Version 2 · Revised 11 November 2026 · 11/12

Question AI’s Answers and Verify the Evidence

By the end of this guide, you can

Create a verification record that identifies claim status, source support, uncertainty and the resulting decision.

Bring to the task

An AI-generated response, the intended use and access to relevant original sources.

An AI response gives a neat statistic, a plausible citation and a confident recommendation. None of these establishes that the statistic exists, that the source supports it or that it applies to your decision. Verification is a separate task with its own questions and evidence.

Begin with intended use. A casual brainstorming suggestion needs a different level of checking from a claim that will enter a client proposal or a teaching article. Identify the statements that could materially change an action, harm understanding or mislead another reader. Spend verification effort where the consequence matters.

COMPARE · APPLY

Verify a claim and record its evidence status



Original Tibyan teaching aid. Illustrative content, not observed field results or a validated instrument.

First ask whether the evidence was accessible, then what it supports. Record evidence status separately from whether you retain, qualify, hold, replace or omit the claim.

Text explanation of the graphic
Verify a claim and record its evidence status
Extract the exact consequential claim and its intended use
Can you access the original evidence?
NOT YETRecord “not checked / source unavailable.” Seek the source; hold or omit a consequential claim.
YESInspect the supporting passage, method, date, population and limits.

What does the evidence support?
Supported for this useRetain with the relevant scope and source.
Partial or unsupportedQualify, replace, omit or investigate further.
ContradictedCorrect or remove the claim; record the contrary evidence.
An inaccessible source does not make a claim false. Record evidence status separately from the action you take.
Original Tibyan teaching aid. Illustrative content, not observed field results or a validated instrument.

Case, demonstration and correction

Complete a three-claim verification ledger

The following AI draft and business numbers are fictional teaching material, revised 11 November 2026. The Lee publication linked below is a real source; the invented draft is intentionally inaccurate.

> 1. “Research proves that AI reduces workers' critical-thinking ability.”
> 2. “Our clarification rate fell by two percentage points after the checklist.”
> 3. “An unspecified report proves this checklist doubles every team's productivity.”

Supplied fictional record for claim 2: before, 8 requests needed clarification out of 40 reviewed; after, 6 out of 50. The periods contain different tasks and there is no comparison group. No source, author or URL is supplied for claim 3.

Exact claim	Source and locator	Evidence judgment	Action
1 · AI causes an ability decline.	Lee et al., 2025, CHI paper; original publication page, publication summary, quantitative finding and qualitative interpretation paragraphs.	The source concerns a survey of 319 knowledge workers and self-reported effort; it does not establish a causal ability decline.	Reject the causal wording and qualify the sentence below.
2 · A two-percentage-point decline.	Fictional record above, “before” and “after” rows.	8/40 = 20%; 6/50 = 12%; the difference is 8 percentage points. The relative decline is 8/20 = 40%. This does not isolate a checklist effect.	Correct both the number and causal implication.
3 · Doubled productivity for every team.	Source unavailable in this packet; no verifiable citation supplied.	Not checked. The missing source is not itself proof that the proposition is false, but it is insufficient for responsible use.	Hold or omit the claim until an appropriate source can be opened and appraised.

Corrected sentence for claim 1: “In the surveyed tasks, greater confidence in generative AI was associated with lower self-reported critical-thinking effort; this does not establish a causal decline in ability.”

Corrected sentence for claim 2: “In this fictional record, clarification rates were 20% and 12%, a difference of eight percentage points. Different task mixes and the absence of a comparison prevent attributing the change to the checklist.”

Claim 3's disposition: omitted from the teaching recommendation; verification remains open. Do not replace “unverified” with “false.”

Audit entry: exercise check recorded on 11 November 2026 by the fictional teaching reviewer. In real use, record the actual checker, date, accessible source, page or section and revised wording. If a PDF or report cannot be opened, say so; do not imply you read it. A second AI's agreement does not supply an independent source.

Weak completion: “The citation is from a respected institution; retain all three.” **Improved completion:** attach the exact source support to each claim, recalculate the numerical comparison, and leave the unavailable-source claim unresolved. A credible source name is the beginning of appraisal, not its conclusion.

COMPARE · NOTICE

Correct the claim, not just the citation

Overstatement

AI causes critical-thinking ability to decline.	A causal ability claim is not established by the survey.

Checked finding

Confidence in AI was associated with reported thinking effort.	Keep the studied context and self-report qualification.

Decision

Rewrite the sentence and retain the limitation.	Do not use the survey as proof of cognitive decline.

Original Tibyan teaching aid. Illustrative example; not observed field results.

Correct the strength and object of the claim: reported effort is not measured ability, and an association is not a causal effect. Retain the source and its scope.

Text explanation of the graphic
Correct the claim, not just the citation
Overstatement
AI causes critical-thinking ability to decline.
A causal ability claim is not established by the survey.
Checked finding

Confidence in AI was associated with reported thinking effort.
Keep the studied context and self-report qualification.
Decision
Rewrite the sentence and retain the limitation.
Do not use the survey as proof of cognitive decline.
Original Tibyan teaching aid. Illustrative example; not observed field results.

Your reusable working record

1. Intended use and consequence

Prioritize the claims that affect the decision or reader understanding.

2. Claim 1: exact original sentence

Preserve the wording being checked.

3. Claim 1: source/title/date/locator

Use the original page or document, not only an institution name.

4. Claim 1: support, method and applicability

Keep effort distinct from ability and association from causation.

5. Claim 1: status and revised wording

Write the usable correction, not “qualify it.”

6. Claim 2: exact claim, inputs and source

Keep numerator, denominator and period visible.

7. Claim 2: reproducible calculation and uncertainty

Distinguish percentage points from relative percentage change.

8. Claim 2: status and actual replacement

Correct the error and avoid adding a causal conclusion.

9. Claim 3: exact claim and accessible source

A missing citation remains a verification gap.

10. Claim 3: evidence status and disposition

Do not confuse not checked with contradicted.

11. Checker, check date, unresolved items and release decision

For real use, enter the actual person and observation date.

Annotated completed record

Intended use and consequence

A public teaching explanation about AI and a checklist; inaccurate causal claims or percentages could mislead readers.

The level of checking follows the intended use.

Claim 1: exact original sentence

“Research proves that AI reduces workers’ critical-thinking ability.”

The exact causal and ability wording is available for inspection.

Claim 1: source/title/date/locator

Lee et al., 2025, The Impact of Generative AI on Critical Thinking. Original publication page, quantitative/qualitative summary paragraphs. https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/the-impact-of-generative-ai-on-critical-thinking-self-reported-reductions-in-cognitive-effort-and-confidence-effects-from-a-survey-of-knowledge-workers/

The locator lets a second reader repeat the check.

Claim 1: support, method and applicability

Survey/self-report association; causal ability decline not established.

The claim is appraised at its actual strength.

Claim 1: status and revised wording

Unsupported causal claim. Replacement: “Greater AI confidence was associated with lower self-reported thinking effort in the surveyed tasks; causal ability decline was not established.”

This is a qualified use of the source, not confirmation of the original claim.

Claim 2: exact claim, inputs and source

“Our clarification rate fell by two percentage points after the checklist.” Fictional before record: 8/40; after record: 6/50; different task mixes, no comparison group.

Both denominators are retained; the fictional dataset is not presented as research.

Claim 2: reproducible calculation and uncertainty

8/40=20%; 6/50=12%; 20−12=8 percentage points; 8/20=40% relative decline. Task differences prevent causal attribution.

The calculation can be checked independently and its limit is explicit.

Claim 2: status and actual replacement

Contradicted numerically. Replace with: “The fictional rates were 20% and 12%, eight percentage points apart; the record does not isolate a checklist effect.”

The replacement fixes the arithmetic without overclaiming.

Claim 3: exact claim and accessible source

“An unspecified report proves this checklist doubles every team’s productivity.” No author, title or URL supplied.

The sentence is intentionally fictional; no real report is being alleged.

Claim 3: evidence status and disposition

Not checked/source unavailable. Omit from the recommendation; seek an appropriate accessible source before reconsidering.

Omission is justified by insufficient support, not proof of falsehood.

Checker, check date, unresolved items and release decision

Fictional teaching reviewer; 11 November 2026. Claims 1–2 rewritten; claim 3 held. An actual publication still requires checking the retained statements and links.

The exercise does not impersonate human approval or a completed real-world audit.

Practice and retry

Complete all three claim records without viewing the answer column. Open the real Lee source for claim 1; recalculate claim 2 from the supplied fictional counts; mark claim 3 honestly when its source is unavailable. Rewrite the draft and have a partner repeat one check from your locator.

Common error and corrective feedback

Common errors: accepting an institutional logo instead of checking support; using one denominator for two periods; confusing relative percent change with percentage points; calling an inaccessible source disproved; asking another AI for certainty instead of obtaining evidence.

Independent-study alternative

Use the three supplied claims. Check the real source if online access is available; if not, mark claim 1 not checked and complete the arithmetic and source-unavailable records. Reopen the real source later before treating the corrected research sentence as verified.

Check your work

- The exact claim is identified.
- The source was opened and supports the wording.
- Method and applicability limits are recorded.
- The status leads to an explicit action.

Apply and review

Before sharing the output, check whether the consequential claims are resolved or visibly qualified and retain the verification record.

Sources and further reading

- NIST (2024). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile, AI 600-1
- Lee et al. (2025). The Impact of Generative AI on Critical Thinking
- Bastani et al. (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics

---

TIBYAN · تبيان · Version 2 · Revised 11 November 2026

Original evidence-informed teaching aid. Cases and example records are hypothetical; the assessment is not a validated certification.