Two Endings

A short story about an automated call that looks wrong on replay. Students write two different endings — one where it's trusted blindly, one where someone questions it — and compare what changes.

AGE BAND	DURATION	GROUP SIZE	CONCEPT
Ages 8–13	20–30 minutes	Individual or pairs	Agency

Learning objective

Students can identify what a person needs — information, standing, or a formal process — before they're able to question an automated decision at all.

What you need

- Printed story starter (in the kit PDF)
- Writing paper

Why this works

Most lessons about questioning automated decisions stay abstract. A story makes it concrete: to write an ending where someone actually asks a question, students have to invent the specific thing that made asking possible — knowing who to ask, having evidence, or simply being allowed to speak up. That detail is the real lesson, and it only shows up if they have to write it, not just discuss it.

How it works

1. Read the story starter together: a robot referee calls a foul that looks wrong on the replay everyone just watched.
2. Individually or in pairs, write Ending A — everyone accepts the call and the game moves on.
3. Write Ending B — someone asks a question, and something changes as a result.
4. Share a few of each ending aloud.
5. Discuss what had to be true, in Ending B, for the question to be askable at all.

Talk about it

- What did the character in Ending B need — courage, evidence, or a rule that allowed appeals — to ask their question?
- Does your school, team, or family have a version of Ending B already built in? What does it actually look like?
- Was Ending A more realistic than Ending B? What does that tell you?