

Proponents too
fixated. for example,
an outstanding
student



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Proponents of standardized tests argue that it is the most efficient way to measure students' performance and teachers' effectiveness. They assert that standardized test is accountable, analytical, structured, and objective. One of the greatest benefits of standardized test is that teachers, schools, and people who are related to education system are responsible for teaching students what they are required to know for these standardized tests. This is mostly because students' scores remain as public record and it can be used as mean to compare teachers' and schools' effectiveness.

In a similar context, standardized test allows test data from New York to be compared to scores in Los Angeles and, the most of time, it is developed by academic experts so each question undergoes an intense process to ensure its validity. There are the most appealing reasons that many states have adopted standardized test. In addition, establishing standards or an instructional framework is necessary in order to follow the standardized test. Thus, it may help teachers to deliver large amount of information in a relatively short period of time.

Lastly, standardized test is objective since there is little chance that bias would affect the scoring (Meador, 2017). However, just as coins have both sides, there are also disadvantages of standardized test. Opponents of standardized testing contend that it is inflexible, a waste of time, impossible to measure real progress, stressful, and political (Meador, 2017).

They assert that a one-size-fits-all approach cannot assess unique individuals because it is too fixated. For example, an outstanding student may not perform well on the standardized test because he/she is not used to

the format. Moreover, standardized tests prevent both students and teachers from being creative since standardized tests force them to spend time on material that will appear on the test. Although learning is an ongoing process and the process is as important as the outcome, standardized tests tend to focus only on students' outcome rather than students' progress and proficiency over time.

In other words, standardized tests don't provide any information about how much the student has gotten better. At last, the atmosphere of the classroom is influenced not only by students but also by teacher. So, if teacher is stressed, it may affect the quality of the lecture. However, teachers and students alike feel test stress. For educators, poor student performance may result in a loss of funding and teachers being fired. (Meador, 2017). I don't believe that "high-stakes" tests are helpful to society overall because it may undermine the value of education.

The purpose of education should be considered first. Many people may not agree, but I support John Dewey's saying that "Education is not preparation for life, education is life itself." Though, education is not means but a purpose itself, many people treat education as a means of getting things like diplomas, passing test, college acceptance, salary increase, and so on.

Sometimes high-stakes test confuses the reason for being educated.

Occasionally, students are not studying to learn but either to pass the exam or to gain good grade on exam. In short, high-stakes tests can cause goal

displacement of education. There are many benefits of higher education on later life.

One of the main advantages of higher education in later life is 'Higher salary'. Individual earning is strongly related to educational attainment. For example, people who have completed high school earn more than those who have not; people with a bachelor's degree earn more than those with only a high school diploma; and those with a graduate education earn more than those with only an undergraduate education (Hill, Hoffman, & Rex, 2005).

Consequently, people with higher income are more likely to purchase healthy food, have time to exercise, have less stress, and pay for health services and transportation. On the other hand, individuals with less education are more likely to suffer from job insecurity, low wages, and lack of assets, which can lead to poor nutrition, unstable housing, and unmet medical needs.

Furthermore, higher education builds skills and fosters traits that are important throughout life and may be important to health, such as conscientiousness, perseverance, a sense of personal control, flexibility, the capacity for negotiation, and the ability to form relationships and establish social networks. These skills can help with a variety of life's challenges.

Therefore, it is difficult to deny the fact that higher education influences one's life in a positive way and elevates one's life quality. However, going to college is not 'always' advantageous.

There is a famous saying "We are all unique, and have our own special place in the puzzle of the universe." We are all unique in our own way so having the same choice cannot be the right choice for all of us. It is not right to force a

fish to ride a tree because a monkey can. In similar context, the benefits of going to college may not apply to everyone.

As stated above, one of the benefits of attending college is higher income. According to The College Payoff (2011), a report published today by the Georgetown University Center for Education and the Workforce while those earning master's, doctoral, or professional degrees still earn more during their careers than those with less education, the gap is closing. Thus, going to college may not be a panacea to all. Despite the fact that going to college is not good for every individual, I still think higher education is beneficial to many people.