

Practical examples for teachers

Related content: M1-T1-MLC3 – What Is an LLM? How Language Models Generate Text – and Why They Hallucinate

Exercise 1 – for the teacher’s own learning

Objective: to experience how and where an LLM hallucinates in one’s own vocational subject, and to practise checking strategies.

Title: Hallucination hunt in my own subject

Exercise: asking an AI five “risky” questions from your own trade and verifying every answer against reliable sources.

Duration: 35–40 minutes

Form of work: individual work

Tools: ChatGPT, Claude or Gemini (with and without web search); your textbook, manufacturer’s manuals, standards or regulations

Instructions:

1. Write five questions from your subject: one asking for a legal or standard reference, one for a precise technical value, one calculation, one about a rare professional term, and one about a recent change.
2. Ask the questions in a new chat without web search. Mark every fact, number, name and reference in the answers.
3. Check each marked item against an authoritative source. Record in a table: claim – correct / wrong / cannot be verified – source used.
4. For the wrong or unverifiable items, ask follow-up questions (“Where does this value come from?”), switch on web search or code, or attach the source document. Note what changed.
5. Write your own five-point checklist for using AI output in your subject.

Lessons learnt:

- Errors cluster where precision, rare knowledge or local rules are needed.
- Follow-up questions, tools and attached sources reduce errors, but do not remove the need to check.
- A subject-specific checklist makes validation fast and routine.

Exercise 2 – classroom work with students

Objective: to develop learners’ critical attitude towards AI-generated information and their habit of checking it against professional sources.

Title: Fact-checkers in the workshop

Exercise: groups search for errors in a short AI-generated work instruction and correct it using professional sources.

Duration: 45 minutes

Form of work: group work (3–4 learners), then whole-class discussion

Tools: a short AI-generated text on a topic from the trade (prepared and checked by the teacher in advance), textbook, manuals, data sheets; projector

Instructions:

1. The teacher shows how a chatbot generates an answer and explains in two sentences why it can be wrong.
2. Each group receives the AI-generated instruction (e.g. replacing a wheel, preparing a mortar, cooling cooked food) containing a few errors or omissions.
3. Groups mark suspicious statements, check them in the textbook or manual, and correct them. They also look for missing steps, especially safety steps.
4. Groups compare their findings; the class collects the types of errors and writes a short “How we check AI” rule card for the workshop wall.

Lessons learnt:

- AI answers can sound professional and still contain errors.
- Reliable professional sources are the benchmark, not the confidence of the answer.
- Missing safety information is as dangerous as wrong information.

Notes for teachers:

- Prepare and check the AI text yourself, and keep a verified answer key; never let learners act on an unchecked AI instruction in the workshop.
- Choose topics where the correct information is available in sources the learners can use.

Copyright © 2026 VITA Consortium

This work may be reused and adapted under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0).



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the National Agency.