



Content Warning: Real Cases of TFGBV, Including Sexual Violence and Murder

This resource includes documentation of technology-facilitated gender-based violence (TFGBV), featuring real cases involving rape, murder, child abuse, and institutional neglect. Some material may contain graphic descriptions, survivor testimonies, and media coverage that could be highly distressing or re-traumatizing.

Please engage with care:

- Take breaks or step away if needed.
- You are not required to read or stay engaged with content that feels unsafe.
- Consider having a body double/ peer support nearby while working through this material.
- Begin or end your session with grounding or care practices

Core Simulation – compulsory

Title: When You Get It Wrong – A Real Correction or Just PR?

Scenario Brief

Last month, your newsroom published an exposé on tech industry gender-based misconduct. The story cited publicly available court records in which a woman’s name was mentioned in a sexual harassment case: as a witness, not as the perpetrator. But through hasty AI summarisation and bad tagging, she was incorrectly named as the harasser.

Now:

- She’s being doxxed, harassed, and trolled.
- She never consented to her name being used.
- Your team used AI to summarise the legal documents and missed the nuance of her role.
- The story has been quoted by other blogs and reposted widely.
- She has sent a public **statement describing emotional harm**, breach of privacy, and is threatening legal action if not corrected.



💔 New Ethical + Legal Dilemmas

- You assumed **open court documents = open consent**. That was wrong.
- Your story violated the principle of **minimising harm**, you published without verifying her role or seeking her comment.
- An AI tool **misrepresented** her role because it couldn't understand legal nuance.
- Your editorial team is split: some want to apologise and retract, others want to “clarify” and move on.

Your Task

- Create two versions of a **public editorial response**:
 1. A **cold legal disclaimer-style** one.
 2. A **values-centred, survivor-aware** apology that doesn't retraumatise but still takes accountability.
- Draft **internal notes** documenting how the error happened (AI, filters, lack of checks).
- Decide what will happen to the original article: Edit? Delete? Annotate?
- Reflect on what would've prevented this using:
 - *The Defamation Filter*
 - *Survivor Consent Log*
 - *AI caution protocols*
 - *Your values (dignity, accuracy, safety)*



Optional Simulation Scenarios: “The Story’s Hot: Do We Run It?”

Pick one more scenario:

1. Screenshots & a Name Drop

A viral Twitter thread accuses a well-known youth pastor of grooming teenage girls via DMs. Multiple screenshots are circulating, some showing flirtatious language and suggestive comments. One girl has submitted a voice note to a popular podcaster, describing her discomfort. She remains anonymous but says he runs a youth camp and coaches a school hockey team, putting him in frequent unsupervised contact with minors.

The Thread is Trending. The Pastor Has Not Responded.

Ethical, Legal & Editorial Dilemma:

- The **screenshots are unverifiable**: no metadata, no confirmation of authenticity.
- **Survivors are anonymous**: you can’t cross-check stories directly.
- The **pastor’s name is already public** via social media, and people are tagging the camp.
- His **access to children during the holidays** adds urgency.
- The **school and camp haven’t made a statement**.

Your Group's Task:

Using the **Consent Log**, and your AI tool of choice (e.g., NotebookLM or DeepSeek), decide:

1. **Do you run the story, hold it, or reframe it?**
2. **If publishing, how do you centre safety, accuracy, and urgency?**
3. **What do KD Principles 1 (Dignity), 2 (Accuracy), and 4 (Safety) suggest?**
4. **How can AI help surface patterns, without implicating yourself?**



● Scenario 2: *The Whisper Network Goes Public – And Lands on Your Desk*

You're a trusted voice, an editor at a national publication or a content creator with a massive following and a reputation for taking on hard truths. You receive a **leaked Google Doc** titled "*Unsafe Men in Media*." The list names over 30 individuals, with brief descriptions of harm, ranging from emotional manipulation to sexual assault.

Some names are **already trending on X**. Others are new. At least two are **your peers or former collaborators who you have a personal** .

The person who shared it says, "*You have the reach. People trust you. Can you do something before these guys hurt more women?*"

🔍 Ethical, Legal & Editorial Dilemma

- **You didn't ask for the list**, but now it's yours. What do you do?
- Do you **validate** or **interrogate** the list in public?
- What are the risks of creating a **narrative around anonymous allegations**, especially for people with no formal complaints filed?
- If you **name names**—is that justice, or is it digital punishment?
- If you keep quiet, are you being complacent?

🧩 Your Task

As a group of **editors and/or creators**, use the **Defamation Filter**, **Consent Log**, and an AI summarisation tool (NotebookLM or ChatGPT) to:

1. Decide whether to **publish, hold, or investigate**.
2. Outline **harm-reduction safeguards** if you choose to publish.
3. Craft a **values-aligned response** that centres:
 - Survivor safety and dignity (KD Principle 1 & 4)



- Accuracy and accountability (KD Principle 2 & 3)
 - The ethical burden of **being first or loudest**
4. Identify what **internal processes or editorial policies** would help make better decisions under pressure in the future.

⚠️ Simulation Twist: The Whisper Becomes a Roar

Mid-discussion, you're notified that someone else **published the list without context**: it's now trending across multiple platforms. Your community is tagging you asking, "*Where's your voice? Why are you silent? Is it because you are friends?*"

Do you pivot? Do you still verify quietly, respond publicly, or let it pass?

👤 3. A Survivor Speaks, Then Deletes

A woman posts her story of intimate partner violence, naming her ex-boyfriend who works at a bank. Hours later, she deletes the thread and makes her account private. Screenshots remain. Your audience is asking for your take.

🔍 Dilemma: She deleted it. Does that signal changed consent in people retelling her story? Can a story still be told based on deleted material?

📧 4. A Leaked HR Email

You receive an anonymous tip: a leaked internal email shows a university disciplined a senior lecturer for inappropriate conduct. But no survivor has spoken publicly. You confirm the email is real: but can't access more details.

🔍 Dilemma: No survivor consent. No full context. But a powerful institution may be hiding harm. Do you publish?



Journaling reflections

How did you feel reading this? Note your instinctive reaction, anger, guilt, fear and confusion?

What would accountability look like? Which response feels more honest, legal deflection or values-based apology?

How could this have been prevented?

List 2–3 safeguards (e.g., human review, survivor contact, consent logs).

What values guide you now?

What principle matters most, dignity, safety, or accuracy?

What will you do differently?

Note one action you'll take in future reporting or storytelling.

Usage Disclaimer

This resource was developed by Mwende Mukwanyaga for African Women in Media (AWiM) as part of the Kigali Declaration-IPDC project supported by UNESCO. It is intended for educational and non-commercial use only. You are welcome to share, adapt, or build upon this material with appropriate credit. Please retain this notice in all copies or adaptations.

Credit must include: *Developed by Mwende Mukwanyaga for AWiM as part of the Kigali Declaration-IPDC project, supported by UNESCO.*

For permissions beyond these terms, please contact AWiM directly.