Teacher Answer Key

Case Study

1. Two specific differences made the second conversation more productive. First, timing: Destiny chose a Saturday morning walk rather than interrupting her mom during dinner — a relaxed, available moment that invited real attention rather than a distracted reflex. Second, framing: Destiny's opening — 'Can I tell you how I actually use it, not just that I use it?' — asked for dialogue rather than judgment, and led with information (specific description of use) rather than defense. Her mom's response — 'I'm glad you told me. I didn't know that's what it did.' — shows that the new information changed the reaction. The first conversation produced overreaction based on alarmed imagination; the second produced dialogue based on actual facts.

2. The reading argues that building a communication baseline when nothing is wrong creates the relational infrastructure for a harder conversation when something is. If the first time Destiny's mom hears about AI use is when something has become genuinely concerning, the disclosure carries the full weight of surprise and triggers alarm. Because Destiny established honest communication while her use was healthy, any future conversation — including one where she is uncertain about her patterns — is an update rather than a revelation. Destiny's case also shows the baseline paying off immediately: having the conversation when she felt confident in her use gave her mom real information, which shifted the dynamic from alarm to dialogue.

Multiple Choice

1. D
2. A
3. A

Matching

1-B, 2-D, 3-E, 4-C, 5-A

Fill-in-the-Blank

1) disproportionate, 2) gains, 3) specifically

Short Answer (Sample Responses)

Q1: The gap is structurally self-reinforcing because both sides are responding rationally to a situation that produces misunderstanding. Adults who are not told about AI use cannot provide useful perspective or identify when something is wrong.

But teenagers are not told because prior disclosures have taught them that disclosure leads to overreaction, loss of privacy, or lectures. The adult's reaction pattern creates the concealment that prevents them from knowing what is happening, which prevents them from improving their reaction. Neither side is simply being unreasonable — the structure itself produces the gap, and it does not close through willpower alone.

Q2: It is harder than it sounds because rationalization is one of the warning signs the reading already identified — the human tendency to justify patterns that might not serve you. Disclosing use that might invite concern means being honest about patterns you have been managing not to look at too directly, which requires more than ordinary courage. The reading argues it matters because articulating an uncertain pattern to another person does several things: it makes the pattern harder to rationalize away, it invites a perspective outside your own, and it creates the relational context in which you can ask for help if you decide you need it. You cannot get outside help for something you have carefully concealed.

Q3: Adults need to demonstrate, through their actual responses in early low-stakes conversations, that disclosure leads to dialogue rather than punishment. A teenager who discloses and gets their device confiscated or a lengthy lecture learns that disclosure is a net negative; that lesson is very hard to unlearn when the stakes are higher. The reading says this infrastructure needs to be built before it becomes urgent because the moment of urgency is the worst time to build it — when something is genuinely concerning, both sides bring more emotion, more defensiveness, and less patience to the conversation. The quality of the conversation you can have when something is wrong depends almost entirely on the quality of the conversations you had when nothing was.