

Title

In my presentation, there were objectives that we surpassed, but also objectives that we failed to achieve. Unlike our last presentation, our PowerPoint existed more to support our words, rather than simply restating what was said. However, not everything was an improvement, as my own personal presentation fell short of what I had aimed to achieve.

Similar to our project on *The Lorax*, I was the only one in our group with extensive prior knowledge on the subject, which acted as a double-edged sword as we did our research. Positively, this prior knowledge allowed me to research more specific topics that I knew existed, bringing about our group's emphasis on the Turing Test as well possible scenarios of the future. However, the converse is also true, as this prior knowledge caused us to miss or intentionally not include certain aspects of the subject that could have added to our argument. For example, if I were to re-do this presentation, I would include Eugene Goostman as an example, as he is a unit of basic artificial intelligence that has passed a watered-down version of the Turing Test. This

ethical dispute that has risen in recent years between those who support that progress of artificial intelligence and those who deny the possibility of artificial intelligence advancing past the machines of modern times. This example had the potential to be powerful as it would be a specific, concise piece of evidence to support the claim that artificial intelligence would be a dividing topic of the world. However, despite being a great example that I would have loved to included, the team had to cut it out due to time constraints.

Another interesting change that occurred during the process of creating our presentation was the change in direction that occurred in our research as we began working on the project. Originally, the question proposed read, “How Will the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence Impact the Changing World,” but as we began to research we expanded it, as we realized that the topic of artificial intelligence went beyond simply the ethics of these living machines, but would also affect human society and the already existing technology. Furthermore, this gave a chance for the three of us to each take a different direction on the overarching topic of AI, as I specified my research on only the ethics of AI, Jacob diverged to the path of societal impacts, and Wyatt researched the topic of technological advancements caused by AI. This shift in the focus of our presentation was a shock, but it was a welcome and beneficial change, as it allowed each of us to take a different perspective on the topic, presenting the topic of artificial intelligence through three very different points of view.

Aside from our research, my own presenting skills had improved between our presentations. Between the two presentations, I learned to be more confident in what I was doing, however, this was not entirely shown. Unfortunately, during our most recent presentation, I became nervous and spoke faster than was originally intended. Furthermore, multiple of the judges commented on the fact that I fidgeted during my teammate’s portions of the presentation,

becoming distracting and