



What are We Talking About When We Talk About Holistic Review? Selective College Admissions and its Effects on Low-SES Students

Michael N. Bastedo ^a, Nicholas A. Bowman ^b, Kristen M. Glasener^a,
and Jandi L. Kelly^a

^aCenter for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA; ^bEducational Policy and Leadership Studies, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA

ABSTRACT

This mixed-methods study used open-response survey data, focus groups, and an experimental simulation to explore how 311 admissions officers defined and used concepts of holistic review in selective college admissions. We found that 3 distinct definitions of holistic review predominate in the field: whole file, whole person, and whole context. We explored these concepts qualitatively and used the coded data to predict decision making in an experimental simulation. We found that admissions officers with a “whole context” view of holistic review were disproportionately likely to admit a low socio-economic-status applicant in our simulation. Inconsistent definitions of a core admissions concept make it more difficult for the public to comprehend the “black box” of college admissions, and a more consistently contextualized view of holistic review may also have real-world implications for the representation of low-income students at selective colleges.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 14 April 2017
Accepted 15 February 2018

KEYWORDS

Admissions; low-income students; undermatching; holistic review; experiment

Today, competition for admission to selective college and universities is more intense than ever. At many higher education institutions in the United States, the number of college applications submitted has increased annually for the past 15 years. The documented growth in applications is due in part to increases in the number of high school graduates—which peaked with the 2012 graduating class—but also to greater numbers of applications submitted per student (Snyder & Dillow, 2015). More than 80% of 1st-year students applied to three or more colleges in 2013, an increase of nearly 20% since 1993; nearly one third of students submitted seven or more applications in the same year (Clinedinst, Koranteng, & Nicola, 2016).

This increased competition has had negative consequences for both low-income students (Bastedo & Jaquette, 2011) and students of color (Posselt, Jaquette, Bielby, & Bastedo, 2012), as students from underserved high schools have fewer resources to compete in a winner-take-all admissions system. Low-income students have less access to the advanced course-taking

opportunities, such as advanced placement (AP) or international baccalaureate, which are crucial for selective college admission, as compared with their more affluent peers (Rodriguez & McGuire, [in press](#)). Outstanding performance in extracurricular activities often requires access to financial resources and a lack of competing work or family obligations, often placing low-income students at a disadvantage (Weininger, Lareau, & Conley, [2015](#)). Finally, higher-income students have massive advantages in the quality of information, counseling, and advising they receive on the nuances of elite college admissions practices (Weis, Cipollone, & Jenkins, [2014](#)).

As admissions competition to selective institutions intensifies, students are increasingly concerned about the evaluations their applications will receive in the admissions process. To the average student, the selective admissions process seems opaque at best and at worst, fraught with mistrust, subjectivity, and special interests (Killgore, [2009](#)), which is particularly true for low-income students (Holland, [2014](#); McDonough, [1997](#)). What also seems clear is that admissions offices lack a consistent definition of what is meant by the holistic review, and the academic literature has yet to engage the question of how these definitions vary across the field.

Although strong quantitative evidence points to factors in the aggregate that predict acceptance to elite colleges and universities, relatively little is known about the processes that institutions enact to develop selection criteria and review prospective students' application materials. Very few studies have examined actual admissions policies, defined as the criteria that govern decisions of inclusion and exclusion, the procedures for assessing applications, and the practices of the Office of Admissions. Although it has been well established that admissions policies at many institutions are not focused exclusively on academic achievement (e.g., Stevens, [2009](#)), the gatekeeping processes that drive admissions decisions at colleges and universities remain unclear.

Many selective institutions have reported using holistic review in their admissions processes (Espinosa, Gaertner, & Orfield, [2015](#)) or its primary attributes (Clinedinst et al., [2016](#)). Nevertheless, holistic review seems to vary greatly from institution to institution, and definitions of holistic review are often vague (College Board, [2002](#)). Elite colleges often assert their concern with the merit of the whole person, which includes both academic and nonacademic characteristics (Killgore, [2009](#)). Academic accomplishments, such as standardized test scores and high school grade point average (GPA), are weighed against other dimensions like character, leadership experience, athletic talent, community involvement, and school and family context. Each element may receive more or less emphasis in admissions decisions, depending on institutional priorities related to enrollment targets, prestige, and tuition revenue. While admissions officers have fairly precise information from transcripts and standardized tests, they have comparatively

weak information on high school contexts (Bastedo & Bowman, 2017; Gaertner & Hart, 2013).

This dearth of empirical research on admissions decision-making processes at selective institutions requires an examination of the black box of admissions to better understand the often-opaque policies underlying admissions practices at selective institutions. This study extended the work of existing research on admissions by exploring holistic admissions practices at selective colleges and universities. In particular, we examined (a) how admissions officers define holistic admissions, and (b) whether these definitions influence decision outcomes when evaluating applicants' files.

In this study, we used a mixed-methods approach to examine how admissions counselors conceptualize holistic review. Using survey data from 311 admissions officers at 174 selective colleges and universities, in addition to focus groups with 15 of these officers, we found that admissions officers offered a broad range of definitions when asked to describe the meaning of holistic admissions. We used these data to produce a grounded typology of holistic review. We then conducted a randomized, controlled experimental simulation and explored whether providing high-quality information on applicants' high school contexts increased the likelihood of admitting low socioeconomic-status (SES) applicants when taking into account how respondents operationalized the concept of holistic admissions. In a high-information condition, admissions officers who espoused a definition of holistic admissions emphasizing educational and family contexts were significantly more likely to admit a low-income applicant from an underserved high school.

Holistic review in selective admissions

Holistic review is both a very new and very old idea in college admissions. Although the idea of individualized review is often lauded today, it is rooted in religious and ethnic discrimination. When higher education institutions were first established in the 17th and 18th centuries, students were admitted almost exclusively on the basis of academic criteria, including the ability to read and write in classical languages (Broome, 1903). As greater numbers of students sought a college education in the decades preceding World War II, the most elite institutions—Harvard, Yale, and Princeton—became increasingly troubled with influxes of Jewish students who often had strong academic profiles but who they believed did not have the kind of “character” or “personality” that they wanted to cultivate (Karabel, 2005; Synnott, 1979; Wechsler, 1977). This blatant anti-Semitism led selective institutions to devise new admissions requirements that also encompassed nonacademic criteria such as character, personality, and leadership (Stampnitzky, 2006). These new policies, referred to as the “whole man” standard, provided

increased discretion to admit applicants on the basis of highly subjective measures that strongly favored affluent, masculine, White Protestant men.

After World War II, the concept of merit was again redefined in selective admissions. With the advent of college entrance exams in the 1950s, colleges and universities gradually adopted standardized tests as a component of their admissions standards. Early advocates of college entrance exams (e.g., SAT and ACT) viewed these tests as a more fair and equitable assessment of applicants, as they seemed to provide objective measures that mitigated subjective preferences in college admissions (Lemann, 1999). This new meritocratic system promised to sort students into higher education on the basis of academic potential rather than social status (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). At the most elite colleges, these ideas of character, personality, and leadership were combined with the use of high school grades and standardized test scores and later were institutionalized into the form of college admissions practices seen today. This form of review greatly served the needs of these colleges to continue relationships with wealthy White communities—and their feeder schools—that were essential to their survival (Karabel, 2005).

The move toward holistic review was reinforced by legal developments. Although *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978) is most often today noted for establishing the diversity rationale for race-conscious admissions, Justice Potter rooted his decision in his admiration for Harvard's process of individualized review. "So long as the university proceeds on an individualized, case-by-case basis," Justice Potter said, "there is no warrant for judicial interference in the academic process" (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978, footnote 59). Public institutions were thus strongly incentivized to move away from formula-driven practices to accommodate legal demands with respect to race-conscious admissions (Hirschman, Berrey, & Rose-Greenland, 2016; Stulberg & Chen, 2014).

The concept of holistic review crystallized in response to criticism of the increased reliance on standardized test scores. In 2001, University of California President Richard Atkinson called for the abolition of the use of the SAT in undergraduate admissions. He argued that test-preparation hysteria was "compromising our educational system" (Atkinson, 2001, p. 2) and gave unfair advantage to affluent students who could afford expensive tutoring services. "In many ways, we are caught up in the educational equivalent of a nuclear arms race . . . We know that this overemphasis on test scores hurts all involved, especially students. But we also know that anyone or any institution opting out of the competition does so at considerable risk" (Atkinson, 2001, p. 3).

To combat the academic arms race, Atkinson proposed a more comprehensive evaluation process that included high school quality and home environment as admissions criteria to ensure "a student who has made exceptional progress in troubled circumstances [is] given special attention"

(Atkinson, 2001, p. 6). These ideas became especially relevant after the passage of SP-1 and Proposition 209 in California, which prohibited race-conscious admissions. Although many alternatives were ultimately tried at University of California, holistic review in context—known at University of California as comprehensive review—both was legally viable (Contreras, 2005; Pusser, 2001) and produced the greatest degree of racial diversity (Traub, 1999). Atkinson promoted comprehensive review as a means to eliminate the SAT—he loathed the word “holistic,” inserted in his speech by an unidentified young staffer—but ultimately, the word stuck (Atkinson, 2005). The College Board, meanwhile, accommodated Atkinson’s criticisms in its revision of “the new SAT,” and ultimately the University of California never eliminated its SAT I requirement.

The use of the phrases “holistic review” or “holistic admissions” was surprisingly uncommon until fairly recently. These phrases are not used in major histories of college admissions (e.g., Karabel, Synott, Wechsler) or in College Board reports presenting “best practices” in admissions (e.g., College Board, 2002). In early newspaper articles, the word “holistic” was generally used with distancing quotation marks, as if the word was both largely unknown and vaguely disreputable. The word was never used in *Gratz v. Bollinger* (2003), either in the decision or the University of Michigan brief, but the court in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) famously valorized the law school’s “highly individualized, holistic review” (p. 4). The court thus echoed the *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978) decision in arguing that “truly individualized consideration demands that race be used in “a flexible, nonmechanical way” (p. 22). This argument was embraced in *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2016), where Justice Kennedy used the word “holistic” no less than 19 times. A more holistic review of applicants, the argument goes, will be legally viable and reduce inequalities in college access; yet there remains little consensus among college admissions officers about what holistic review should entail and how it should be enacted.

Research design and qualitative methods

This study drew from a randomized, controlled trial, open-response survey data, and focus groups to explore how holistic admissions is operationalized by practitioners in the admissions field and whether these definitions affect admissions decision making. Our research strategy embraced a mixed-methods design (Greene, 2007; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) through which the collection of qualitative survey and focus-group data informed the creation of a conceptual typology to better understand holistic review. This typology was then used in the analysis of experimental data collected from the same group. We thus sought to yield the benefits of creating a

dialogue between grounded theory-driven data collection—with concepts defined by the informants themselves—and the causal inference that may be drawn from a randomized, controlled trial.

Participants and analysis

Open-ended survey responses

Survey participants were 311 admissions officers working at 174 different U. S. colleges or universities within the top three tiers of Barron's (2013) *Profile of American Colleges*. Barron's (2013) *Profile of American Colleges* is frequently used in higher education research to capture college selectivity levels, as it ranks 4-year schools into a six-tiered hierarchy of competitiveness based on high school class rank, high school grades, standardized test scores of the incoming class, and the institution's selectivity rate. In 2013, 397 colleges and universities were categorized in the top three tiers of Barron's Admissions Competitiveness Index. Survey participants therefore represented 44% of institutions in these Barron's categories.

Participants were recruited from attendees of the 2014 annual meeting of the National Association of College Admissions Counseling; we limited invitations to those who worked at a selective college or university and whose job title implied they would regularly review applications (e.g., directors of enrollment management at large institutions, whose responsibilities generally involve managing other employees and working with university administrators, were not invited). Among conference attendees, 1,017 admissions officers met the criteria for participation in our study and thus received invitations to participate in the experiment and subsequent survey. Admissions officers received \$50 for their participation. Of the 311 participants (31% response rate), 57% were female, 77% were White/Caucasian, 10% were Black/African American, 9% were Latino/Hispanic/Chicano, 6% were Asian American/Pacific Islander, 1% were American Indian/Alaska Native, and 2% were from other racial/ethnic groups (these racial/ethnic figures add up to slightly more than 100%, as participants were allowed to choose multiple categories). Because data on admissions officer characteristics are not collected on a national level, it is unclear to what extent these participants were representative of college admissions officers at universities in the United States or within selective college admissions more specifically.

After the conclusion of the survey-gathering process, the open-ended survey responses were open-coded to develop emerging themes from the data, while utilizing insights from grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 2014; Suddaby, 2006). We particularly focused on the response to our first question, "What does holistic admissions mean to you?" After open coding all the responses, anchoring concepts (or axial codes) were developed that organized the responses into a three-part typology (whole file, whole

person, whole context). Data were further coded to examine rival definitions and schema that did not fit neatly into our emerging typology.

Focus groups

Although we found our initial framing of the data compelling, we sought to use focus-group interviews to allow us to interact with informants and explore our emerging ideas in greater depth. Drawing on a subset of the 311 survey participants, we recruited 15 participants in three focus groups to delve further into the survey findings (Morgan, 1997). Specifically, we sent recruitment e-mails to all 311 survey participants and drew a convenience sample of 15 admissions representatives from 15 different colleges and universities in the top three Barron's tiers. In our recruitment materials, we emphasized that participation was entirely voluntary, and participants' names and institutions would not be linked to their responses.

We sought to triangulate our survey findings through additional data collection (e.g., focus-group data and experimental data), multiple methodologies, and multiple researchers examining the same data (Mathison, 1988). Participants received an additional \$50 gift card for their participation in the focus groups. Like the survey, each of the participants was an admissions officer at a selective college who read applications during the reading season. The participants were generally deans of admissions and associate deans of admissions, or their equivalent. Each focus-group interview was led by a member of the research team paired with a partner who took notes and managed logistics. The interview protocol sought to delve more deeply into their beliefs about holistic review and the role of various key components in a holistic process (e.g., test scores, noncognitive factors, personal qualities, institutional fit).

In each focus group, participants spoke at length about their admissions review processes, while often engaging one another with questions about different office policies and procedures. Participants seemed at ease and even eager to discuss the topic of holistic review, with discussions often exceeding the scheduled 60 min. Two researchers separately coded the focus-group data, looked for consistencies and inconsistencies with our emerging typology, and asked questions to specifically engage alternative logics, discrepant evidence, and plausible rival explanations and frameworks of holistic review. Thus, we sought to fully explore both our own emerging ideas, rival explanations, and negative cases presented in the data (e.g., Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2016; Maxwell, 2004).

Qualitative findings

Nearly 95% of respondents in our survey stated that they used holistic admissions in their admissions decision-making process. However, we found a wide variety of definitions of holistic review among our informants.

Table 1. Typology of holistic admissions practices.

	Definition	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Total	Example Statements
Whole File	Admissions decisions are determined by reading the whole file and/or all parts of the application.	33%	50%	56%	50%	"We review, consider, and evaluate all information provided when rendering an admission outcome." "Holistic admission means that we will evaluate all of the components of the application and not rely on any one component as the determining factor in our decision. All aspects of the application from testing to transcript to extracurricular activities and the personal statement are an important [part] of our evaluation." "We consider the five traditional areas: rigor, GPA, and testing are the three on the academic side, and then extracurricular activities and the written pieces, the essays and recommendations. We don't make or break a decision based on a particular test score. I think in a holistic way, we are very in tune to the ups and downs of every file."
Whole Person	Admissions decisions consider the applicant as a unique being in light of individual characteristics and achievements.	20%	19%	19%	19%	"Holistic means looking beyond just the objective like test scores and GPA to really try to get to know the applicant as a student and as a person. It means putting similar emphasis on academic record as additional supplemental materials like essays, resumes, etc." "It means that we value getting to know the whole person—beyond just grades and scores. Our job is really to shape the class and if we are indeed committed to creating a diverse, interesting, and vibrant community, we must value the applicants as individuals."
Whole Context	Admissions decisions consider the whole person within the context of their family and school environments; considers hardships, extenuating circumstances, and/or educational opportunities.	47%	25%	24%	29%	"In addition to looking at testing, we also take into consideration personal statements, family background, socioeconomic background, teacher recommendations, extracurricular activities, etc. We also look carefully at the school(s) a student has attended and the opportunities (academic and extracurricular) that a student has had access to throughout their high school career." "Students are reviewed in their individual context. When reviewing an application, it's important to consider each student's unique circumstances including family, school, opportunities available to them, etc." "Placing a student's academic performance and curriculum in context of their school and life to really get a sense of what opportunities have been available to them and which of those they have chosen."

Note. A small percentage of survey responses (2%) were categorized as "not holistic," so some tier columns and total reporting may not add up to 100%.

Coding the 311 responses to this question revealed several themes with respect to how admissions officers evaluated prospective applicants. These themes resulted in a typology of holistic admissions consisting of the following categories: “whole file,” “whole person,” and “whole context.” A small number of responses (2%) were categorized as “not holistic.” [Table 1](#) provides data supporting each category of the typology, as well as the percentage of responses that fell within each category by selectivity tier. Based on the survey results, we convened three focus groups with admissions officers to gain further clarification about the typology. Both the survey and focus-group data suggested differences in the manner in which various admissions officers operationalized the concept of holistic admissions.

A typology of holistic admissions practices

Whole file

Admissions officers practicing holistic review as “whole file” emphasized the importance of reading all parts of the application. Although it is rarely how holistic review is portrayed in the media, half of survey responses fell under this whole-file category, and the category was most evident among less selective institutions in our sample. “Every component of the application process is considered,” one admissions officer explained. “Rec[ommendation] letters, academics, extracurricular activities, etc. It is an all-encompassing process.” Admissions officers who conceptualized holistic review as whole file extended evaluative criteria beyond measurable academic achievements, such as GPA and standardized test scores, to assure that all submitted application materials were considered when rendering admissions decisions. This finding was consistent with some statements about holistic review that talked about moving beyond formulas (College Board, 2002).

Admissions officers enacting whole-file review assigned value to many areas in the application, but the ways in which nonacademic factors were used were often vague or ambiguous. “Holistic admission means that we will evaluate all of the components of the application and not rely on any one component as the determining factor in our decision,” one admissions officer shared. “All aspects of the application from testing to transcript to extracurricular activities and the personal statement are important to our evaluation.” Another respondent added, “No one criteria supersedes the other criteria. Holistic admission means considering all parts of the application and weighing them together for a result.” As suggested by these statements, admissions officers who conceptualized holistic review as whole file tended to extend evaluative criteria beyond measurable academic achievements (e.g., GPA and standardized test scores) to ensure all submitted application materials, including nonacademic qualifications, were considered when rendering admissions decisions.

However, all aspects of the application were not necessarily weighed equally. As one focus-group participant shared, “We can place emphasis on any piece of the applicant’s file. We can read the application and make subjective decisions. We view all aspects on the application, but the focus or emphasis can shift on each applicant.” These explanations illustrated how demonstrated achievement in one area, such as academics, does not guarantee admission and each piece of the application is considered in decision-making processes. As another participant shared, ““Holistic admission means that we will not rely on any one component as the determining factor in our decision.” Rather, all components of the application were considered. However, these responses made no mention of how academic or family contexts might influence these value assignments, and it was often difficult to determine from these responses how admissions decision making was not simply arbitrary or idiosyncratic to individual cases.

Whole person

Admissions officers practicing holistic review as “whole person” valued treating the applicant as a unique individual in addition to considering all elements of the file. About 20% of respondents described this type of review. Admissions officers who used whole-person review sought to evaluate academic achievements in light of the applicant’s character, personality, or ability to contribute to the community in a unique way. “We value getting to know the whole person—beyond just grades and scores,” one officer said. “Our job is really to shape the class and if we are indeed committed to creating a diverse, interesting, and vibrant community, we must value the applicants as individuals.” A second admissions officer built on this description: “Holistic [review] is not simply relying on academic performance, such as GPA and test scores, but rather considering the whole person. This includes such attributes as their involvement, leadership, background, and what potential benefits they will bring to our community.” A whole-person review thus evaluates the applicant’s unique characteristics and achievements but does not describe consideration of an applicant’s context or environment. This view was consistent with statements about holistic review that talked about moving beyond academic qualifications and assigning ratings to personal characteristics.

Whole-person review also strives to humanize applicants. “We assess each part of the applicant—the heart and the mind,” one admissions officer said. Another said, “I would describe holistic review as getting to know the whole kid and their whole story . . . understanding when to rely on the humanity side of your head rather than the math side.” In addition to examining multiple layers of each applicant, admissions officers practicing whole-person review often defended the use of subjective measures. “Holistic means looking beyond just the objective like test scores and GPA to really try to get to know the applicant as a student and as a person,” one officer said. “It means

putting similar emphasis on academic record as additional supplemental materials like essays, resumes, etc.” A second officer further supported the use of subjective measures by explaining, “We are trying to get as detailed a picture of the student as possible, seeing them as a person rather than numbers and letters. Personality counts.” In adhering to these principles, officers practicing whole-person reviews created three-dimensional portraits of applicants to understand their unique stories.

Whole-person review was also emphasized at schools that considered the applicant’s “fit” and contribution to community. Our data revealed that 8% of respondents considered institutional fit—the perceived alignment of an applicant’s academic ability, extracurricular interests, and/or overall character with their institution—as part of holistic admissions. One officer shared:

I would say something that’s important is reading holistically to determine if the student is going to really fit into the community and into the curriculum, into the way in which the coursework is taught and that they’re going to be successful and have the ability to take advantage and grow within the curriculum and what the school has to offer.

Fit was seen as important not only for a student’s academic success, but also for their general happiness on campus. “The fit factor is probably the most important part of our application process,” one admissions officer said. “We try and divide out ... who will really be happy and successful at our particular type of institution Who fits with the personality of campus?” These admissions officers tended to describe their campus as having its own unique personality or culture.

In addition to identifying ways in which applicants might “fit” with their campus, admissions officers were also concerned with how a student would engage in the community once they arrived. One officer expressed that campus involvement and student success go hand in hand: “There are studies that have shown that students who are involved in high school are going to get involved in college. They’re going to attach to their university and they’re going to do well and do better at their institution.” A second officer similarly explained that contribution to the community is “vitally important” because her institution is a small, residential campus that relies on student participation and involvement to build community. These admissions officers often relied on students’ past behavior in the form of high school involvement or leadership to determine whether they would contribute to their campus communities. Yet admissions officers practicing whole-person review did not mention students’ opportunities for involvement in high school (or lack thereof) or how students’ high school or family context may influence these aspects of the application. These admissions officers also sought students who could make distinct contributions while benefiting from campus life. When evaluating an applicant, one admissions officer emphasized that it is important to ask, “Will the campus be

improved by their presence?” Whole-person review, then, went beyond all parts of an application file to include projections about how an applicant might perform academically or enhance the campus community based on their reading of the application, but it stopped short of considering the context of students’ educational opportunities.

Whole context

Admissions officers practicing holistic review as “whole context” considered all elements of the application and valued treating applicants as unique individuals, but they placed those applicants in the context of the opportunities available in their families, neighborhoods, or high schools. Approximately 30% of survey respondents described holistic review this way, and this form of review was far more common at the most selective institutions in our sample. Such evaluations extend beyond comparisons among applicants to a more nuanced consideration of opportunities afforded to each individual. Responses in the whole-context category take into account academic opportunity in one’s high school, family background, ongoing hardships, extenuating circumstances, or other contextual factors. “We look at each student within his or her context,” one admissions officer said. “Our philosophy is that it is impossible to understand the achievements of a student without also understanding the various external influences—school setting, socioeconomic status, ethnic background, geographic background, and family background—that have contributed to his or her journey.”

Admissions officers who described whole-context review often seemed knowledgeable about how differences in K–12 contexts—in wealth, college counseling, access to advanced courses, standardized test preparation, and many other factors—can perpetuate inequities in college admissions (e.g., Bastedo & Jaquette, 2011; McDonough, 1997; Park & Becks, 2015). While admissions officers who conceptualized holistic review as whole person considered influences of achievement at the individual level, those who espoused a whole-context process transcended individual characteristics to consider environmental factors such as socioeconomic background, racial identity, and school and family context that have shaped a student’s academic and extracurricular achievements. These admissions officers contemplated how applicants maximize available educational offerings and push themselves academically within their unique contexts (Bastedo, Howard, & Flaster, 2016). As one admissions officer explained, “We look at each applicant individually in terms of what their school offers and how they’ve challenged themselves in the environment available to them.” When making comparisons between applicants from different socioeconomic backgrounds, for instance, these officers recognized differences in high school contexts and availability of resources with making admissions decisions. A counselor illustrated this process by stating:

The thing that I think makes the difference in the read for me is looking at context, the context that the student came from and the context that they're achieving within. If they're in a low-socioeconomic family and a low-socioeconomic school and they're achieving at the highest level that we've seen from a student from that school, then likely they're going to adapt to their environment and succeed when they're provided opportunity.

Explicit consideration of school profile, resource availability, and family background in addition to individual attributes was a key differentiator between whole-context and whole-person review. Officers practicing whole-context admissions often situated quantitative measures like standardized test scores within the broader educational environment. They not only recognized persistent gaps in the performance of different student subgroups on the SAT, but they also acknowledged how differential levels of resources might affect test scores. When evaluating test scores, an admissions officer explained that he considers whether "this is someone who has the time or the means to take a \$3,000 standardized test prep course" and if students "only have the option to take [the SAT] once or whether time and money" restrict their ability to take multiple college entrance exams. "For us, thinking holistically about test scores is really looking at the broader view of the student. What options are available to them both within their family and their area and their school?" Another counselor similarly explained, "We know that students have very different resources and very different options in terms of test preparation or lack thereof. It's something that you again contextualize based on the background, school, and the family resources of the student when we try to understand what those test scores represent."

Admissions officers who operationalized holistic review as whole context also acknowledged how differences in students' environments may affect the quality of the application.

What we look for in the application, especially for our low-income students or underrepresented students, are hints of what their lives might look like in ways that they weren't able to say within the application. So, how can we be better advocates of the students because they might not be able to advocate themselves, like the more polished students in a prep school who have known they are going to college since they were born and just have had a lot of help with that . . . So we look at what parents do, languages at home, classes taken, a lot of times that might even lead us to the Web sites of high schools, especially large public schools, to figure out what is it that we should know about this school that a student is not able to tell us.

This officer described a process of "reading between the lines" to determine whether a student's access to resources and information may have influenced his or her application. Whereas students from well-resourced high schools or familial contexts may have received specialized support for developing their college applications (e.g., essay-writing assistance, test-prep services), others

may have had little help or guidance. “Some kids are really savvy” about the college admissions process and have resources and guidance at their disposal to guide them through the process, as one admissions officer described her most well-resourced applicants.

They come from a high-performing public or independent school. They hire independent counselors. There are a whole lot of people on their team. Then there’s that student who is working hard, really hard, and their parents have not gone to college or have only a little bit of college and they aren’t aware of these ways and the little ins and outs that they need to do, so that’s part of the decision-making process.

These officers recognized the “unequal playing field” that students face in their primary and secondary school careers and attempted to use contextualized review to account for these disparities in the admissions decision-making process.

Interestingly, we often found that even within individual institutions, there could be wide variation in the definitions of holistic admissions among admissions colleagues. For instance, we solicited responses from eight admissions representatives at one large, public university and found that half of the counselors described whole-file review, whereas the other half described whole-context review. “Holistic admission review requires that students are reviewed in the context of their high school and the opportunities available to them,” one of these admissions officers said. “Every piece of their lives that we have access to needs to be considered in order to assess their level of preparation, motivation, and potential for success.” However, one of their colleagues defined holistic admissions as “looking at all academic indicators as well as the personal characteristics and traits of the student.” Looking at our data within institutions, we suspected there was a great deal of variation among admissions officers in their use or disuse of whole-context review.

Experimental design

Materials and procedure

The survey-response data were drawn from an experimental study on college admissions (see Bastedo & Bowman, 2017, for a full description). Although the experiment randomly assigned participants to conditions that were unrelated to holistic review, the availability of both data sources within the same study makes it possible to consider how the type of holistic review may interact with attributes of the admissions file. Admissions officers ($n = 311$) were asked to review three simulated admissions files and to use the same standards that they would use when reading files at their own institutions. Participants were presented simulated admissions files for three male applicants. Each application contained information about the applicant’s high

school, academic qualifications, extracurricular activities, and personal statement. One applicant had strong academic credentials and attended an upper middle-class high school. Another applicant attended an upper middle-class high school, but his grades, coursework, and standardized test scores were all lower than the first applicant. A third applicant received good grades and took the most difficult courses offered at the lower-SES high school that he attended, but his courses were less advanced and his standardized test scores were lower than those of the first applicant. Grades, coursework, and test scores were adjusted across selectivity tiers to simulate applicants at the margin of admission. To avoid confounding effects, race, ethnicity, gender, college, and major were identical across applications.

Participants were randomly assigned to have different information about their high school and applicants' performance relative to their high school peers. The two experimental groups did not differ significantly on any demographic or admissions variables in the study, including their definition of holistic review ($ps > .11$). Participants in the limited-information condition ($n = 154$) were provided with the following: high school name (fictitious), state, institutional control (public), number of students, and graduation rate. Participants were also given the applicants' parental education, so they knew at least one dimension of applicants' SES.

All information provided in the limited-information condition was also provided in the detailed-information condition ($n = 157$). Moreover, the applications in the detailed-information condition contained additional data about the student's high school: enrollment rates at 4-year and 2-year colleges, average test scores, percentage of students who met federal eligibility criteria for free or reduced-cost lunch, percentage of students with limited English proficiency, number of AP courses offered, and percentage of students who received a credit-bearing AP score (3 or higher). The detailed condition also contained each applicant's percentile within their high school for weighted and unweighted high school GPA as well as number of honors/AP classes. The median ACT and SAT scores at the high school were also shown for each section of these exams. By providing enhanced contextual information, we sought to give admissions officers multiple ways in which applicants' performance could be considered in context.

Measures

The dependent variable was an ordinal measure of admissions recommendations (1 = deny, 2 = waitlist, 3 = accept). Institutional attributes included dummy-coded variables for being Tier 2 (highly competitive) and Tier 3 (very competitive), with Tier 1 (most competitive) as a referent group. Based on survey participants' qualitative responses to the open-ended question, "What does holistic admissions mean to you?" a binary variable for whether

institutions conducted a whole-context review was used (0 = no, 1 = yes). This independent variable was derived from the qualitative survey data, and responses that fell into the not holistic, whole-file, and whole-person categories were collapsed and coded as 0. Another variable indicated the experimental condition of whether participants received detailed information about the high school and students' performance relative to peers (0 = no, 1 = yes). Several participant attributes were also used, including race/ethnicity (given the small sample sizes for some groups, this was combined into a single dichotomous indicator in which 0 = White/Caucasian, 1 = Non-White), sex (0 = male, 1 = female), parental education (1 = elementary school to 9 = graduate degree), experience working in admissions (1 = less than 1 year to 7 = 21 years or more), and whether they were working at the same institution from which they received their bachelor's degree (0 = no, 1 = yes).

Analyses

Ordinal logit regression analyses were conducted predicting the admissions recommendation for each applicant. The independent variables were whole-context review, detailed high school information, selectivity tier, and participants' race/ethnicity, sex, parental education, admissions work experience, and whether they were working at their alma mater. Two-way interactions between whole-context review and detailed high school information along with three-way interactions between whole-context review, detailed information, and selectivity tier were also examined. When constructing the interaction terms, the original variables were standardized so that including the interaction term in the analysis did not alter the results for the main effects (Jaccard & Turrisi, 2003). (The substantive results were identical with and without the interactions in the model.) Most analyses were conducted with the full sample and also separately for each selectivity tier. However, the three-way interactions were only conducted with the entire sample, because they included tier within the interaction term. Ordinal logit analyses have an assumption of parallel lines (Long, 1997); for a three-category outcome, this assumption means that the slopes for the predictors are the same when examining the lowest outcome response category versus the two highest categories as when examining the two lowest categories versus the highest category. Twelve of the 14 analyses satisfied this parallel line assumption ($ps > .05$); the two exceptions were the full-sample analyses with the high-SES, high-achieving applicant that contained three-way interactions and those with only two-way interactions. For those analyses, logistic regressions using a binary outcome yielded substantively identical results to those reported here.

Hierarchical generalized linear modeling analyses were also conducted, with applicants (Level 1) nested within participants (Level 2). A substantial

proportion of the variance in admissions recommendations occurred between participants, as indicated by an intraclass correlation coefficient of .32. This outcome was treated as ordinal within the multilevel analyses. A slopes-as-outcomes model was used to examine whether the link between holistic admissions and admissions decisions varied significantly across applicants. Independent variables at Level 2 were the use of holistic admissions, along with participants' race/ethnicity, sex, parental education, years of admissions experience, and whether the participants were working at their alma mater. Binary variables at Level 1 were used to indicate the applicant. All predictors at both levels were grand mean-centered.

Experimental results

Table 2 displays the results for regression analyses with the two-way interaction. Whole-context review had a marginally significant negative relationship with admissions recommendations for the high-SES, high-achieving applicant in the full sample; this relationship was significant when examined separately for Tier 1, which represented the most selective colleges in our sample. No other main effects of whole-context review were present. Detailed high school information had a positive relationship within the full sample only for the low-SES applicant. Detailed information was also positive and significant in Tier 3 for both the low-SES and the high-SES, middle-achieving applicants, whereas it had a marginally significant and negative association in Tier 2 for the high-SES, middle-achieving student.

Moreover, a significant, positive interaction between whole-context review and detailed information was present within Tier 1 for these same two applicants. This finding meant that providing detailed information about high school context provided a significantly greater increase in admissions recommendations when a whole-context review process was used. The result was intuitive for the low-SES applicant, because this file-reading approach should help admissions officers view the student's credentials and experiences through the lens of his life circumstances (e.g., the challenges associated with attending an underresourced high school). However, we could only speculate about the results for the high-SES, middle-achieving applicant, because that student's file did not indicate any obstacles that he had to overcome. It is possible that this combination of whole-context reading and detailed information made the strong high school environment more salient and more likely to be considered within a holistic admissions framework. Admissions readers may have placed more value on the fact that this student was coming from a strong high school and therefore would have stronger academic preparation on entrance. This boost did not occur for the highest-achieving applicant, because he already performed well by any objective

Table 2. Results of ordinal logit regression analyses predicting admissions recommendations overall and by selectivity tier.

Sample/selectivity	Predictor	Applicant		
		Low-SES	High-SES, middle-achieving	High-SES, high-achieving
Full sample (all tiers)	Detailed high school information	.313* (.122)	.018 (.122)	-.177 (.227)
	Whole-context review	.134 (.129)	.002 (.115)	-.355+ (.204)
	Detailed × Whole Context	.156 (.125)	.187 (.124)	.007 (.203)
	Detailed high school information	.103 (.269)	-.256 (.270)	-.534 (.438)
	Whole-context review	-.215 (.242)	-.172 (.240)	-.678* (.335)
Tier 1	Detailed × Whole Context	.693* (.291)	.937** (.308)	.458 (.384)
	Detailed high school information	-.133 (.212)	-.354+ (.209)	—
	Whole-context review	.281 (.230)	.133 (.220)	
	Detailed × Whole Context	.011 (.236)	.091 (.227)	
	Detailed high school information	.762** (.216)	.484* (.219)	-.424 (.486)
Tier 2	Whole-context review	.344 (.229)	.034 (.220)	-.432 (.449)
	Detailed × Whole Context	-.100 (.225)	-.045 (.220)	.108 (.450)
	Detailed high school information			
	Whole-context review			
	Detailed × Whole Context			
Tier 3	Detailed high school information			
	Whole-context review			
	Detailed × Whole Context			
	Detailed high school information			
	Whole-context review			

Note. SES = socioeconomic status. Standard errors are in parentheses. Detailed high school information and whole-context review were standardized before creating the interaction term; therefore, as intended, the inclusion of the interaction term did not substantively alter the main effects. Control variables were participants' race/ethnicity, sex, parental education, admissions work experience, and whether they were working at their alma mater. The full-sample analyses also controlled for institutional selectivity. All participants who received detailed high school information, used whole-context review, and worked at Tier 2 institutions recommended accepting the high-SES, high-achieving applicant. Because the interaction term for that applicant and tier combination therefore perfectly predicted the outcome, the subgroup analysis could not compute a valid regression coefficient and standard error.

+ $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

standard, which led to his having high overall recommendations across conditions (which may have also resulted in a ceiling effect).

Additional analyses were conducted to explore further the combination of whole-context review, detailed information, and selectivity tier (Table 3). All three-way interactions for the low-SES and the high-SES, middle-achieving applicants were significant; the negative coefficients indicated that the combination of whole-context review and detailed information led to more favorable admissions recommendations within Tier 1 than within Tiers 2 and 3. Thus, the nuanced read afforded by a whole-context perspective may be more important at Tier 1 institutions (given their low acceptance rates) than at less selective institutions.

Table 3. Results of ordinal logit regression analyses with three-way interactions predicting admissions recommendations.

Predictor	Applicant		
	Low-SES	High-SES, middle-achieving	High-SES, high-achieving
Detailed high school information	.276* (.127)	.024 (.126)	-.245 (.229)
Whole-context review	.182 (.135)	.024 (.129)	-.388+ (.203)
Tier 2	.461** (.165)	.635** (.166)	.681* (.269)
Tier 3	.632** (.168)	1.088** (.175)	.902** (.257)
Detailed × Whole Context × Tier 2	-.362* (.161)	-.345* (.158)	-.376 (.232)
Detailed × Whole Context × Tier 3	-.394* (.164)	-.404* (.161)	-.028 (.212)
Nagelkerke pseudo R-square	.194	.268	.290

Note. SES = socioeconomic status. Standard errors are in parentheses. Detailed high school information, whole-context admissions, and selectivity tier were standardized before creating the interaction term; therefore, the inclusion of the interaction term did not substantively alter the main effects. Control variables in all models were participants' race/ethnicity, sex, parental education, admissions work experience, and whether they were working at their alma mater. All possible two-way interactions between detailed information, whole-context admissions, and selectivity tier were also included for the low-SES and high-SES, middle-achieving applicants. Because of the same issue described in Table 2, models containing two-way interactions with tier could not be conducted for the high-SES, high-achieving applicant, so the results presented in the last column do not include two-way interactions. Preliminary analyses showed that the results for the other two applicants were substantively identical with and without the two-way interactions, so this analytic decision likely also did not affect the findings for the high-achieving applicant.

+ $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Multilevel analyses explored whether the link between whole-context review and admissions recommendations varied across applicants. Based on this typology, conducting a whole-context read should have a more positive relationship for the low-SES applicant (whose academics and extracurricular activities would be considered more favorably in the context of his environment) than for the high-SES applicants. This prediction was generally supported, as evidenced by the significant cross-level interactions. As shown in Table 4, the first model indicated that the link between whole-context review and admissions recommendation was greater for the low-SES applicant than for the high-SES applicants combined. The second model contrasted each of the two high-SES applicants with the low-SES applicant (who served as the referent group). Relative to the low-SES applicant, the relationship between whole-context review and admissions recommendation was significantly more negative for the high-

Table 4. Results from hierarchical generalized linear modeling analyses predicting admissions recommendations.

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2	
	B (SE)	OR	B (SE)	OR
Level 1 × Level 2				
Low-SES Applicant × Whole-Context Review	0.575* (.283)	1.777		
High-SES, Middle-Achieving Applicant × Whole-Context Review			−0.627+ (.356)	0.534
High-SES, High-Achieving Applicant × Whole-Context Review			−1.371** (.523)	0.254
Level 1				
Low-SES applicant	−0.727** (.126)	.483		
High-SES, middle-achieving applicant			−0.201 (.155)	
High-SES, high-achieving applicant			2.599** (.267)	13.450
Level 2				
Whole-context review	0.072 (.242)		−0.093 (.299)	

Note. SES = socioeconomic status; SE = standard error; OR = odds ratio. Odds ratios are only provided for statistically significant results. Analyses modeled admissions recommendations (Level 1) nested within participants (Level 2). Additional control variables in all analyses were selectivity tier as well as participants' race/ethnicity, sex, parental education, admissions work experience, and whether they were working at their alma mater (all entered at Level 2).

+ $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

SES, high-achieving applicant, and it was marginally more negative for the high-SES, middle-achieving applicant.

Conclusion

Given the commonality of the phrase “holistic review” or “holistic admissions,” we sought to undertake a deeper exploration of a concept that is relatively opaque to outsiders. At a surface or symbolic level, holistic review was widely diffused, with 95% of respondents saying they practice holistic admissions. Using focus-group and open-response survey data from our informants, we derived a three-part typology that most accurately described our informants' self-concept of holistic review: whole file, whole person, and whole context. Contrary to how holistic review is often discussed publicly, we found that only 29% of our informants espoused a whole-context view of holistic admissions.

We further hypothesized that in a simulated application review, our whole-context informants would be more likely to admit a low-SES applicant when provided with more detailed information on the high school context. Supporting the hypothesis, we found that these readers were significantly more likely to recommend admission for the low-SES applicant. Previous work has suggested that admissions officers may be more likely to admit low-income students when

provided high-quality information about high school contexts (Bastedo & Bowman, 2017). This research built on previous work by demonstrating not only that a range of definitions of holistic review exist but that these definitions serve as important differences in cognition among admissions officers. Those admissions officers who think about holistic review in a contextualized way may be more likely to respond to interventions that seek to improve the admissions chances of low-income applicants. Thus, we should consider not just our interventions, but the training and norming practices that engage admissions officers around these interventions.

Our qualitative results also helped to explain why there is significant confusion among students, parents, and the public about holistic admissions. Admissions officers themselves simply do not have a common definition of holistic review beyond “reading the entire file.” What is talked about in public or among relatively elite actors inside the selective college admissions community has not diffused consistently to admissions officers throughout the field, particularly those at less selective institutions. There may be legitimate reasons why contextualized holistic review is not yet pervasive in the field, including large and rising numbers of applications, the costs of time-intensive holistic review processes, and the financial aid expenditures needed to support low-income students. Although holistic review may be a necessary symbol to maintain status and legitimacy, it fuels the perception of an admissions black box that is arbitrary and impenetrable to the people it serves.

A lack of transparency only served to feed the admissions consulting industry among wealthy families (McDonough, 1994; Weis et al., 2014), the arms race of extracurricular activities (Friedman, 2013; Weininger, Lareau, & Conley, 2015), and the influence of college rankings (Bastedo & Bowman, 2009; Bowman & Bastedo, 2009; McDonough, Antonio, Walpole, & Perez, 1998). It also exacerbated information asymmetries in admissions knowledge between wealthy and poor students (Bell, Rowan-Kenyon, & Perna, 2009; Engberg & Allen, 2011; Engberg & Wolniak, 2010; Holland, 2014) and facilitated the undermatching of low-income students (Bastedo & Flaster, 2014; Smith, Pender, & Howell, 2013). These forms of gaming and manipulation—not to mention opportunity hoarding—are all facilitated by the ambiguity and seeming arbitrariness in college admissions decisions, with demonstrably negative effects on the well-being of students and families (Weissbourd, 2016).

This research is meant to be the beginning of a dialogue about how we define and communicate what is meant by holistic review. Ultimately, however, this discussion has to be led and reconstructed by admissions professionals—the leaders, professional organizations, and the colleges they serve. This effort may be crucial to understanding why we have made so little progress in reducing the stratification of higher education, and it

serves as a first step toward a more consistent set of admissions language and practices that better serve our highest ideals for fair, just, and equitable access to selective colleges.

ORCID

Michael N. Bastedo  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3358-2564>

Nicholas A. Bowman  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8899-7383>

References

- Atkinson, R. C. (2001). *Standardized tests and access to American universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.rca.ucsd.edu/speeches/satspch.pdf>
- Atkinson, R. C. (2005). College admissions and the SAT: A personal perspective. *APA Observer*, 18, 15–22.
- Barron's. (2013). *Profiles of American colleges 2014* (31st ed.). Hauppauge, NY: Author.
- Bastedo, M. N., & Bowman, N. A. (2009). U.S. News & World Report college rankings: Modeling institutional effects on organizational reputation. *American Journal of Education*, 116(2), 163–183.
- Bastedo, M. N., & Bowman, N. A. (2017). Improving admission of low-SES students at selective colleges: Results from an experimental simulation. *Educational Researcher*, 46, 67–77. doi:10.3102/0013189X17699373
- Bastedo, M. N., & Flaster, A. (2014). Conceptual and methodological problems in research on college undermatch. *Educational Researcher*, 43, 93–99. doi:10.3102/0013189X14523039
- Bastedo, M. N., Howard, J. E., & Flaster, A. (2016). Holistic admissions after affirmative action: Does 'maximizing' the high school curriculum matter? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 38, 389–409. doi:10.3102/0162373716642407
- Bastedo, M. N., & Jaquette, O. (2011). Running in place: Low-income students and the dynamics of higher education stratification. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 33, 318–339. doi:10.3102/0162373711406718
- Bell, A. D., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., & Perna, L. W. (2009). College knowledge of 9th and 11th grade students: Variation by school and state context. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 663–685. doi:10.1080/00221546.2009.11779039
- Bowman, N. A., & Bastedo, M. N. (2009). Getting on the front page: Organizational reputation, status signals, and the impact of *U.S. News and World Report* on student decisions. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 415–436. doi:10.1007/s11162-009-9129-8
- Broome, E. C. (1903). *A historical and critical discussion of college admission requirements*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clinedinst, M., Koranteng, A.-M., & Nicola, T. (2016). *State of college admission 2015*. Alexandria, VA: National Association for College Admission Counseling.
- College Board. (2002). *Best practices in admissions decisions*. New York, NY: Author.
- Contreras, F. E. (2005). The reconstruction of merit post-Proposition 209. *Educational Policy*, 19, 371–395. doi:10.1177/0895904804274055
- Engberg, M. E., & Allen, D. J. (2011). Uncontrolled destinies: Improving opportunity for low-income students in American higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, 52, 786–807. doi:10.1007/s11162-011-9222-7

- Engberg, M. E., & Wolniak, G. C. (2010). Examining the effects of high school contexts on postsecondary enrollment. *Research in Higher Education*, 51, 132–153. doi:10.1007/s11162-009-9150-y
- Espinosa, L. L., Gaertner, M. N., & Orfield, G. (2015). *Race, class, and college access*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin. 136 S.Ct. 2198 (2016).
- Friedman, H. L. (2013). *Playing to win*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gaertner, M. N., & Hart, M. (2013). Considering class: College access and diversity. *Harvard Law & Policy Review*, 7, 367–403.
- Gratz v. Bollinger. 539 U.S. 344 (2003).
- Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grutter v. Bollinger. 539 U.S. 306, 330 (2003).
- Hirschman, D., Berrey, E., & Rose-Greenland, F. (2016). Dequantifying diversity: Affirmative action and admissions at the University of Michigan. *Theory and Society*, 45, 265–301. doi:10.1007/s11186-016-9270-2
- Holland, M. M. (2014). Navigating the road to college: Race and class variation in the college application process. *Sociology Compass*, 8, 1191–1205. doi:10.1111/soc4.12203
- Jaccard, J., & Turrissi, R. (2003). *Interaction effects in multiple regression* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14–26. doi:10.3102/0013189X033007014
- Karabel, J. (2005). *The chosen*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Killgore, L. M. (2009). Merit and competition in selective college admissions. *Review of Higher Education*, 32, 469–488. doi:10.1353/rhe.0.0083
- Lemann, N. (1999). *The big test*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 13–17. doi:10.3102/0013189X017002013
- Maxwell, J. A. (2004). Using qualitative methods for causal explanation. *Field Methods*, 16, 243–264. doi:10.1177/1525822X04266831
- McDonough, P. M. (1994). Buying and selling higher education: The social construction of the college applicant. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65, 427–446.
- McDonough, P. M. (1997). *Choosing colleges*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- McDonough, P. M., Antonio, A. L., Walpole, M., & Perez, L. X. (1998). College rankings: Democratized college knowledge for whom? *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 513–537. doi:10.1023/A:1018797521946
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Park, J. J., & Becks, A. H. (2015). Who benefits from SAT prep? An examination of high school context and race/ethnicity. *Review of Higher Education*, 39, 1–23. doi:10.1353/rhe.2015.0038
- Posselt, J. R., Jaquette, O., Bielby, R., & Bastedo, M. N. (2012). Access without equity: Longitudinal analyses of institutional stratification by race and ethnicity, 1972–2004. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49, 1074–1111. doi:10.3102/0002831212439456

- Pusser, B. (2001). The contemporary politics of access policy: California after Proposition 209. In D. E. Heller (Ed.), *The states and public higher education policy* (pp. 121–152). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*. 438 U.S. 265 (1978).
- Rodriguez, A., & McGuire, K. (in press). More classes, more access? understanding the effects of course offerings on Black–White gaps in advanced placement course-taking. *Review of Higher Education*.
- Smith, J., Pender, M., & Howell, J. (2013). The full extent of student-college academic undermatch. *Economics of Education Review*, 32, 247–261. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2012.11.001
- Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2015). *Digest of education statistics 2013* (NCES 2015-011). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Stampnitzky, L. (2006). How does ‘culture’ become ‘capital’? Cultural and institutional struggles over ‘character and personality’ at Harvard. *Sociological Perspectives*, 49, 461–481. doi:10.1525/sop.2006.49.4.461
- Stevens, M. L. (2009). *Creating a class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stulberg, L. M., & Chen, A. S. (2014). The origins of race-conscious affirmative action in undergraduate admissions: A comparative analysis of institutional change in higher education. *Sociology of Education*, 87, 36–52. doi:10.1177/0038040713514063
- Suddaby, R. (2006). What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 633–642. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2006.22083020
- Synnott, M. G. (1979). *The half-opened door*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Traub, J. (1999, May 2). The class of Prop. 209. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/05/02/magazine/the-class-of-prop-209.html>
- Wechsler, H. S. (1977). *The qualified student*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Weininger, E. B., Lareau, A., & Conley, D. (2015). What money doesn’t buy: Class resources and children’s participation in organized extracurricular activities. *Social Forces*, 94, 479–503. doi:10.1093/sf/sov071
- Weis, L., Cipollone, K., & Jenkins, H. (2014). *Class warfare*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Weissbourd, R. (2016). *Turning the tide*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.