

8-9-2009

Poor Are Hurt When Schools Rely on Standardized Tests

Aaron W. Hughey

Western Kentucky University, aaron.hughey@wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/csa_fac_pub

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Repository Citation

Hughey, Aaron W.. (2009). Poor Are Hurt When Schools Rely on Standardized Tests. *The Lexington Herald-Leader*, August 9, 2009.

Available at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/csa_fac_pub/40

This Editorial is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Counseling & Student Affairs Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

(Sunday, August 9, 2009, pages D1-D2)

Poor are hurt when schools rely on standardized tests

By Aaron W. Hughey

For several years, educational researchers have noted a direct correlation between socioeconomic status and scores on standardized tests such as the ACT, SAT and GRE.

It is well documented that students from more affluent families typically score significantly higher on these tests than do their counterparts from less affluent families.

And the relationship is linear: the higher the socioeconomic status of the family, the higher the test scores.

Now there is solid scientific evidence that the brain is physically affected by being raised in poverty.

A study published earlier this year in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences found that the chronic stress experienced from growing up in poverty appears to have a direct impact on the development of the brain.

Specifically, children from lower socioeconomic families tend to have underdeveloped working memories



MCCLATCHY-TRIBUNE

as compared to children from families that are doing better financially.

Why is this important?

Obviously, these findings have a number of significant implications. One of the most relevant is related to how we use standardized tests

About the author

Aaron W. Hughey is a professor in the Department of Counseling and Student Affairs at Western Kentucky University. Reach him at Aaron.Hughey@wku.edu.

such as the ACT and the GRE in our college admissions processes — both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Although we often state that these tests constitute only one component of a larger admissions process, the reality is that they are often the primary criterion by which admission is determined.

Moreover, it is also well documented that several minority groups are still overrepresented in the lower socioeconomic classes. Therefore, when we deny admission to students based heavily on their scores on standardized tests not only are we discriminating against the less affluent, we are also guilty of discriminating by default on the basis of race

See TESTS, D2

TESTS | More measures to predict success

From Page D1

and ethnicity.

It is morally and ethically wrong to deny someone admission to college based on predictors that are innately flawed and biased toward more affluent applicants. Any admissions decision that uses standardized test scores should also take the socioeconomic status of the applicant equally into account.

So should we discard these tests?

No. But we should definitely marginalize their role in our admissions processes. Many institutions are already doing this. It would be nice if more institutions were on the leading edge of this movement instead of waiting to see what other colleges and universities are doing before adjusting their policies to reflect this inevitable trend.

Standardized tests, as they are used in our society, have reached the pinnacle of their utility. I am convinced that our reliance on them will decline as their inherent weaknesses are more clearly understood and publicized. We need to begin to see assessment as a much more comprehensive process oriented more toward inclusion than exclusion.

And yes, we need to ensure that we admit students who are qualified. But there are better ways of doing this that do not involve an almost exclusive reliance on traditional standardized tests. Even the major testing companies are beginning to acknowledge the inherent limitations of their more established instruments as predictors of academic performance.

The Educational Testing Service recently introduced a new instrument, the Personal Potential Index (PPI), that looks at a number of factors considered essential for success in graduate school. These characteristics include creativity, teamwork and integrity — factors that are obviously integral to student success but are not measured by traditional tests such as the GRE.

Incidentally, these are exactly the kinds of characteristics that nontraditional (typically older, more mature) students consistently report as being the critical determinants of their success in college or graduate school.

Motivation, attitude and perseverance tend to be more accurate predictors of achievement among this group than intellectual or cognitive ability.

Again, the truth is that individuals from poor families have had to deal with numerous challenges that those with more affluent origins cannot even begin to understand or appreciate. For these people, standardized test scores tend to be more reflective of their socioeconomic background — and racial or ethnic heritage — than their actual educational potential.

Standardized tests will probably always have their place in one form or another. What we need to recognize and confront is the irrational confidence we seem to have in what they actually tell us. The efficiency we achieve from these tests simply does not justify the harm they do to individuals from lower socioeconomic classes.

The sooner we acknowledge and accept this, the sooner we can begin to mitigate the injustice that standardized tests inherently perpetuate.