

Example of argumentative essay on technology in the college classroom

[Profession](#), [Student](#)



OUTLINE

Introduction

Whether or not the use of technology in the college classroom brings more harm than good, is debatable. While technology has been a central factor in many sectors including business and education, this debate has taken a center stage, with proponents of either side pushing to have their views heard. This paper prominently addresses the pro-technology side of the argument, followed by brief rebuttal and counterarguments.

The Argument for Technology in College Classrooms

- According to Osorio et al (2005), " the human computer interaction makes communication, a central factor in education, easier". The human computer interaction makes the conveyance of information easier through eliminating barriers associated with human weaknesses. However, " the success of technology integration into classrooms depends on how end users receive and embrace it" (Gu, & Zhu, Y, 2013).

- Osorio et al (2005) think, " Technology is the single most important way of introducing efficiency to the wheels of higher education." By efficiency, it means that the students in the college classroom are capable of effortlessly accessing, retrieving and applying information in research. Additionally technology provides applications that assist in personal development.

Patricia Riley notes " Some additional apps that my students recommend for rehearsal and performance assistance" (Riley, 2013)

- Accessibility is yet another pro of using technology in the classroom setting of colleges. According to Reed (2010), " technology makes a wide array of

resources readily available to the college student”. Accessibility and retrieval are closely linked.

- Hammonds et al (2013) argue that the use of technology makes students remarkably organized " These students have been raised in a digital environment"

The counterarguments

- The other side of the debate has two noteworthy points, and the first one is “ technology is associated with resistance to change, due to lack of knowledge, or ignorance” (Reed, 2010). Essentially some people fear technology because they are not well versed in it.

- Secondly, Hammonds et al (2013) argue that other people associate technology with distraction because, “ it comes with such features as games and other online media”.

Rebuttal of Counterarguments

What others consider distraction is essential since play and enlightenment are as well essential. In light of this, the Organization of American Historians (2012) says, “ the real power of computer lies in its graphics rather than its word processing function”.

Conclusion

It is evident, from the foregoing, that the pros of using technology in college classroom outweigh the cons. As such, the use of technology in the college classroom is a valid option, and all institutions should endeavor to embrace the idea.

References

- Gu, X., Zhu, Y. & Guo, X (2013). Meeting the “ Digital Natives”:
Understanding the Acceptance of Technology in Classrooms. *Educational
Technology & Society*, 16 (1), 392-402.
- Hammonds, L., Matthessen, L., Wilson, E. K & Wright, V. (2013). Gateway
tools: Fine tools to allow teachers to overcome barriers to technology
integration. *The delta Gamma Bulletin*.
- Organization of American Historians. (2012). Book reviews. *Journal of
American History*
- Osorio, J., Tatnall, A., Visscher, A., & IFIP TC 3/WG 3. 7 International Working
Conference on Information Technology in Educational Management (ITEM).
(2005). *Information technology and educational management in the
knowledge society: IFIP TC3 WG3. 7, 6th International Working Conference
on Information Technology in Educational Management (ITEM), July 11-15,
2004, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain. New York, NY: Springer.*
- Reed, R. H., Berque, D. A., & WIPTE. (2010). *The impact of tablet PCs and
pen-based technology on education: Going mainstream, 2010. West
Lafayette, Ind: Purdue University Press.*
- Riley, P. (sept. 2013). Teaching, learning and living with iPads. *Music
educators journal*, 100(1), pp. 81-86