

Analysis of Mistakes in the Group Discussion on "Will Artificial Intelligence Take Away Jobs?"

The report evaluates a group discussion where nine participants debated whether artificial intelligence (AI) will replace jobs. The group was assessed based on four criteria: Content Knowledge & Comprehension, Logic and Reasoning, Body Language & Group Dynamics, and Language Fluency. A summary of their strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement is as follow:

1. Content Knowledge & Comprehension

Positives:

The group showed a fair understanding of AI, especially regarding tools like ChatGPT. They discussed the positive and negative effects of AI on employment, with some participants bringing up emerging roles like prompt engineering. There was a general awareness of AI's growing role in various industries.

Speaker initiated the discussion by stating how AI, particularly tools like ChatGPT, is becoming an integral part of everyday life, especially for students and professionals. AI helps in tasks such as problem-solving and decision-making.

Negatives:

The discussion focused too heavily on ChatGPT, overlooking the broader spectrum of AI technologies. Additionally, many points were superficial, lacking depth or supporting data. Repetitive ideas without fresh insights diminished the overall comprehension of the topic.

Several speakers made claims without providing any data or facts to back them up. For instance, someone mentioned that AI would take away jobs without giving statistics or studies to support their arguments. This made their statements less convincing. (**Note:** one mention about numbers like “85 million jobs will be replaced by AI by 2025 according to Google,” but no proof or source has been mentioned.)

The discussion ended without any final summary or key takeaways. There was no clear conclusion on whether AI would replace jobs or what actions should be taken in response. (**Note:** The video ended without it, it might be there but not recorded or any other case).

Improvement Suggestion:

The group can enhance their content by researching AI beyond familiar tools like ChatGPT and providing more detailed examples with supporting evidence, such as statistics or real-world case studies.

2. Logic and Reasoning**Positives:**

Some participants made valid arguments about the dual effects of AI – job displacement versus job creation. They pointed out that while AI may replace repetitive tasks, it also opens new opportunities in technology-driven industries.

Negatives:

The discussion lacked depth in logic. Arguments were sometimes circular or contradictory, such as stating AI cannot replace human creativity but later claiming AI could handle human-like interactions. Many points lacked clear evidence or rationale, which weakened the reasoning.

There were times when participants contradicted each other or even themselves, but they didn't explain these contradictions. For example, one speaker said AI couldn't replace human intelligence, but then later admitted that AI is becoming very advanced. These contradictions were left unresolved.

Improvement Suggestion:

To improve, the group should focus on building stronger, well-reasoned arguments and avoid repeating the same ideas. Supporting claims with data or examples will make their reasoning more convincing and coherent.

3. Body Language & Group Dynamics**Positives:**

The group generally respected turn-taking and responded to each other's points, which created a cooperative atmosphere. There was a balance of opinions, with participants engaging both in agreement and disagreement. This promoted healthy group dynamics.

Negatives:

Some participants dominated the conversation, while others were less active. At times, one or more participants did not get the opportunity to speak, even when they indicated their willingness to contribute. Additionally, there was limited use of non-verbal communication, such as active listening cues (e.g., nodding or eye

contact), which affected overall group interaction. Also, some private chats between two students were noticed.

Improvement Suggestion:

Encouraging quieter members to participate more actively and improving non-verbal communication would enhance group cohesion and ensure a more dynamic discussion.

4. Language Fluency

Positives:

Most participants expressed their ideas clearly and used appropriate vocabulary. Some speakers communicated their thoughts effectively, making relevant points about the impact of AI on jobs.

Negatives:

There were noticeable issues with fluency, such as overuse of filler words and awkward phrasing. Some participants struggled to articulate more complex ideas smoothly, and the repetition of points detracted from the overall fluency of the conversation. Also, some pronunciation was not clear. For example, ChatGPT sometimes spoken/heard as ChargeGPT.

Improvement Suggestion:

The group can improve fluency by preparing more concise statements and avoiding filler words. Practicing how to present complex ideas in a clear and structured way would also enhance communication.

Some Additional Comments

1. Unclear Structure and Lack of Flow

The discussion lacked clear organization. Participants often jumped from one topic to another without connecting their points, which made it hard to follow. Instead of discussing the topic step by step, ideas were mixed up, and it was difficult to understand the overall argument.

2. Repeating the Same Ideas

Many speakers repeated the same points without adding anything new. For example, several people talked about AI replacing jobs but didn't provide new insights or examples. This led to a repetitive discussion, which wasted time and did not push the conversation forward.

3. Circular Arguments

Some participants kept repeating the same arguments without adding new information. For example, they said that AI would both create and take away jobs

4. No Clear Conclusion

The discussion ended without any final summary or key takeaways. There was no clear conclusion on whether AI would replace jobs or what actions should be taken in response. (**Note:** The video ended without it, it might be there but not recorded or any other case).

Section	Marks
Content Knowledge & Comprehension	3/5
Logic and Reasoning	2.5/3
Body Language & Group dynamics	3/5
Language Fluency	3/5
Total Score	11.5/20