**IEL Spring 2019**

**Week 6 task assignment model template**

**Names and assigned numbers**:

1. Mitoma Ryo(B10)

2. Rawat Adwait (B16)

3. Tomoya Sudo (B21)

4. Wan Muhammad Azim Nazmi Bin Wan Asmadi(B30)

**General plan (please give a short summary of how your group will deal with the article)**

The article is very long and has many vocabulary words that are unknown to the reader. Thus, the work will be divided between the members of the group based on following tasks, 1. Online searching 2. Basic Computer Skills 3. Lextutor site & AWL 4. Vocabulary. Each task will be given to one member and a list of all things unknown in the article will be made. This list will then be used as an assistance sheet when reading the actual article.

Everyone will read about 12 paragraphs and write a summary of each paragraph. The whole article will be divided in 4 parts. These 4 parts are then read by 4 people. That parts are divided in such a manner that when read, each member will read 8 paragraphs already read by someone else, so that when summaries are written, each paragraph has 2 summaries.

The summaries will then be compared and then judged based on the amount of information each summary contains. Lacking ones will be removed and complementary summaries will be merged to get one summary for each paragraph, ensuring the quality of summary of each paragraph. Since everyone has read about half of the article anyway the next half will be easy to understand using the summaries.

Due to parts of the article of individual work is read by other members, we can determine if some of our group members are slacking off or not by reading our own respective summary is matching with the article or not.

**Detailed plan**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task description** | **Due** | **Person responsible** |
| Share Line IDs. | 2019/6/10 |  |
| Make a Line Group. | 2019/6/11 |  |
| Make an empty template for assignment with name of group members. | 2019/6/12 | Adwait |
| Make Backup. | 2019/6/13 | Adwait |
| Use AWL highlighter and make a list of all AWL words in the article. | 2019/6/14 | Nazmi |
| Use Lextutor to filter all words in K3 list or higher including Off-list words. | 2019/6/15 | Tomoya |
| Send all the files related to the progress of the assignment to the group. | 2019/6/16 | Nazmi and Tomoya |
| Update detailed plan table in assignment file. | 2019/6/17 | Ryo |
| Backup assignment. | 2019/6/17 | Adwait |
| Use the assignment file to google search all the unknown vocabulary words. | 2019/6/18 | Ryo |
| Make sure everyone understands every meaning of the words in the article | 2019/6/18 | Adwait |
| Make a general plan of how to go about reading the article and update the assignment file. | 2019/6/19 | Nazmi |
| Update detailed plan table in assignment file. | 2019/6/19 | Ryo |
| Backup assignment file. | 2019/6/19 | Adwait |
| Reading work begins. | 2019/6/20 | Everyone |
| Submit summaries. | 2019/6/24 | Everyone |
| Gather and read all the summaries and make a summary per paragraph. | 2019/6/28 |  |
| The summaries are read for the test. | 2019/6/29 |  |

**Vocabulary list**

**K3>**abstraction acknowledge acquire alongside alternatively aspects assess assigned behave behaved behavior behaviors capacities capacity ceased collaborate colleagues communicate communication comprise concrete confesses confessional confront consequence conservative consisted consistent consistently converted cooperating cooperation cooperative coordination core corporation corrupt crucial decades declared decline democratic demonstrate density depictions devices digital disruptive distant diverse donate donation effectively emerge enabled encounter encountering ensure errors essential estimated evolution evolve evolved exhibit experiment experimentation experiments expert explore exploring externalities fiction flexibility flexible focused foundation fundamental generosity generous genetically hence highway implications independent inevitable infections inherited innovations inquiry intelligence interact interaction interactions interfere intervene intimacy intimate intimately invention latter merely moral multiple network notion occupied outcome phenomenon philosopher plotting posing potential potentially practitioners prediction primarily prompt prospect racist radical radically reflective regulate reinforce responses retreat reveal revolutionized romantically rural sacrifices significant software solution substantially target task technical theoretical therapists thereby tragedy transform transformed transforming transmitted urban urgent via virtual virtue

**K4>**accustomed anthropologist arenas artificial artificially behalf bizarre consoling contemplate depriving differentiate differentiating dilemmas distraction endowed ethical ethically hardware hybrid inhibit intelligent jerks mandate norm polarize robot shallower steered stumbled suite traits

**K5>**autonomous collision communally confidants electorate fatigue imperatives midst millennia pedestrian premature prone reckless ripple susceptible tablets unleash wrestle

**K6>**accordance advent attentively bland chess clumsy contours gratification ostensible perkily perpetrators pre reciprocal staple thwart

**K7>**innate lulled malicious nomadic oversight permeates sounder stunt

**K8>**commons consequential ingenuity posited usurp zoologists

**K9>**awhile disorganized insinuate insinuates leach polity reciprocity secondhand virtuoso

**K10>**altruistically atrophy incipient outperformed ubiquitous

**K11>**bedevil hologram lieu sentient

**K12>**empathic iconoclastic invective madrigal narcissistic

**K13>**humanoid

**K14>**preempt

**K15>**quotidian

**K16>**dehumanizing

**Off>**ai bot bots businessman driverless fi henry hobbes isaac kathleen kissinger mit nondestructively numberpo online railroad retweeted sci spillovers trolling unmalicious widespread

**AWL**

assess benefit consisted consistent consistently contract create environment establishing estimated individual individually individuals require requiring researchers responses significant similar similarly specific specifically theoretical acquire affect affected affecting aspects assistant assistants computer consequence designed designers feature features focused focusing injure injury positive potential potentially previously primarily regulate alternatively circumstances contribute coordination core corporation demonstrate ensure instance interact interaction interactions outcome philosopher sex sexual sexually task technical technology communicate communication emerge errors hence implications investigate occupied prediction capacities capacity challenges contact decline enabled evolution evolve evolved fundamental network notion target abstraction acknowledge assigned cooperating cooperation cooperative diverse expert flexibility flexible inhibit intelligence intelligent reveal transform transformed transforming adapted adults classic comprise converted decades differentiate differentiating equipment equipped foundation innovations intervene phenomenon survival transmitted crucial eventually exhibit inevitable intense practitioners prospect radical radically reinforce thereby vehicle vehicles via virtual widespread behalf ceased devices ethical ethically found norm relaxed revolutionized colleagues encounter encountering levy posing

**Summary**

Isaac Asimov posited Three Laws of Robotics to keep robots from hurting humans.

Social suite, a set of consepts such as love, friendship, cooperation and teaching, didn't change even though there are many invention of technologies like internet and so on, but in case of invention of AI made to look and behave like us, it will change not only how we communicate with them but also how we communicate with other human beings.

The author(Nicholas A. Christakis) did a experiment. In the experiment, there are two cases. In one case, robots acted making occasional errors, stating that robots also make mistakes. In the control group, robots just acted normally (with robots which only made bland statements). As a result, in the former circumstance, people got more relaxed about their mistakes and conversational than the latter case.

In another, virtual experiment, the author divided 4,000 human subjects into groups of about 20, and assigned each individual “friends” within the group; these friendships formed a social network. The task assigned to the group was each person had to choose one of three colors, but no individual’s color could match that of his or her assigned friends within the social network. Unknown to them, some groups contained a few bots that have the same setting as the previous experiment. Like the previous experiment, the groups that have said bots outperformed those who don’t have one. What’s more, the effect also affect the group that are not directly connected to the bots but at not at the same degree. Bots help humans help themselves.

Hybrid systems (systems with human and robot social interactions), with appropriate AIs humans improve relating to each other. To back this, the political scientist Kevin Munger directed specific kinds of bots to remind people who send racist remarks to other people in the Internet that they are humans too, which lead to a decline in usage of racist speech.

Contrary to these the experiments, they can also make people less productive and less ethical. [In a experiment with selfish robots, where the humans were given money in a game where if they donate the money to their neighbor the money donated will be doubled. Humans were cooperating and donating to their neighbors till the selfish robots stopped to donate, in turn humans also stopped donating as well.] The notion of selflessness and sacrificial nature for the community easily broke down by the interjection of robots is concerning.

There’s already real life example which is 5.7 million Twitter users in the run-up to the 2016 US presidential election trolling and malicious Russian accounts-including ones operated by bots-were regularly retweeted in a similar manner to other, unmalicious accounts, influencing conservative users particularly. Bots took advantage of social suites like teaching and cooperation to affect people indirectly polarizing the country’s electorate.

There are other social effects of simple types of AI such as children bark rude comments at digital assistants such Alexa and Siri, that can make the children treat other people the same, or that kids’ relationships with artificially intelligent machines will interfere with, or even preempt, human relationships. MIT expert Sherry Turkle told The Atlantic’s Alexis C. Madrigal recently that children with AI interactions might not be able to acquire empathic connections.

As digital assistants become ubiquitous, some people began treating as sentient beings, writing in these pages last year, Judith Shulevitz described how some people treat them as confidants, or even as friends and therapists, This brings the question: if we grow more comfortable talking intimately to our devices, what happens to our human marriages and friendships？As AI permeates our lives, we must confront the possibility that it will stunt our emotions and inhibit deep human connections, (leaving our relationships with one another less reciprocal, or shallower, or more narcissistic).All of this could end up transforming human society in unintended ways that we need to reckon with a polity.

Anthropologist at De Montfort University in the UK, Kathleen Richardson, robots can dehumanize and could lead to retreat from real intimacy. We might even progress from treating robots as instruments for sexual gratification to treating other people that way. Other observers like David Levy said that having robot as sex toys is a good thing. Sex robots won’t be susceptible to sexually transmitted diseases or unwanted pregnancies, and they could provide opportunities for shame-free experimentation and practice. Levy believes that sex with robots will come to be seen as ethical, perhaps in some cases expected.

While driver-less car which is very near to us have many good things such as preventing accidents, it can deprive us of an occasion to exercise the abilities which are cooperation and social coordination, could lead to their degradation in cooperation and social coordination skills.Self-driving cars will take not only the driving duties but also the moral judgments (like which human to hit during an inevitable collision), and affect other humans indirectly. For example, it might decrease the attentiveness of drivers and increase likelihood of accidents when they change from self-driving lanes to human-driving lanes. Or it might just improve human performance of people who drive with autonomous vehicles. In either case, it would be reckless to release new kinds of AI without taking such social externalities into account beforehand. We must apply the same effort and ingenuity that we apply to the hardware and software that make self-driving cars possible to managing AI’s potential ripple effects on those outside the car.

In 1985 Issac Asimov added another law to the list of laws of robotics, to prevent harming humanity. But had problems defining harms, stating “A human being is a concrete object,” he later wrote. “Injury to a person can be estimated and judged. Humanity is an abstraction.” (Which means, defining humanity is difficult and thus teaching a machine what harm means is also difficult.)

Just like why normal rules, laws and demands for democratic oversight are needed between human to human interaction. Similar rules and laws are needed when AI comes into picture of human-to-human interaction. As the effects of these interactions are really broad and far reaching, some systematic method to deal with this is necessary.

Already, a diverse group of researchers and practitioners (computer scientists, engineers, zoologists, and social scientists, among others) are coming together to develop the field of “machine behavior,” to improve our technical and theoretical understanding of how a machine interacts with humans, as the scientists don’t see them as man-made objects but as new class of social actors.

As AI becomes more wide spread and sentient, we need to have a better way to differentiate that is just not normal and the behavior that is really dangerous to us (sky net). The most concerning thing being the factors that affect the foundation on which humanity have survived till now.

The Enlightenment philosopher Thomas Hobbes argued that humans needed a collective agreement to keep us from being disorganized and cruel. On the contrary, without the need for government etc. humans are genetically equipped with “social suites” to live more peacefully and communally before the arrival of AI.

As humans don’t have time to evolve to deal with the changes that arrive along with AI. We need to, take steps, to form another social contract (a relationship with machines and not humans) to live with AI in a peaceful manner.