just the latest in a long line of adaptations of what is a mythic poem, not a historical event (even if Elon Musk has not got the memo). Yet Nolan's epic has inspired thousands of people across the world to pick up a translation of the Odyssey and start bickering with each other about their ideal Odysseus. Any literary or historical movie has done its job when it has the whole internet arguing about ancient Greece – and reading more.

AI slop videos online, however, are doing something new and quite distinct from the world of Hollywood. The problem with AI history, as with all things on social media, is that it is shaped by algorithm, and imposes the prejudices of the political majority. As the historian Hallie Rubenfeld told me last week: "These reels and pictures have entered a space where fact and fiction are blurred and are becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish from one another." Most disturbingly of all, for those of us who value the study of history as a discipline, AI videos purport to inform while never showing us their sources.

Prof Anna Neovesky, one of the University of Erfurt academics behind the latest study of AI history, tells me that platforms should take more "responsibility to address fakes and mark AI-generated content". But all evidence so far has shown that this is unlikely, making it all the more vital that we educate students how to identify and assess the sources for the narratives they are absorbing.

To teach history in a world of AI, we should apply the same principles. Teach students to ask: what data has this AI video scraped? Whose agenda does it serve? The digital humanities specialist Melissa Terras calls this "information literacy". It is not an optional skill.

- **What is the point made by the author in the first two paragraphs ? (2 points)**

The author points out the historical inaccuracies AI slop is ridden/laden with. For him, AI history videos pushed by social media algorithms should not be taken as reliable educational content.

- **For the author, what is the difference between AI history slop and Hollywood movies ? (3 points)**

Both Hollywood movies and AI history videos are attempts at recreating and reimagining past events and can be highly inaccurate and distorted vision of the past. Yet, Hollywood movies don't pretend to be teaching material but still inspire debates and prompt watchers to document themselves. However, AI history slop is considered teaching material but it can be more problematic since it is algorithm-shaped and, as algorithms can be biased and don't show their sources, AI history slop should not be considered a reliable source of information. Moreover, they are often consumed alone, not starting any exchange on the topic.

- **What are the potential solutions to the issues raised by AI history slop, according to the article ? (5 points)**

The article emphasizes the need for online platforms to better manage the content they share, notably by dealing with fake news and notifying users when content is AI-made, though it may not happen anytime soon. Consequently, the responsibility of checking information is passed on to the users who should question the origins and the motives of AI history slop.

B) "Relying on AI chatbots for historical facts can influence your political beliefs, new study shows"— Adapted from *PsyPost*, March 30th, 2026

People increasingly use generative AI as everyday search engines to learn about historical events and gather facts. The scientists wanted to know if the way these chatbots write about history could sway how people think about modern issues. Previous studies focused on how artificial intelligence persuades people when it is specifically instructed to make an argument or spread misinformation. This new research focuses on a more subtle form of influence.

"My collaborators and I started wondering how AI-generated content could influence people in more routine, everyday settings," said study author Daniel Karell, an assistant professor of sociology at Yale University. "Namely, what happens when people simply develop the habit of querying a chatbot to learn things about the world? Once we had this question, we decided to focus on the case of using AI to learn about historical events since research has shown that people's understanding of history profoundly influences their identities and worldviews."

The scientists explored a concept called latent bias. This is an underlying slant that naturally develops in a computer program during its training process. It often occurs because the software absorbs the subtle opinions and language patterns present in the millions of internet pages it reads.

To test this concept, the researchers conducted an experiment with 1,912 participants. They selected a group of people that closely matched the demographic makeup of the United States population. Each participant was asked to read short summaries of two real historical events from the twentieth century.

One event was the Seattle General Strike of 1919, where tens of thousands of workers stopped working for several days. The second event involved university student protests in 1968 that demanded more academic representation for ethnic minorities. The scientists selected these specific events because they are not widely known to the average person today.

The scientists found that reading the different summaries had a measurable impact on participant attitudes. The default chatbot summaries led to more liberal opinions compared to the standard Wikipedia summaries. This suggests that the baseline model carries an underlying liberal bias that naturally surfaces even when a user asks a simple question.

"People's views on a historical event can be influenced by learning about this event from a popular commercial AI chatbot, even when a user prompts the chatbot with a basic, neutral query," Karell said.

"Furthermore, their attitudes can also be influenced by the chatbot when it has been instructed to take on a particular political bias, which is easy to do."

"Overall, users of AI should be aware that the companies that develop AI tools — and the governments that might impose regulations on them — can imbue the chatbot with characteristics that subsequently influence users, even when they are using the AI tool in mundane, everyday ways."

While the study provides evidence of persuasion, it is important to avoid overstating the scope of the findings. The experiment only tested summaries of two historical events. Nonetheless, it could be that the effect sizes accumulate and ultimately become more consequential over many uses of a chatbot, but further research will be needed to determine this."

The degree of underlying bias likely varies between different computer models created by different companies.

"In the near future, many people will learn about history, as well as other things about our world, by simply asking a chatbot to tell them about it," Karell said. "This puts knowledge and learning in the hands of the developers and regulators of AI tools, which I think will have significant implications for society."

"After we conducted the study (but before publication), xAI announced that it was going to use its AI chatbot, Grok, to create its own version of Wikipedia, called 'Grokipedia,'" Karell added. "So, widespread, publicly available summaries of history (and other knowledge) generated by a private company's AI tool are now a reality."

- **Explain what « latent bias » is. What did scientists try to prove regarding latent bias ? (2 points)**

Latent bias is the involuntary/unintentional influence generative AI derives from the sources it used to train itself and that it can have on users, especially those who use it as their go-to source of information. Scientists tried to prove that — though unwillingly — Artificial Intelligence was biased by its coders and could change how people understand history and thus the way they perceive the world — as history is foundational for people's opinion.

- **What is the main concern of Daniel Karell, the assistant professor of sociology at Yale University, who conducted the study ? (3 points)**

Daniel Karell fears that people's understanding of history and, so, of the world could be dictated by commercial AI chatbots which may reflect the political leaning of their companies' developers. As a result, knowledge can be shaped by private companies such as xAI. What is more, AI regulators — namely the government — could also have a say in how knowledge is passed on by AI chatbots.

II - Compréhension globale (15 points) — Vous répondrez sur la même copie que pour la compréhension guidée, ne répondez pas sur le sujet qui n'est pas à rendre. Pour la partie A) ne refaites pas tout le tableau, uniquement la colonne ''doc 1, 2'' et la colonne ''Analytical reading''. Les réponses attendues pour la partie A) doivent être précises et concises.

A) Briefly fill in the "<u>analytical reading</u> " part of the tab we introduced in class. In other words, sum up the message the authors of both articles wanted to convey. (5 pts)

	Description/ Context	Factual Reading	<u>Analytical reading</u>	Connections /Links
Doc 1			AI videos cannot be used as educational content even though they pose as such. Users should beware of AI history videos and question their origin. More than ever, information literacy is a needed skill to avoid the manipulation or revision of historical facts. Opinions can thus be tampered with by AI history slop.	
Doc 2			Algorithms can be biased even if the bias isn't intentionally coded into it. They can influence AI users and shape their opinions. As algorithms are designed by private commercial companies, the transmission of knowledge can fall into their hands. Regulators should step in but they may also decide what version of knowledge can or cannot be passed on. Once again users are asked to bear the brunt of checking sources to avoid being influenced by AI, its developers or regulators.	

B) Use both the facts and your analysis <u>of the articles</u> to answer the following question <u>in 200 words (+/- 10%) (10pts):</u>

To what extent can generative AI change the way opinions are formed ?

Both articles question the transformational role generative AI could play in people's opinions and worldview. Indeed, they address the rising amount of AI-generated content online and how it could shape users' understanding of history and, in turn, their opinions.

Document 1 argues that AI history slop posing as educational content should be handled carefully, as it may be inaccurate and misleading. Document 2 confirms that AI-generated content is inherently misleading, albeit unintentionally, since coders' biases are ingrained in its algorithms.

Moreover, both documents raise the issue of who produces AI-generated history content. Document 2 worries that private interests may take control of the creation and transmission of knowledge, while Document 1 fears the manipulation and revision of historical facts on social media. Whether ideological or political, such content could serve an agenda.

Consequently, both documents call for some form of regulation but doubt the authorities' ability to step in efficiently. Document 1 thus notes that users are de facto responsible for checking the veracity of what they watch, while Document 2 stresses the importance of information literacy so that users are not easily swayed.

To conclude, whether intentionally or not, generative AI influences how opinions are formed and should be regulated so that economic or ideological interests cannot harness it. (196 words)

Barème DS1 – October 5th 2026

Note :

Appréciation :

Compréhension guidée: **/15**

Compréhension globale: **/15**

Lecture analytique /5

Réponse Type synthèse /10
- Réponse organisée
- Propos reformulés
- Documents croisés
- Pas d'ajout hors corpus
- Réponse pertinente

Qualité de la langue : **/20**

- Correction de la grammaire **/10**
- Richesse du vocabulaire **/5**
- Capacité à reformuler le propos **/5**

Barème DS1 – October 5th 2026

Note :

Appréciation :

Compréhension guidée: **/15**

Compréhension globale: **/15**

Lecture analytique /5

Réponse Type synthèse /10
- Réponse organisée
- Propos reformulés
- Documents croisés
- Pas d'ajout hors corpus
- Réponse pertinente

Qualité de la langue : **/20**

- Correction de la grammaire **/10**
- Richesse du vocabulaire **/5**
- Capacité à reformuler le propos **/5**