

# Analysis of Group Discussion on "Will Artificial Intelligence Take Away Jobs?"

The report evaluates a discussion by nine participants about AI's impact on employment. Assessment focused on four main criteria: Content Knowledge & Comprehension, Logic and Reasoning, Body Language & Group Dynamics, and Language Fluency. Here's a summary of strengths, weaknesses, and improvement suggestions:

## 1. Content Knowledge & Comprehension

- **Strengths:**

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.

- **Weaknesses:**

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).

- **Suggestions for Improvement:**

The group could benefit from exploring a wider range of AI applications and supporting statements with specific data and case studies to improve depth and credibility.

## 2. Logic and Reasoning

- **Strengths:**

Some participants noted AI's dual impact: it displaces repetitive jobs while creating new roles in tech-driven fields.

- **Weaknesses:**

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.

- **Suggestions for Improvement:**

Building stronger, well-reasoned arguments with clear data examples would improve coherence and make discussions more persuasive.

## 3. Body Language & Group Dynamics

- **Strengths:**

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.

- **Weaknesses:**

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.

- **Suggestions for Improvement:**

Actively encouraging quieter members and improving non-verbal engagement would enhance group interaction.

## 4. Language Fluency

- **Strengths:**

Participants generally conveyed ideas with clarity and used appropriate vocabulary, contributing relevant points.

- **Weaknesses:**  
Frequent filler words, awkward phrasing, and pronunciation issues (e.g., "ChatGPT" misheard as "ChargeGPT") disrupted fluency. Points were sometimes repeated unnecessarily.
- **Suggestions for Improvement:**  
Preparing concise statements and practicing articulation of complex ideas would improve fluency and communication quality.

### Additional Comments

- **Structure and Flow Issues:**  
Participants often changed topics abruptly without clear transitions, making the discussion hard to follow.
- **Repetitive Points and Circular Arguments:**  
Several participants repeated similar ideas without introducing new insights, leading to redundancy.
- **Lack of a Clear Conclusion:**  
The discussion ended without summarizing key takeaways or reaching a conclusion on AI's impact on employment. (**Note:** The video ended without it, it might be there but not recorded or any other case).

### Scoring Summary

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