ADTA 5900/5760.501: Discussion 1

Thuan L Nguyen, PhD

1. Discussion Question

Since large language models such as GPT 3.5, GPT 4, LaMDA, LaMDA 2, and Gemini were released, it is opined that these powerful neural networks would bring out changes to human societies drastically – with both good and not-good impacts.

Do you agree with the above opinion?
Please provide details and examples to support your opinions.

2. Due Date & Time

2.1 PART I: Response to the discussion question

Due date and time: **11:00 PM** on **Thursday 01/30/2025**

2.2 PART II: Response to classmates' posts

Due date and time: **11:00 PM** on **Sunday 02/02/2025**

IMPORTANT NOTES:
--) The student should respond to the discussion question as soon as possible so that the classmates can reply to his/her post in time.

2.3 PART III: Peer Evaluation

The instructor grades students' discussion posts. However, as another way to encourage students to read and evaluate classmates' posts, each student must peer-evaluate one classmate's discussion posts, including the response to the discussion question and replies to other students' posts.

The instructor will send an email to each student to inform him/her which classmate the student must do peer-evaluation of discussion posts and send a report (MS Word) to the instructor via email (Thuan.Nguyen@unt.edu) by the due date and time.

To peer-evaluate the assigned classmate's posts, the student must **use a template** (posted on Canvas) that contains two sections: One for reporting self's discussion posts and the other for peer-evaluation.

The student must submit the discussion peer-evaluation document sent to the instructor (Thuan.Nguyen@unt.edu) as an attachment to a UNT email.

The subject of the email must be: "ADTA 5550: Discussion 1 Report – Submission."

Due date & time: 11:00 PM – Wednesday 02/05/2025

3. Grading

- This is an assignment with the max score: **100 points**.

- **PART I: 50 points**
  - The student must respond to the discussion question by the due date and time.

- **PART II: 30 points**
  - The student must reply to 3 different classmates' posts by the due date and time.

- **PART III: 20 points**
  - The student must peer-evaluate the assigned classmate's posts and submit the report by the due date and time.

<u>IMPORTANT NOTES</u>:
*--) To be counted as one reply to classmates' posts, the student's reply MUST be **in the classmate's discussion thread**. It means that the students has to reply to the classmate's response to the discussion question.*

<u>FOR EXAMPLE</u>:
--) Student X has responded to the discussion question and started a discussion thread. Classmate A posted a reply to X's response – of course, in X's thread. Then X replied to A's post – also in X's thread.

- A's reply to X's is counted (for A) because he/she has replied to X's posts in X's thread.
- X's reply to A's post is **not** counted because he/she has replied to a classmate's post in his/her own thread.

The requirement is set up to encourage students to contribute to classmates' discussion threads, not only to his/her own thread.

4. Replies to Classmates' Posts – Informative and Significant

4.1 Overview: Being Informative and Significant

To be counted as **a reply** to classmates' posts, a reply must be **informative** and **significant**.

To figure out what should be informative and significant, the student can review the following examples of replies.

4.2 Examples of Informative and Significant Replies

James Banks
Aug 30, 2021

I found this article disturbing on several fronts and struggled to identify its desired intent. Specifically, was the author for or against AI. The article starts with a reference to AI co-parenting, touts the advances in transportation, warns of the invasion of privacy and bias in criminal justice AI, continues regurgitating the risks in advertising using the Facebook scandal, before finally closing with the ominous message that AI will "know you better than you know yourself". Each area seemed to focus on either an ambiguous message, a clear positive or a clear negative, but not a holistic view of pros and cons combined for any given topic. Although not clear to me in the article, I suspect the intent was to suggest that there was a juxtaposition of positive and negative aspects to AI. Let's review the ambiguous messages, the positive messages, and the negative messages individually.

The authors view of co-parenting by an AI and advertising seemed ambiguous at best. By implication the idea of an AI providing parental functions sounds worrisome. However, the author didn't seem to focus on this as a potential negative. Personally, I agree with the author on this point, as the risks of AI co-parenting seems no greater than the risks of using television as a co-parent which we have experienced since its advent of TV. Dr. Victor Fornari, director of child and adolescent psychiatry at a NY hospital, states that "Technology has become child care" (Thompson, 2016). In fact, it would seem logical that an intelligently supervised co-parenting approach (even artificial) is better than the unsupervised usage of these electronic devices as was seen in the 70's and 80's with TV and current day with computers, tablets, and phones. Similarly, focused advertising seems to be a concern to many social media and search engine users; again, the Facebook Cambridge Analytica scandal is often used as an example of misuse. Senior executives at Cambridge Analytica boasted about using "psychological manipulation, entrapment techniques" to sway views (Meredith, 2018). However, I would argue that this is the primary purpose of advertising, to sway an individual to purchase based on psychological manipulation; why else do we see commercials with scantily clad and/or muscle bound models next to sports car -or- impossibly gleaming white teeth in tooth paste inserts. Frankly, it seems a more effective use of my time to be presented an advertisement that is relevant to me personally; I have no issue with such focused advertisement. Therefore, I disagree with ambiguous aspects presented in these sections of the article; I see them as no worse than our current situation or even better.

…

Ryane Tabor (She/Her)
Aug 31, 2021

Hi James,

I have to agree, I thought the article was ambiguous but I think your last paragraph may be right on point. I found it interesting that the author is the CEO and founder at Disrupt University which is described in the article as an alternative education company offering coding and online learning programs. I have to believe that the author's intent was to share both the positive and negative sides of AI on society to generate discussions just like these. Thanks for the post!

↩ Reply

IMPORTANT NOTES:
--) ***Both students*** *(James: responding to the discussion question to open a new discussion thread; Ryane: replying to James's post) are doing **very good jobs**. Their posts are **informative** and **significant**.*

4.3 Examples of Uninformative and Insignificant Replies

Sep 7, 2021

Hi ,

I completely agree with your views.

← Reply

Sep 7, 2021

Hello ,

I totally agree with you and your example fit your idea

← Reply

Sep 8, 2021

Hey ,

Yes, I agree with your statements. Its really cool to say that "A good graph tell a story".

← Reply

Sep 8, 2021

I agree with the data you provided.

← Reply

IMPORTANT NOTES:
--) These replies are not informative and significant. They are not counted as replies to classmates' posts.