

Debate on "should computers replace teachers" essay



This is the first argument that I would like to give against the motion. I agree that some aspects of the educational system are already provided by the computer and yes, it is definitely true that you don't need a person to learn everything – education is a largely personal matter. However, if we eliminate the teacher-student interaction completely, a part of the educational experience will be lost. It's not just the act of standing before a class that makes a teacher a teacher, there's the whole social experience of learning – the working together, bouncing ideas off of one another, etc.

People are always complaining about the loss of social contact that has come with the age of technology I fail to imagine what they'd be saying if the computer became the new teacher. Report this Argument Pro I first thank my opponent for starting this debate and now I shall begin. I know most members of this website find semantics annoying and cheap but since I'm arguing for the PRO side of this resolution I still feel a need to point out an important semantic flaw. The Resolution is ' Computers CAN replace... and even from reading Con's first argument you can see he has already admitted that it ' CAN' be done though he say's it would lose an important quality desired in a teaching environment. So by Con's own admission the Resolution has been affirmed PRO; that Computers CAN indeed replace human teachers. For that reason alone Pro already wins this debate; but lets pretend I don't for the sake of making this debate longer and more entertaining. My following arguments will apply as if the Resolution were ' Robots will... ' or ' Robots should... ' replace human teachers.

Well I suppose it would be more accurate had I put ' Computers' rather than Robots, but you cant talk about this subject without getting into robots.

<https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com...> and the truth of the matter is (if you click on the link I just gave) Robots (a kind of computer) have ALREADY started to replace teachers. And all the things my opponent worries over being lost appears to have been programed into this robot teacher. She can even 'scold' a student if need be. So a robot is just as capable as a human in the teaching application.

Not to mention the advantages of having a controllable programmable teacher. Once we make all teachers robots you wont have messy problems that put your school on the news in a bad way when your teacher sleeps with their students. <http://shavedlongcock.blogspot.com...> You also can rest assured that the robot teacher will only teach what is in the school board agreed upon agenda. if your school said evolution would be taught, you wont need to worry about the teacher taking the personal liberty to 'make aware' their students of a controversy surrounding this topic if you don't want them too. heir is very little you can do to censer human teacher's from teaching what 'they thinks important' that the school board doesn't. Next off education is perhaps the most debt inducing expense any state has. Teacher Unions are often considered one of the strongest Unions out their, making sure they can fight for every dollar they can get in their salary. remove these humans you have to pay every week for the robots you only have to purchase once and you just made running the educational system financially possible to pull off without going into debt.

Some of you might go 'isn't that slavery, to employ people your not going to pay but rather pay to own'. The answer is No. their robots no one cares.

Robot labor is the closest we can ever get to slave labor again while it's still <https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

moral. I think we should not miss out on this opportunity. So what do we want between the 2? Teachers that teach the things we voted on they should teach for sure and nothing else. True control over what our kids are learning? Do we want a real solution to state debt by taking teacher salaries out of the budget?

Do we want to do the right thing and protect our kids from seductive randy teachers who would steel their innocence at the age of 14? Or are we going to risk our kids safety with real people? Are we going to compromise our control over what they learn by employing rouge humans? Are we going to miss an opportunity to make a feasible cut from the educational budget that could bring your state out of debt? I think the answer is clear for anyone who truly care for our young students out their. Certain jobs should only belong to robot computers, and teaching is one of them.

I look forward to your response. ???? Report this Argument Con First of all I would like to thank my worthy opponent for accepting this debate. It will surely be great fun to debate with Marauder. Now to talk about the debate I would first like to bring forward my reply for my opponent's and then I shall move on to my arguments. " I know most members of this website find semantics annoying and cheap but since I'm arguing for the PRO side of this resolution I still feel a need to point out an important semantic flaw. The Resolution is ' Computers CAN replace... and even from reading Con's first argument you can see he has already admitted that it ' CAN' be done though he says it would lose an important quality desired in a teaching environment. So by Con's own admission the Resolution has been affirmed PRO; that Computers CAN indeed replace human teachers. " First of all I'd like to clarify <https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

that I had suggested in my previous argument that SOME aspects of the educational system are provided by the computer and not all the aspects are covered up by it. On the contrary, a teacher covers all the aspects of educational system. 2)" <http://www.msnbc.msn.com.....> nd the truth of the matter is (if you click on the link I just gave) Robots (a kind of computer) have ALREADY started to replace teachers. And all the things my opponent worries over being lost appears to have been programmed into this robot teacher. She can even ' scold' a student if need be. So a robot is just as capable as a human in the teaching application. " My opponent, if you read the link given by you properly, you ill come across quite a lot of sentencing stating that the developers of this robot say that this robot is not about replacing human instructors. Moreover you have stated in your argument that she is capable f scolding her students if she wants but unlike human teachers; she is only capable of showing six basic emotions – surprise, fear, disgust, anger, happiness, sadness . The developer has himself admitted that a robot cannot be a kind of inspirational role model. The robot has no intelligence. It has no ability to learn. It has no identity. It is just a tool. 3)" Not to mention the advantages of having a controllable programmable teacher. Once we make all teachers robots you wont have messy problems that put your school on the news in a bad way when your teacher sleeps with their students. [ttp://shavedlongcock.blogspot.com...](http://shavedlongcock.blogspot.com...) ; By saying that computers cannot replace teachers I meant that computers cannot replace good teachers. The problem you have mentioned in the above argument can be solved by awareness from the side of both parts and students. I do not think that a teacher employed in a good teacher would ever indulge himself or herself in such a " messy thing". 4)" You also can rest assured that the <https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

robot teacher will only teach what is in the school board agreed upon agenda. If your school said evolution would be taught, you won't need to worry about the teacher taking the personal liberty to 'make aware' their students of a controversy surrounding this topic if you don't want them to. There is very little you can do to censor human teacher's from teaching what 'they think is important' that the school board doesn't. "Don't you think that the students have the right to know both the sides of the coin to develop their own opinion about things. This will only help the society in getting a better future member. 4)" Next off education is perhaps the most debt inducing expense any state has.

Teacher Unions are often considered one of the strongest Unions out there, making sure they can fight for every dollar they can get in their salary. Remove these humans you have to pay every week for the robots you only have to purchase once and you just made running the educational system financially possible to pull off without going into debt. "I wonder what made my opponent think that replacing a computer machine will be cost efficient. Take the example of the robot my opponent had mentioned in his argument. What do you think would be the cost of such a precious machine?

Well in my opinion not less than a billion dollars. I cannot imagine the amount when multiplied by the population of the country. Secondly, my opponent pointed out that teachers work primarily because of money but there are many teachers who don't just work for money but also for the welfare of mankind. Next I would like to bring forward my arguments:- Man created computer, computer did not create man. No matter how much it tries, an invention

cannot outwit its inventor. Computers can check a paper's spelling and grammar, but they cannot teach someone style or help clarify an idea.

They can give a grade, but cannot pat someone on the back. They can display a novel chapter or poem to the screen, but cannot sit in the middle of a group of children and read it with the right voices. They can display a three-dimensional model of a sodium chloride molecule, but cannot answer a question about it unless the programmers who designed the model had anticipated the question beforehand. They can tell the story of the Alamo, complete with pictures and sounds, but cannot tell what it feels like to walk inside the room where Jim Bowie died.

They can tell a student that his or her answer is wrong, but cannot wipe away the frustrated tear that may follow. They can record whether a student is present in class, but cannot ask why the student looks nervous or angry or depressed. They can print a story that a student has written, but cannot recognize its potential and encourage the student to keep writing. At least, not if the student is expected to believe it. The creators of any educational software need to be teachers or workers in the education system, or programmers who had previously worked in the field of education.

Therefore, although students may learn knowledge by computer, the skills and ideas ultimately emanate from the teaching staff. While the computer may offer a correct answer or explanation to students, the comprehension capability of every student varies from student to student, making it is impossible for the computer to offer an explanation catered to a student's particular level of understanding. However, the teacher is able to undertake

this task, as he or she possesses expertise in teaching. For example, when a teacher discovers that many students cannot understand professional knowledge, he or she may offer explanatory examples.

The computer, however, may only analyze a question in terms of a simple right or wrong response. The teachers are invariably responsible for carrying a dual role. Most teachers act as not only an educator, but also a kind of father or mother-figure in taking care of students in school. The teacher is able to assist parents in solving a child's mental problems other than imparting daily knowledge. The computer, which is purely an algorithmic electronic device, cannot hope to assist in this regard. In summary, the computer may not play a major role in education in comparison to the benefits of a teacher bestows.

However, it is critical that teachers improve their old teaching modes by using computers at some level of educational teaching. Teachers not only impart bookish knowledge but also inculcate in the students, several moral values. This task cannot be performed by any computer . A slave can never in-cage his master, in the same way, artificial intelligence cannot replace human intelligence which is the greatest gift of all. Report this Argument Pro

“ First of all I'd like to clarify that I had suggested in my previous argument that SOME aspects of the educational system are provided by the computer and not all the aspects are covered up by it.

On the contrary, a teacher covers all the aspects of educational system” Oh, well good then, now I shall have to work to have the resolution affirmed. To put what Con contended here in more mundane terms ‘ since computers

can't do everything humans can, they can't replace them. ' They can't cover all the aspects of the educational system. But you see; to be able to replace our teachers; they don't have to. They just have to cover the bare minimum necessary aspect of our educational system. I will get more into what the bare minimum things you must have to have a working teacher in minute; but first to address a few objections.

I won't quote too much to save room so I am relying on you the readers to pay attention enough to know which objections I'm addressing. If my opponent feels in doing this I misrepresent exactly what he said please point it out and I will either defend myself for my mistake or apologize. First off; of course the developers are going to say they are not about to replace human instructors. If they were to come out and say that their project would meet so much political resistance from more than just the teacher Unions for sure. Plus this kind of statement when dealing with technology is always meant in the sense that ' it's not going to do.... ny time SOON' It advances every day. we have robotics so advance that a monkey can have its brain plugged into it and eat food using only it. the importance of the robot-teacher in the link is that we know for sure that advances have gone so far that we can already make them do those six emotions. not just any 6 emotions, but the pivotal ones that you bare minimum must have if your going to replace the human teacher. Concerning ' computers can't replace good teachers', if we are allowed to add to the resolution in round 2 like that then I add to it that by computers it means ' androids that would put Data from Star Trek to shame'.

Since its added to the resolution we get to debate as if those androids were real today. Of course neither of us are allowed to do this in a debate now
<https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

that its begun; and the risk created by employing human teachers that this could happen matters. As my opponent like to push in this debate ' their just tools' so a robot wont endanger our kids in this way on its own. We control it and thus protect our kids. Continuing to employ humans means your going to employ some that are by our desired standards ' bad' and you wont discover they are until its too late.

Con thinks the solution would be as simple as ' making parents and students aware', but come on, . If your teacher throws a pass at you would you have told your parents. Its awkward just to think about having that conversation. Unless you have very good parents, you probably will just keep this to yourself and try handling it on your own. And the truth is a lot of parents just don't meet up to that par. This isn't to say most are not trying their best; maybe they aren't being that much of a dad because they didn't really have one growing up to show them how its done.

Maybe this is their first child. Becoming that kind of parent whose son or daughter will come to about this is tough. If you have parents like that then praise God for you have truly been blessed. never take it for granted. My opponent says students have a right to ' think' and make their own choice knowing both sides of all issues, and he's right. But not on my Taxpaying dollars. Society can only benefit from making sure the only students that know both sides are the ones that learned to get off there lazy butts and look it up themselves.

Why do I think it will save money; Because I know how long term investments are cost efficient. Paying for a wind turbine will mean on

electricity you will have paid more than you would have not buying it for the first few years. But after even more years go by the saving from what your not paying the power company will have added up enough to pay of the equipment. If you listen to any financial guru out their you'll find they advise making long term investments if you want to get out of debt, or even get rich. How can my opponent think this equipment will be 'billions of dollars'?

Cause its a Robot? They are college students that get the funds easy to make a robots for 'kicks' (pun intended) every year. Their not billion dollar equipment. [http://www. me. vt. edu...](http://www.me.vt.edu...) Another point; schools are finding a way to put unreasonably expensive stuff in every room this very day. It used to a school district was lucky to have 1 smart board, in my last year in high school I rarely had a class were their wasn't one. Radio stations donate them, Ruritan clubs raise funds just for getting the school one... the community pulls together to equip its schools with the best tech all the time. Secondly, my opponent pointed out that teachers work primarily because of money " I pointed no such thing out. I only pointed out that their union is strong. So we are not about to successfully cut their already low pay without a uphill battle with that Union. Now on to Con's case: Con argues over things like how our creations cant outwit there creators, but this is not relevant because for the computer to replace the working human teachers it does not need too. We are not looking to make things greater than us that could revolt against us to fulfill the resolution. nly something that can baby sit a class of students and guide them through the learning process equipped with all the bare minimum functions needed to do that. what are those things then? Its said that in order to learn something you need to repeat the

material 4 times. can a Robot be programmed to direct the class to ' read' material before and after class, have them copy it in class and and play recorded voice tape that comes with the book to read it to the class during? Yes! In japan teachers play much less of a role than what my opponent says they do and look how their students turn out. hey are stereotyped as smarter than us and their is a reason for this. reducing the teaching process to that which a computer is only capable of will force the students to think on their own rather than have a teacher think of some way to dumb down the material for them to think less and still get it. Who do these human teachers think they are anyway trying to take the position of ' role model' for our kids? That right belongs to the parents alone. Any parents out their reading this tell me if you ever find it annoying when your kid starts quoting their teacher to argue with your view as if he/she knows better than you their Dad/Mom?

Your trying to raise your kids to hold at least a certain extent of your values so you don't have to worry about them once your dead and their totally on their own. This is your right and one of the reasons people have kids to pass on part of themselves in their child's character. Who does the teacher think he/she is to take that away from you? They are in your way (the parent) in raising your kids. Theirs enough ' social' structure in the class provided by all the human students having to work together. We do not need to keep the human element in the teacher. She/He is the most dangerous one of all to leave it in.

You know they complained at first about taking the REAL sugar out of sodas when they switched to corn syrup. but after time passed by we can see its one of those changes that we are better off without. The same will go with <https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

teachers. Report this Argument Con 1)" They (robots) just have to cover the bare minimum necessary aspects of our educational system" I would like to ask my readers – Wouldn't you prefer teachers who are capable of covering ALL the necessary aspects of the educational system over these robots who on the contrary can only provide 'bare minimum' aspects of it.)" Who do these human teachers think they are anyway trying to take the position of 'role model' for our kids? That right belongs to the parents alone. Any parents out there reading this tell me if you ever find it annoying when your kid starts quoting their teacher to argue with your view as if he/she knows better than you their Dad/Mom? Your trying to raise your kids to hold at least a certain extent of your values so you don't have to worry about them once your dead and their totally on their own.

This is your right and one of the reasons people have kids to pass on part of themselves in their child's character. Who does the teacher think he/she is to take that away from you? They are in your way (the parent) in raising your kids. " To this I would only like to say that a teacher is one of the strongest pillar in shaping a child's future. I am sure that everyone has either met or heard of a teacher who have changed their life or the lives of others. I certainly have met such a teacher who has inspired me to be who I am.

She motivated me all through my school days and if I am here debating on this topic then its all because of the support she gave me in building up my confidence. Moreover my opponent had rightly pointed out that it is awkward for children to talk about sensitive issues with their parents unless they are very good parents – " Its awkward just to think about having that

conversation. Unless you have very good parents, you probably will just keep
<https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

this to yourself and try handling it on your own. And the truth is a lot of parents just don't meet up to that par. I certainly do feel that there is a difference between parents and friends. However teachers are our those friends who act as our second parents. I think the only person one would ever like to look unto for advice after ones' parents are his teachers. 3)"

Concerning ' computers cant replace good teachers', if we are allowed to add to the resolution in round 2 like that then I add to it that by computers it means ' androids that would put Data from Star Trek to shame'. Since its added to the resolution we get to debate as if those androids were real today. There is nothing to add as a resolution in this context. It is pretty obvious that when I talk about teachers better than computers I certainly mean that " good" teachers can't be replaced by a computer. A ' bad' teacher can be replaced by anything and everything because all the qualities I mentioned in my arguments can only be found in a good teacher. 4)"

Why do I think it will save money; Because I know how long term investments are cost efficient. Paying for a wind turbine will mean on electricity you will have paid more than you would have not buying it for the first few years.

But after even more years go by the saving from what your not paying the power company will have added up enough to pay of the equipment. If you listen to any financial guru out their you'll find they advise making long term investments if you want to get out of debt, or even get rich. " Not all the countries can afford that long term investment, in this way several countries will lag behind in the race of development. This will in turn spread inequality, unrest and will hamper fraternity among several countries.)" We are not looking to make things greater than us that could revolt against us to fulfill

the resolution. only something that can baby sit a class of students and guide them through the learning process equipped with all the bare minimum functions needed to do that. " If this is the case then I think my opponent should revise his definition for replacement. To answer this argument I can only say that if these computers are made to ' baby sit a class of students' then they are in no way replacing the teachers.)" In Japan teachers play much less of a role than what my opponent says they do and look how their students turn out. they are stereotyped as smarter than us and their is a reason for this. reducing the teaching process to that which a computer is only capable of will force the students to think on their own rather than have a teacher think of some way to dumb down the material for them to think less and still get it. " This is the case of just one country. I don't think that ALL the countries will be able to take up such an action.

This will lead to the development conflict among the countries. I have already mentioned this before. As for my new arguments... A computer can never lead a discussion and respond in intelligent ways to student questions. In a discussion of history or government or economics (my subjects) a computer would not be able to answer any but the most frequently asked questions. It would be like expecting a student to learn straight from a book without any teacher to explain the text to them or to answer questions that were only tangentially related to the text.

There are not many students self-motivated enough to learn alone. Most students need a flesh and blood support system that gives instant feedback and offers spontaneous face-to-face communication. That's why so many college students fail online courses-no self-motivation, no independent study

<https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

skills, and insufficient time-management. Report this Argument Pro “ It is pretty obvious that when I talk about teachers better than computers I certainly mean that “ good” teachers can’t be replaced by a computer. ” No such thing is obvious at all.

In round 1 you gave no definition of ‘ teacher’ that defined it as the best example of a teacher. In fact the only thing in Round one to be found that addresses what kind of teacher you were talking about is in the resolution ‘ Human teachers’ So the resolution say’s we are only concerned with ‘ Human teachers’ now you can Google that if you want to see if theirs any room to write off the bad ones from being concerned with in this debate and that it only applies for the good but I can tell you right now it wont be the case. “ human” generally isn’t taken to cover both the good and the bad.

In the few occasions the term ‘ human’ is used to being ‘ good’ or ‘ bad’ at all its always referring to ‘ bad’. a evangelist challenges a person on the street saying ‘ if you tell lies what does that make you? ‘ and the street person says ‘ human’ or ‘ un-perfect’ instead of ‘ liar’. So it’s pretty obvious that from the round 1 definitions (or lack of them) we are talking about the bad teachers too. In fact, the bad ones really are the only ones we should be considering because the ‘ good’ ones are so rare and few that they are only a statistical anomaly that you would never consider them to logistically exist.

Their has to be significant amount before you consider them. So my opponent had a ‘ good’ teacher. So what; I have a friend that won the lottery, but it’s still most correct to say that buying into lottery tickets will never make you any money. How can one have any security in sending their

kids to schools whose teachers are not robots? How do I know my child is in safe hands and not in the hands of a teacher like the one in the video who nearly killed her student? How could that school have known that she would be like that? After all that teacher was just being 'human' full of unpredictable flaws that can range from harmless ones to lethal ones. All of the videos show teachers being a little too 'human' for me to ever feel safe knowing my child could be taught by one of these. That one of these teachers could be in the position of role model for my kid and then abuse that fact to get what he/she wants with my kid. "Wouldn't you prefer teachers who are capable of covering ALL the necessary aspects..." well if these extra aspects are not part of the bare minimum ones then they are luxuries, not necessary aspects which was my point.

And my opponent has still failed to show how I could count on my child's teacher likely being one who would even provide those 'luxuries'. Maybe the optimum situation would be my kid having the greatest teacher ever who does all my opponent says and more so I would prefer that but concerning the resolution with replacing human teachers, we can't act as if the perfect teacher actually exists. "To this I would only like to say that a teacher is one of the strongest pillars in shaping a child's future. I am sure that everyone has either met or heard of a teacher who has changed their life or the lives of others. This is not a refutation; in fact it acknowledges what I said that teachers are taking such a role, a role which as a parent you would optimally want only for yourself to affect the child in such a way. Plus when so many teachers out there who are in this role model position are selling out to their students, you should only expect negative effects on your child's development

even if you could get over the pride factor and be willing to share the honor of raising your kid with the teacher. " I certainly do feel that there is a difference between parents and friends.

However teachers are our those friends who act as our second parents. I think the only person one would ever like to look unto for advice after ones' parents are his teachers. " That's the problem though Con; because when the teacher is the bad guy that put's them in the prime position to get their perverted way with your kid. And that's the scenario that brought up my argument about ' awkward to think about talking to your parents" about a bad kinda teacher. And hear your saying that if they cant go to their parents they should go to their bad teacher? That makes no sense Con. " Not all the countries can afford... Who cares? What other countries can afford is not relevant to the scope of this debate unless the only kind of ' replacement' you think the resolution refers is one that must be done in a day, or a year even. And if you read round one again it is not defined like that. And how could it be? such a definition would be the most incorrect view of ' replacement' I have ever seen. If teachers are to be replaced by robots it of course will start with rich countries in rich schools. then as technology advances the robots are easier to produce cost effectively and the price goes down and more can afford robots. he older models go for sell on eBay at discount price when they are replaced and even the poorer of places can manage to get a robot teacher. So theirs poverty in the world, some people are better off than others, but unless you can prove that addition of robot teachers in particular to the already high list of things that make countries ' unequal' to each other would increase unrest to a level of bloodshed you

point about unrest is irrelevant. some countries don't have computers should you and I destroy the ones we are on right now until they can afford them too? No. If this is the case then I think my opponent should revise his definition for replacement" well seeing as there has been no given definition in this debate for 'replacement' I might as well make the official one then shouldn't I? Replacement: can be used in place of something and do what that something's primary task was. Replacement is a term almost never taken so strictly to mean 'does everything the last thing did and in the same manner' to say something has been replaced it can do its job a little differently and even in different degree of effectiveness than the thing it replaced. This is the case of just one country. I don't think that ALL the countries will be able to take up such an action. This will lead to the development conflict among the countries. I have already mentioned this before. "Again; So what? Also defend your reasons for why in this particular case other countries can't follow the suit, for here we are not talking about the addition of equipment but rather a country that teaches in simpler manner with less required of the teacher. all countries may not be able to take a step forward at the same time but they can take a step back at any time they want.

And as we can see from Japan's case that particular step back has only proven good for the students. As for Con's 'new' arguments, I fail to see anything new about it. Just another attempt to arouse the audience's sentimentality towards the handful of good teachers out there. But I already addressed that, and I also already argued about how the risk weighs with bad 'human' teachers over having controlled robots that can't be everything

the 'good' teacher can be. You just can't ignore those logistics, if all teachers were replaced by robots it would be an upgrade in teaching quality.

And when only about 27 classrooms out there can have a right to say differently, how can we care about those 27 over the hundreds of others that would be improved. Now am I saying there are hundreds of teachers out there so bad they sell pot to their students and sleep with them or try to strangle them? No of course not but I do say that hundreds of them don't measure up to the ideal teacher my opponent has been referring to. Report this Argument Con No such thing is obvious at all. In round 1 you gave no definition of 'teacher' that defined it as the best example of a teacher.

In fact the only thing in Round one to be found that addresses what kind of teacher you were talking about is in the resolution 'Human teachers' Well, to be frank when I started the debate I only had the picture of a 'good teacher' in my mind. Let us not be oblivious to the fact that human teachers include both good and bad teachers. What I wanted to suggest was that there is no substitute of a good teacher and as far as a 'bad teacher' is concerned; even self study works well with it. In fact, the bad ones really are the only ones we should be considering because the 'good' ones are so rare and few that they are only a statistical anomaly that you would never consider them to logistically exist. " Really! I solemnly disagree. In fact the bad ones are the rare ones. How many teacher killing student or teacher raping student cases have you seen or read about? I think that good teachers exceed the number of bad teachers by clear majority. Moreover, not all teachers are dumb enough to sacrifice their future just for a futile desire. " Who cares?

<https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

What other countries can afford is not relevant to the scope of this debate unless the only kind of 'replacement' you think the resolution refers is one that must be done in a day, or a year even. And if you read round one again it is not defined like that. And how could it be? such a definition would be the most incorrect view of 'replacement' I have ever seen. " WHO CARES! that is what you suggest me for a question of international importance! Don't you think that technology is meant for the usage of everyone? I think that it is a right that every country should have. If teachers are to be replaced by robots it of course will start with rich countries in rich schools. then as technology advances the robots are easier to produce cost effectively and the price goes down and more can afford robots. So theirs poverty in the world, some people are better off than others, but unless you can prove that addition of robot teachers in particular to the already high list of things that make countries 'unequal' to each other would increase unrest to a level of bloodshed you point about unrest is irrelevant. Certainly the problem of replacement will add to the already high list of things as you put it contributing to this unrest indirectly if not directly (although I still think that it will bring instability and bitterness in the relationship between various countries) " well seeing as their has been no given definition in this debate for 'replacement' I might as well make the official one then shouldn't I?

Replacement: can be used in place of something and do what that somethings primary task was.

Replacement is a term almost never taken so strictly to mean 'does every thing the last thing did and in the same manner' to say something has been replace it can do its job a little differently and even in different degree of

effectiveness than the the thing it replaced. " To this I would just like to provide my readers with a few meanings of the word replace given in some of the dictionaries a) merriam-webster – to restore to a former place or position b)oxford – put back in the same position c)lexicool – put back in the exact position " As for Con's ' new' arguments, I fail to see anything new about it.

Just another attempt to arouse the audiences sentimentality towards the handful of good teachers out their. " I do not think there was anything ' sentimental' in my piece of argument or any mention of good teachers. I advice my opponent to read the text again. Teachers are a vital part of our economy. If we were to replace teachers with computers than millions of jobs would be lost. Children' s grades would also fall dramatically, as they could easily cheat and get away with it. Students need teachers as they can tailor lessons to a specific classes needs and give feedback on work.

Computers cannot have compassion, interest or any other emotion to a student. I have enjoyed good teachers and have experienced new phenomena through technology (mainly the internet). However, technology cannot substitute for having an in person teacher who is knowledgeable, well prepared and interested in their students. Further, technology cannot substitute for many educational experiences such as the in person interaction with other people (we're social animals) and directly experiencing certain things as a part of the learning process. How many of us would want blood drawn by a nurse who has only done it through an online training?

To conclude, a just as a calculator can never ever teach maths similarly a computer can never teach academics or anything else for that matter.

Lastly, debating with my pro had been an excellent experience. Thanks a lot and best of luck for the future. Report this Argument Pro “ What I wanted to suggest was that there is no substitute of a good teacher and as far as a ‘ bad teacher’ is concerned; even self study works well with it. ” Well too bad, as the final round is not the time of any debate to put limitations that keep the range of what you have to defend or support on how you would like it.

Round 1 is the round for doing that. Also, self study works really well in Japan and with Robots too. “ Really! I solemnly disagree. In fact the bad ones are the rare ones. How many teacher killing student or teacher raping student cases have you seen or read about? I think that good teachers exceed the number of bad teachers by clear majority. Moreover, not all teachers are dumb enough to sacrifice their future just for a futile desire. ” If you read my closing statements in round 3 you will see I made clear I was not labeling all bad teachers as the ones who rape, strangle, and sell their students pot. hat you have been giving long list of all the things a good teacher does that robots cant this entire debate is a standard extremely few live up too. now maybe its unfair for me to take all those who don’t quite measure up to ‘ wipe tears away from frustrated student’ to call them outright ‘ bad’; but if they fail to live up to the core theme of what your attributing to teachers, that theme obviously being that they care about there students, then they should be called a ‘ bad’ teacher.

And you’ll find that most teachers out there would tell you they have to

become such a ‘ bad’ teacher that they don’t care if they are to protect
<https://assignbuster.com/debate-on-should-computers-replace-teachers-essay/>

themselves from becoming 'burnt out'. In order to have a peace of mind they think 'if the student fails well it's their life' I know this cause it's nearly always the start of the semester speech I have gotten from any of my teachers. I suppose it's too late to ask but I would be willing to bet Con's 'inspiring teacher' is new at teaching and has yet discovered the need to quite caring so they won't become 'burnt out' early in their career.

Audience if you're thinking that last bit was a new argument being given when my opponent can't rebut, it's not, just clarification of the fact that I did not say all 'bad' teachers live up to the degree of bad of the ones in the videos. "

WHO CARES! that is what you suggest me for a question of international importance! Don't you think that technology is meant for the usage of everyone? I think that it is a right that every country should have. " I was not saying who cares about giving robots to all the poor countries, I said who cares as to how it's relevant to this debate. the problem of all countries not having the same privileges as others is a compound one that is not connected to teaching with humans to teaching with robots. Second off, it is a non-sequencer that because it is international that it would be important. Anyway the point was the definition of replace in its normal usage can allow for this replacing to take time and not need to be one total and swift action. "

Certainly the problem of replacement will add to the already high list of things as you put it contributing to this unrest indirectly if not directly (although I still think that it will bring instability and bitterness in the relationship between various countries" Well, that's quite an unfathomable thought to add unsupported in the last round. and the reason I say that is the very fact that you are selling the case for human teachers over robots before

we are logistically even able to make such a change in 1 school shows that their will be no unrest for equality, only stubborn resistance to the change. the countries would have to totally agree the change will be better to feel 'unrest' over the robots. To this I would just like to provide my readers with a few meanings of the word replace given in some of the dictionaries a) merriam-webster – to restore to a former place or position b)oxford – put back in the same position c)lexicool – put back in the exact position" well round 4 isn't really the place for this addition of definitions but even considering them it doesn't solve the your problem, for it doesn't specify what is being referred to as the ' same' or ' exact'.

It of course cant mean the most literal sense ' replace Mr. Graham with a Mr. Graham' for that's the only true way to be totally the ' same'. it of course always refers to a set of qualities with people doesn't it. ' replace with someone who does the same stuff' but how much needs to be the same to count as the same, we know its never meant to go as far as the teachers ' accent' It means the important relevant factor that fits the context of our topic. nd here the important relevant factor for ' teachers' as a general whole which cannot be defined by any ones unique style to teaching is the fact that they ' impart knowledge of facts that is in school syllabus' So we can see my usage of ' replacement' has been just fine for this debate an if my opponent wanted to debate over a different kind of replacement Con should have set the debate restrictions up for that in round 1. " Teachers are a vital part of our economy. If we were to replace teachers with computers than millions of jobs would be lost" millions of jobs that anyone with economic sense would give up anyway. eachers are severely underpaid.

meanwhile Con has ignored here that millions of jobs would be made installing robots, programming them, and maintaining them, producing them in factories in the first place, producing replacement parts, ect... “ Children’ s grades would also fall dramatically” No, we’ve seen in japan that this style of teaching has produced smart kids “ as they could easily cheat and get away with it. ” Con here has failed to mention how all that human teachers do to stop cheating would not continue in robots as well.

In fact humans teachers pretty much really on computers now for catching cheaters. My source for that is from a teacher in my family. So in conclusion for the governs.... 1) Your state will benefit from this long-term investment, from no longer paying humans, not to mention the high tech jobs you brought into your state. for the taxpayers.... 2) the kids will only learn what you voted they would learn, this is real control of what your money is being used for. for the parents... 3) the only role model in your child’s life will be you, making it easier to raise you kid. Iso the security of knowing the robot wont sell pot to your kid, strangle, or rape or kidnap them. for the human teachers that would lose there jobs..... 4) you are not being paid enough to sacrifice as much time as you do now, its time you learned the cold reality that you need to get a job with decent pay, you deserve it. for the kids... 5) wouldn’t it be awesome to have robot for teacher, just like the one on that cartoon you watch, or close anyway. Plus you can rest assured they wont shred your Yugioh cards when they confiscate them, they really will just hold them until the end of the day.