

# Access Through the Ages at an Elite Boarding School: A Case Study of Phillips Academy

Author: Samantha Jo Carney

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/2768>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),  
Boston College University Libraries.

---

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2012

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

BOSTON COLLEGE

Lynch School of Education

Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education

Program in Higher Education

ACCESS THROUGH THE AGES AT AN ELITE BOARDING SCHOOL:

A CASE STUDY OF PHILLIPS ACADEMY

Dissertation

by

SAMANTHA CARNEY

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

August 2012

© Copyright by Samantha Carney  
2012

Access Through the Ages at an Elite Boarding School:  
A Case Study of Phillips Academy

by

Samantha Carney

Dr. Ted I. K. Youn, Dissertation Chair

ABSTRACT

This study is about access for low-income students at an elite boarding school. As “feeder schools” to elite colleges and universities, elite boarding schools play a significant role in determining which students will be in the upper class in America; however, little is known about the history of low-income students at these schools. The purpose of this study is to examine the history of access at one elite boarding school through the frameworks of organizational saga and institutional theory to enhance understanding of how the concepts of access and opportunity at elite institutions have developed over time.

Employing a historical, organizational case study approach, this study uses archival research, document review, and interviews with school leaders to construct a developmental history of Phillips Academy, in Andover, Massachusetts. Findings from data collection and analysis revealed a profound organizational saga oriented towards access that has guided Phillips Academy through its development.

Phillips Academy's powerful organizational saga of access is embraced by senior leaders, faculty, and alumni, and has deepened their commitment to the historical traditions of the institution. This organizational saga allowed the school to survive and thrive, despite major changes in its organizational field over the last century. By fostering deep commitment among multiple actors throughout the institution's history, Phillips Academy's organizational saga has become a dominant influence in its organizational decision-making.

This research extends Burton Clark's (1970) concept of organizational saga to the concept of organizational fields, and explores the interaction of a strong organizational saga with an institution's organizational field. It contributes to the literature on elite boarding schools, and enriches that of elite colleges and universities by better understanding their historic "feeder schools." It also contributes to our understanding of social production, reproduction, and mobility in the United States. Implications for theory and elite boarding schools, colleges, and universities are discussed, along with calls for further research.

## Acknowledgements

This dissertation has truly been a labor of love. Years ago I myself was a scholarship student at a boarding school, navigating what then seemed like uncharted territory. The experience was a transformational one, and it allowed me to see firsthand the potential of elite education to change lives. The story of scholarship students at boarding schools is not one often told, and I feel fortunate to have a part in sharing the story, for both the students and the institutions that serve them. In a way, this study is my small way of paying it forward.

I owe endless thanks to all of the Phillips Academy administrators, staff, and faculty that welcomed me onto campus and into the community. In particular, the camaraderie and support of Nancy Jeton, Belinda Traub, and Melissa Dolan in the Head of School's Office made my day, each day. I owe enormous thanks to the entire senior administrative team for allowing me to pursue this study—it was an incredible honor to be allowed into the inner workings of a school that I have the utmost respect for. I'd also like to thank Timothy Sprattler and Paige Roberts, the former and current Archivist and Head of Special Collections at Phillips Academy, respectively, for allowing me to wander through the school's history. Conducting research in the Phillips Academy Archives was truly a magical experience for me.

This research was supported by the Boston College Lynch School Summer Research Fellowship, which allowed me to squirrel myself away in the furthest reaches of the (unairconditioned) Phillips Academy Archives for uninterrupted weeks on end. I am grateful to have had the financial support, and the completion of this dissertation would surely have been prolonged without it.

Thank you to Dr. I.K. Youn for his patience and careful direction throughout this process, particularly during the times when I couldn't see the forest through the trees. He always pushed my ideas further than I was able to on my own, and I was also aided by his generosity in lending from his extensive library. The ideas in this dissertation were also fostered and nurtured in classes, discussions, and debates with Dr. Karen Arnold and Dr. Patrick McQuillan, and I feel lucky to have such a wonderful committee to advise me on this journey.

I've also enjoyed the support of a wonderful cohort that, happily, seems to expand each year. Katie O'Dair and Kara Godwin in particular have been there to talk me off the proverbial ledge more times than I can count, and I only hope I can repay them in the months and years to come.

This work is dedicated to my family: To my nephew Jackson Clyde, who was born on the first day of graduate school, and has served as a constant physical reminder of just how long I've been at this! To my mother, whom I owe everything for having the courage to allow me to leave home for boarding school at the age of 14. As she knows, it has made *all the difference in the world*. And to my husband, who has been an unwavering source of support in everything I do. There just aren't words to express my gratitude to him for walking alongside me on this journey.

“The grass withers. The tree falls. It is the word that remains. Learning will treasure and employ the trust we commit to her. The great forces whose seat is here, whose sphere is in the hearts and lives of men, will never lose their might or lack their opportunity. Men go. Institutions remain.”

- Reverend Alexander McKenzie, speaking at Phillips Academy, 1878

“...If you say that you are trying to correct a wrong, external factors should not make you change.” – Dean of Faculty, Phillips Academy, 2011

## Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction .....	1
Focus of the Study.....	4
Conceptual Framework .....	5
Research Questions .....	15
Significance.....	15
Research Design.....	16
Definition of Relevant Terms.....	18
Overview of the Study.....	21
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature .....	23
The Organizational Form of Boarding Schools .....	24
The Organizational Functions of Boarding Schools .....	28
A Brief History of Elite Boarding Schools .....	36
The Relationship between Elite Boarding Schools and Elite Colleges and Universities .....	43
Students at Elite Boarding Schools .....	52
Conclusion.....	62
Chapter Three: Methodology .....	64
Research Questions .....	65
Research Design and Methodology.....	65
Selection of Unit of Analysis .....	69
Description of Unit of Analysis .....	71
Subunits of Analysis .....	73
Data Collection.....	74
Data Analysis .....	80
Validity and Reliability .....	81
Research Issues and Limitations of the Study.....	82
Chapter Four: The History of Access .....	85
The Founding and Early Years.....	85
Access in the 1800s.....	92

Access from 1900-1940 .....	102
Access in the Middle of the 20 <sup>th</sup> Century .....	114
Access at the End of the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century .....	137
Access in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century .....	142
Conclusion.....	158
Chapter Five: Institutional Pressures & Influences .....	160
Institutional Pressures .....	160
Institutional Influences.....	169
Chapter Six: Discussion and Implications .....	186
Discussion .....	192
Implications.....	204
Future Directions.....	206
Conclusion.....	207
Appendix A: Interview Protocol.....	210
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form .....	212
References:.....	215

## Chapter One: Introduction

This is a study about access for low-income students at elite boarding schools. More specifically, it's about Phillips Academy<sup>1</sup>. Phillips Academy, while arguably one of the most elite secondary schools in the world, has a reputation for being more diverse and less socially exclusive than many of its peers, and is one of the only private high schools in the nation to offer need-blind admission. The story of access at Phillips Academy is not the story of access at all boarding schools, or even some boarding schools, but nevertheless is illustrative of how some private secondary institutions developed their commitment to access over time.

Given the particularity of this study, one might ask why it matters. Access to elite schools matters for several different reasons. Elite boarding schools have traditionally sent the majority of their graduates to the most elite colleges and universities in the nation. Elite colleges and universities are rich in resources, and offer educational and extracurricular opportunities to students often unavailable to students at non-selective institutions. Elite educational institutions tend to be more residential, which research has shown correlates with higher academic success (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Furthermore, according to Kamens (1977), "Schools symbolically redefine people and make them eligible for membership in societal categories to which specific sets of rights are assigned" (p. 217). Admission to elite colleges and universities in particular can make

---

<sup>1</sup> Phillips Academy is also often referred to as "Phillips Academy Andover," or simply as "Andover." As such, "Phillips Academy" and "Andover" are used interchangeably throughout this dissertation.

individuals eligible for membership in the upper class. Indeed, Karabel (2005) calls elite colleges and universities “gateways of the American elite” (p. 2). As the gateways to the “gateways,” elite boarding schools have the ability to change or preserve the circulation of elites in America with their admission practices and policies, and to determine which students will be “the chosen” (Karabel, 2005).

**Table 1. Elite Boarding Secondary Schools in America**

<b>School</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Year Founded</b>	<b>Students**</b>
Blair Academy	NJ	1848	454
Brooks	MA	1926	365
Canterbury*	<i>CT</i>	<i>1915</i>	
Choate*	CT	1890	850
Deerfield Academy*	MA	1797	620
Emma Willard	NY	1814	317
Episcopal High School*	VA	1839	435
The Governor’s Academy	MA	1763	390
Groton School*	MA	1884	372
Hill School*	PA	1851	503
Hotchkiss*	CT	1891	587
Kent School*	CT	1906	565
Lawrenceville School*	NJ	1810	815
Loomis Chaffee School	CT	1914	672
Middlesex School*	MA	1901	375
Milton Academy	MA	1798	670
Miss Porter’s School	CT	1843	322
Northfield Mount Hermon	MA	1879	630
Peddie School	NJ	1864	551
Phillips Academy, Andover*	MA	1778	1,109
Phillips Exeter Academy*	NH	1781	1,000
Portsmouth Priory*	<i>RI</i>	<i>1926</i>	
Saint Mark’s School*	MA	1865	338
St. George’s School*	RI	1896	365
St. Paul’s School*	NH	1856	537
Tabor	MA	1876	505
Taft School*	CT	1890	588
Thacher School	CA	1889	235

School	State	Year Founded	Students**
Westminster School	CT	1888	392
Woodberry Forest School*	VA	1889	402
Total			14,964

\* One of Baltzell's "Select 16" (1958)

\*\* Numbers of students have been updated to reflect enrollments in 2010-2011

There are nearly 300 boarding schools in the United States, but only a fraction of these are considered elite (Baltzell, 1958; Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009b) (see Table 1). Together, these schools enroll nearly 15,000 students, which is less than 1% of the entire population of high school students in the United States (U.S. Census, 2009). The cost of tuition, room, and board at elite boarding schools often exceeds \$40,000 per year, a price that many students at elite boarding schools can afford to pay. However, some elite boarding schools also offer significant financial aid to assist those students who cannot afford the cost of tuition. The number of students that are on financial aid at elite boarding schools ranges from twenty percent to fifty percent (Boarding School Review, 2011), depending on the school. Who attends these elite boarding schools? Are these schools engines of social mobility, or wheels of social reproduction? And, given the relatively small number of them, does it matter?

Indeed it does. While small in number, elite boarding schools produce many of the nation's social, political, and business leaders. That these positions are attainable by people from all walks of life is a critical component of the American Dream and the rationalized myth of social mobility. For this Dream to be realized – and for the myth to be upheld – elite boarding schools, colleges, and universities need to enroll a diverse

group of students. In 2004, Astin and Oseguera wrote: “From the perspective of anyone interested in educational equity, the question is: How accessible are the best institutions at the top of the pecking order to students from different socioeconomic groups?” (p. 322). In the last decade many elite colleges and universities have made concerted efforts to increase their numbers of low-income students. Elite boarding schools have done the same. The push to increase financial aid budgets, target low-income students in recruiting efforts, and demonstrate that classes are racially and socioeconomically diverse has swept across the elite education landscape, in essence becoming a codified myth being adopted by institutions regardless of how it serves their rational ends (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). What forces have pushed this trend forward? Does access really matter more than ever before, or is this just an example of strategic isomorphism among elite institutions of education? And, does it matter as long as access is – on balance – increasing?

### **Focus of the Study**

In 2007, Phillips Academy Andover, an elite boarding school located in New England, adopted a new need-blind admissions policy. Under the new policy, Andover committed to admitting students without considering their financial background and ability to pay, and also guaranteed to meet students’ full demonstrated need with grants. When Andover adopted the policy it joined the ranks of nearly twenty elite colleges and universities throughout the United States that had already done so, and became one of only two secondary schools to adopt such a policy. Need-blind admission was the culmination of a series of efforts stemming from the most recent Strategic Plan, which had set forth the goal of reaffirming the mission of Phillips Academy “to be a school that

seeks youth from every quarter by *ensuring access* to the school for young people of talent, intelligence, and integrity from diverse cultural, geographic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds” (Phillips Academy, 2004). By adopting the policy of need-blind admissions, Phillips Academy was making its greatest overture to date toward access. Moreover, Andover had attained a standard which many other elite boarding schools and highly selective colleges and universities could only dream about.

In some ways, the decision to adopt need-blind admissions was not revolutionary. Phillips Academy has admitted and enrolled low-income students for many years, and has long offered financial aid to low- and middle-income students who cannot afford to pay the cost of tuition, room and board. On the other hand, by adopting need-blind admissions, the institution was making an explicit statement that access was not only important, but one of the highest priorities for the academy, as it took on a huge financial risk to do so. Additionally, it came at a pivotal time in this country’s history – just months before one of the largest economic recessions to hit America in the past several decades. Why was this decision made now? Was it because other elite colleges and universities had recently announced similar policies? Or was it the final iteration of an institutional commitment to access that had fomented over years, decades, and centuries? And, what can be learned from Andover’s experience with access?

### **Conceptual Framework**

Several scholars have put forth theories as to why elite universities have included and excluded certain groups throughout their histories. In his impeccably researched study of the history of admission at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, Karabel (2005)

attributes the increased attention towards access at elite universities in the latter half of the twentieth century to organizational self-interest:

At certain historical moments – especially in periods of social crisis, when the legitimacy of the system itself is in question – the elite colleges will reach out beyond the privileged to the disenfranchised. They do so not because the visible presence of previously excluded groups adds to the diversity of their students' educational experience, but because it reinforces a belief – crucial to the preservation of the social order – that success in America is a function of individual merit rather than family background. (p. 545).

Karabel (1984, 2005) maintains that organizational self-interest is at the heart of all institutional admission policies and practices. By practicing selective admission based on obscure rating systems, elite colleges and universities ensure that the public will continue to believe that applicants are judged on their intellectual abilities, not on their ability to pay. That elite institutions of education engage in fair and meritocratic methods of selecting students contributes to the “logic of confidence” (Aurini, 2006) these institutions enjoy, whereby they are protected from close inspection and enjoy a “taken-for-granted trust” (p. 90).

However, (1997) has pointed out that the University of Pennsylvania doesn't fit Karabel's theory, having never implemented discriminatory admissions policies, and Columbia University did so only after putting serious effort towards democratizing the student body. Farnum adds to Karabel's (1984) model of educational change by proposing that an organization's educational philosophy, ideology, and institutional

character influence how that organization reacts to changes in its organizational field, and subsequently how it responds to these changes. This aligns with Karen's (1990) position that "An understanding of an organization's perception of its needs and goals - determined by both internal and external influences - is a critical step, then, in comprehending the larger political and socioeconomic context within which selection takes place" (p. 228). Farnum recommends considering the shifting historical and functional context that an institution operates in when analyzing institutional change. Institutional change is catalyzed not only by external factors, but also by the interaction of these external factors with the institution's historical identity, mission, and self-perceived purpose, as well as the time and space in which they take place.

Building on the theoretical foundations of these prior works, a central premise of this study is that satisfactory answers to why Andover adopted need-blind admission in 2007 require more than a review of actors, information, and events involved in the decision. Rather, I have widened the scope of analysis to consider both the larger historical context and the organizational field in which this decision was made. The decision to adopt need-blind admission did not occur within a vacuum, but rather developed over years, decades, and perhaps even centuries. The conceptual framework for this study has two components: first, the use of an organizational saga to frame the developmental history of access at Andover, and second, the underlying rationale of institutional theory to explain why Andover acted and reacted to environmental changes throughout its history. An overview of this framework and rationale is presented here.

**Organizational saga.** Burton Clark (1970) introduced the concept of the organizational saga in his seminal work The Distinctive College to explain how a handful of small liberal arts institutions evolved to become successful and highly unique colleges. Clark defined an organizational saga as the following:

An organizational saga is a collective understanding of unique accomplishment in a formally established group. The group's definition of the accomplishment, intrinsically historical but embellished through retelling and rewriting, links stages of organizational development...An organizational saga presents some rational explanation of how certain means led to certain ends. (p. 178).

Organizational sagas are important to the extent that they highlight “nonstructural and nonrational dimensions of organizational life and achievement” (Clark, 1970, p. 178).

The concept of an organizational saga fits well with the development of access at Andover because sagas are “rooted in history,” “claim unique accomplishment,” and are “held with sentiment by the group” (Clark, 1970). Language around the need-blind admissions policy in both the Strategic Plan and major marketing publications for the school connects the policy directly to the founding Constitution of the school, which called for educating “youth from every quarter.” Because Andover is one of the only secondary schools in the nation to boast need-blind admission, this is held as a “unique accomplishment.” And finally, the “youth from every quarter” phrase, and accompanying mottos, are often used to describe the school, and are arguably “held with sentiment by the group.”

According to Clark (1970), there are at least two stages to an organizational saga: initiation and fulfillment. The initiation stage usually entails “a strong purpose, conceived and enunciated by a single man or a small cadre...whose first task is to find a setting that is open, or can be opened, to a special effort,” but can also occur in an “established organization that is not in crisis, not collapsing from long decline, yet ready for evolutionary change” (p. 180). Fulfillment occurs when the institution’s personnel, curricular and extracurricular program, external social base, and student subculture all embrace the saga. I argue that student subculture is significantly less important in an elite boarding school than a college or university, as students in secondary schools have less autonomy and less ability to influence the culture of the institution on a long-term basis. Based on the review of literature presented in Chapter Two, I have constructed a basic chronological timeline of the developmental history of Andover, with specific attention given to events related to access (see Table 2). I have identified several stages of the institution’s development that I believe conform to Clark’s conceptions of initiation and fulfillment, and have noted them in Table 2.

**Table 2. Chronological Timeline of Development of Organizational Saga**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Andover Event</b>	<b>Organizational Saga Stage</b>
<b>1778</b>	Phillips Academy is founded as an academy for local boys with a Constitution that calls for educating “youth from every quarter.” Students on scholarship are admitted almost immediately.	Initiation stage of the organizational saga begins when a “strong purpose” (Clark, 1970) is identified
<b>1781</b>	The school's motto, “Non sibi,” or “Not for one's self,” is forged into the school seal by Paul Revere	
<b>1856</b>	First African-American student graduates from Andover, and subsequently becomes the first African-American student at Harvard	
<b>1880s</b>	Major structural and functional changes at Andover and Exeter as they adapt to new threat of public schools and differentiate	Initiation stage of the organizational saga

	themselves by focusing solely on college preparatory activities and increasing their residential facilities, becoming true "boarding schools" (McLachlan, 1970; Levine, 1980).	concludes when the institution goes through "evolutionary change" (Clark, 1970)
<b>1890-1910</b>	The "golden age" of elite boarding schools, as dozens are founded at this time, many rooted in strong Protestant values and supported by the nation's industrial successes (McLachlan, 1970)	
<b>1910</b>	One third of all Andover students are on financial aid at this time; the student body is much more socioeconomically and racially diverse than the St. Grottlesex <sup>2</sup> schools (Andover has African American and Jewish students when very few other schools do). Andover is known at this time for being very academic and admitting students based on scholastic achievement alone, rather than by other characteristics – perhaps an early manifestation of meritocracy (Levine, 1980)	The beginning of fulfillment stage
<b>1920s</b>	The vast majority of Andover's graduates are admitted to and enroll at Ivy League institutions and other elite colleges	
<b>1963</b>	A Better Chance (an organization that identifies talented urban youth of color and sends them to elite boarding schools) is founded by headmasters of elite boarding schools, including Andover, for the explicit purpose of increasing the pipeline of students of color to elite boarding schools	
<b>1973</b>	Co-education is adopted at Andover	
<b>2004</b>	Andover's most recent Strategic Plan is released, and calls for a renewed emphasis on reaching "youth from every quarter." Sets the implicit goal of achieving need-blind admission within the next few years	
<b>2007</b>	Need-blind admission policy is adopted. Andover is officially the only secondary school in the nation to carry the distinction of being need-blind. 43% of students are already on financial aid at this time; that same year the market crashes and the institution loses nearly \$100 million from its endowment	
<b>2009</b>	"Access to Success" initiative is announced. Involves a bundle of programs designed to close the preparation gap being detected among students entering from different backgrounds	
<b>2010</b>	45% of students are on financial aid; 12% receive full scholarships (including all travel costs to and from school, laptops, athletic equipment and clothing, summer opportunity funding, etc.); lowest admissions rate historically (12%); highest admissions yield historically (78%)	Fulfillment attained

While it is clear that a significant portion of Andover's student body received financial aid at the beginning and end of the twentieth century, less is known about the

---

<sup>2</sup> The term "St. Grottlesex" emerged in the mid-twentieth century and was documented by Cookson & Persell (1985) in *Preparing for Power*. The "St. Grottlesex" schools are St. Paul's, St. Mark's, St. George's, Groton, and Middlesex Schools.

intervening years. To that end, I collected data from the entire history of the institution to fill in the gaps in the chronology. The framework of an organizational saga fit well with the linear temporality of the study, and helped to organize the type of information I collected for analyses. I expand on this framework further in Chapter Three.

**Institutional theory.** While Andover’s organizational saga may at least partially explain why Andover adopted need-blind admission in 2007, normative pressures from elite colleges and universities, as well as other boarding schools, may have also influenced the adoption of the policy. Accordingly, I use institutional theory to explore how Andover was influenced by other organizations. Institutional theory “considers the processes by which structures, including schemas, rules, norms, and routines, become established as authoritative guidelines for social behavior” (Scott, 2004, p. 2).

Institutional theory can elucidate why certain organizations adopt similar patterns and take on certain organizational functions, even when those functions do not correspond directly with the purpose of the institution. According to Scott (2004):

Institutional theory emphasizes that organizations are open systems—strongly influenced by their environments—but that it is not only rational or efficiency-based forces that are at work. Socially constructed belief systems and normative rules exercise enormous control over organizations—both how they are structured and how they carry out their work. (p. 117).

Because institutional theory considers the environment, forces at work, and socially constructed belief system of an organization, it is appropriate for studying the history of access at Phillips Academy.

Applying institutional theory to the focus of this study, many elite boarding schools tout a commitment to socioeconomic diversity, and use a range of financial aid policies to attract students. This is possibly a result of normative pressures from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, as well as other elite collegiate institutions that influenced elite boarding schools to adopt certain legitimated elements, such as need-blind admissions. These legitimating elements may have developed into institutional myths, which Aurini (2006) writes become “deeply ingrained in the psyche of the institutional environment and must be taken for granted as legitimate and kept separate from evaluations or outcomes” (p. 89).

One way to explore the institutional pressures exhibited over Andover is to define its organizational field. According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), an organizational field is comprised of “those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life,” including “key suppliers” and “resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products” (p. 148). As the primary recipient of the graduates of elite boarding schools, and a supplier of legitimacy by admitting their graduates, elite universities constitute a significant sector of the organizational field of elite boarding schools, and vice versa. Because of the close relationship enjoyed by elite boarding schools and elite universities in the first half of the twentieth century, “few alternative partners” (Williamson, 1975, p. 40) for Andover emerged in the second half, making the institution highly sensitive to policy and priority changes at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. As these institutions – as well as other elite colleges and universities – changed their admissions policies to support

the rationalized myth of meritocracy and equal opportunity, Andover may have adjusted not only its admissions policies but the type of student which it hoped to graduate to fit these new norms, engaging in a form of mimetic isomorphism (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). I use the histories of admission at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton already provided by researchers such as Jerome Karabel (2005), David Karen (1990), and Joseph Soares (2007) as a comparison to the emerging history of access at Andover to see if they mirror, mimic, or oppose one another.

Based on the theoretical frameworks presented by the concepts of organizational saga and institutional theory, the argument developed in this study is summarized in the following propositions:

- 1.) *Andover has a historical record of admitting financially needy students that has long preceded recent efforts around access, and makes it nearly unique among elite boarding schools.*<sup>3</sup> This assumption is supported by an institutional archival record of a scholarship student enrolled at Andover within the first decade of the institution's founding (Phillips Academy, 2009). It is further supported by Levine's (1980) study of boarding schools, in which he found that in 1906 one-third of Andover's student body was on some form of financial aid.
- 2.) *This historical commitment to access represents an organizational saga.* The rationale for this proposition has been provided in the Theoretical Rationale section. To reiterate, Andover's commitment to access appears to be "rooted in

---

<sup>3</sup> The exception to this is Phillips Exeter Academy, an institution remarkably similar in development, character, and organization to Phillips Academy (indeed, they were founded by the same family).

history, claims unique accomplishments, and is held with sentiment by the group” (Clark, 1980, p. 182).

3.) *This organizational saga has determined why Andover acted and reacted the way it did to changes in its environment throughout history.* Clark (1980) writes:

The saga is a strong self-fulfilling belief; working through institutional self-image and public image, it...determine(s) the tracks along which action is pushed by men’s self-defined interests. The early belief of one stage brings about the actions that warrant a stronger version of the same belief in a later period. (p. 182).

Because sagas may shape the actions of institutions, institutions with organizational sagas may not be as susceptible to normative pressures arising from other institutions in the environment if those pressures are in conflict with the institutional values upheld by the saga.

4.) *The decision to adopt need-blind admission in 2007 was a combination of the organizational saga reaching fulfillment **and** normative pressures that led to isomorphism in the organizational field.* While Andover’s organizational saga has deeply influenced the way the institution has approached access, Andover has also been susceptible to some normative pressures due to the changes in its organizational field in the twentieth century. To fully understand the organizational evolution of Andover, one must consider both its organizational saga as well as normative pressures it experienced in its field.

## **Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to examine the history of access at an elite boarding school through the frameworks of organizational saga and institutional theory to enhance our current understanding of how the concepts of access and opportunity at elite institutions have developed over time. Accordingly, the primary research question is:

- From what organizational contexts and pressures did the decision to adopt need-blind admission emerge?

Exploration of this primary research question is guided by the following sub-questions:

- What is the history of access at Andover?
- What internal and external factors have influenced Andover's commitment to access over time?

## **Significance**

An overview of the relevant scholarly literature on elite boarding schools reveals that education researchers have often focused solely on the social reproductive function and relative social exclusivity of elite boarding schools. While several authors have written about how boarding schools inculcate a sense of privilege and power in their students (Cookson & Persell, 1985; Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009b; Khan, 2011), there has been little research on how boarding schools operate, the missions and cultures that drive them, and their process of identifying and selecting students for admission. This research will extend the literature on elite boarding schools and enrich that of elite colleges and universities by better understanding their historic “feeder schools.” Without a fuller understanding of how elite boarding schools have selected their own students, the

detailed explorations of admission at the most prestigious universities in the United States provided by scholars such as Jerome Karabel (2005) and Joseph Soares (2007) are incomplete.

This study contributes to research on social reproduction, access and admissions, as well as emerging class priorities in the United States. While elite boarding schools only enroll and graduate a few thousand students per year, these graduates are vastly overrepresented in leadership positions in many fields: law, health, governance, education, social justice, and entertainment, among others. As discussed earlier, even before attaining professional stature, elite boarding school graduates are often enrolled at a disproportionately high rate at America's most selective postsecondary institutions when compared to graduates from public high schools. Because of the role that these schools play in elite production and reproduction, we must understand who has access to these institutions, and why.

### **Research Design**

For this dissertation I conducted a historical, organizational case study of Phillips Academy. Case studies “investigate real-life events in their natural settings,” and seek to “capture both a phenomenon (the real-life event) and its context (the natural setting)” (ed. Yin, 2004, p. xii). Case studies are particularly useful when the phenomenon is intertwined with its context, and it is impossible to separate one from the other. Additionally, case studies also encourage a wide range of data collection activities in order to understand the “hows” and “whys” of the phenomenon.

Phillips Academy was purposefully selected as the case for analysis for several reasons. First, it is one of the oldest selective boarding schools in the United States, and has been identified as one of the “leading New England-type boarding schools” (Baltzell, 1958, p. 306) in the past, and continues to be considered “elite” today (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009b, pp. 1098-1099). In this respect it is representative of other highly selective boarding schools, as it shares much of the same characteristics, organizational structure, and primary functions. But Phillips Academy is also a unique case, as Andover has a history of offering financial aid to students that sets it apart from most other elite boarding schools (Levine, 1980), and continues to deploy significant human and financial resources to support low-income students enrolled at the institution today. Yin (2008) indicates that extreme or unique cases are suitable for case studies. For these reasons Phillips Academy was an appropriate institution for studying the history of access at elite boarding schools.

This study primarily relied on archival research, document review, and interviews with school leaders as data sources. The Phillips Academy Archives served as the primary source of data, and were supplemented with two institutional histories provided by Claude M. Fuess (1917) and Frederick R. Allis (1979). Both of these authors were affiliated with Phillips Academy at the time of the publication of their histories, and as such their bias is acknowledged. Their institutional histories have been used to provide context for the archival research. Other data sources included contemporary documents pertaining to the need-blind policy and the “Access to Success” initiative, as well as semi-structured interviews with senior administrators and a trustee. Findings from all four

sources of data were used to build a history of access at Andover, and to explore how Andover came to adopt need-blind admission in 2007.

### **Definition of Relevant Terms**

For the purposes of this dissertation, the terms *access*, *need-blind admissions*, *low-income*, *admissions policy*, *elite boarding school*, and *organizational field* are used as follows:

- *Access*: In this study *access* is defined as the opportunity to apply for, be admitted to, and enroll in an elite boarding school. While this study is not explicitly about college access, or what kinds of educational opportunities students receive *as a result* of having attended an elite boarding school, this study does follow the assumption that most students that attend elite boarding schools (regardless of income) go on to enroll and graduate from college. Since low-income students are often disadvantaged in terms of college prospects, and are underrepresented in selective four-year colleges and universities (Bowen, Kurzweil & Tobin, 2005), the assumption can be made that by having the opportunity to attend an elite boarding school, the chance that a low-income student will go on to enroll in and graduate from college increases.
- *Need-blind admissions*: When an institution has a need-blind admissions policy, it means that they review applications for admission without considering a student's ability to pay. There are two types of need-blind admissions policies: those that meet the full demonstrated need of an admitted student with a combination of grants and loans, and those that admit students but do not meet their full need,

leaving it up to students to procure their own funding. The first policy is considered to be the “gold standard” of college admissions.

- *Low-income*: This is a complicated term. The current definition of “low-income individual” provided by the U.S. Department of Education is “an individual whose family’s taxable income for the preceding year did not exceed 150 percent of the poverty level amount” (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The designation also takes into consideration the size of a family unit (i.e. a family of two that makes \$22,065 or less qualifies as low-income, a family of three that makes \$27,795, \$33,525 for a family of four, and \$39,255 for a family of five) (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). This is the definition that the U.S. Department of Education uses to ascertain the amount of financial aid a student qualifies for when attending a college or university. However, federal financial aid does not apply to secondary schools. Instead of submitting the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and CSS/Financial Aid Profile, families complete the School and Student Service for Financial Aid Report of Family Contribution, which is administered by the National Association for Independent Schools (NAIS). Many elite boarding schools recalculate the information in this report according to their own standards to determine the distribution of financial aid. Therefore, there is no precise definition of a student who qualifies for full financial aid at Andover. Indeed, the academy admits that they set “no prescribed ceiling on family income when offering full-scholarships” (Phillips Academy, 2011). One important outcome of this difference is that a

student determined “low-income” and qualified for a full scholarship at Andover might not be determined as such by colleges and universities four years later. (Indeed, the correlation between low-income designations at elite boarding schools and colleges would be an interesting future study.)

Another important factor to consider is that the designation “low-income” is a fairly recent term in the history of American education. According to Bourdieu (1984):

[A] group's presence or absence in the official classification depends on its capacity to get itself recognized, to get itself noticed and admitted, and so to win a place in the social order...The fate of groups is bound up with the words that designate them. (pp. 480-481).

Since the term “low-income” was only introduced in the twentieth century, I will also be using the word “charity” and “scholarship” to indicate that students needed financial assistance.

- *Admissions policy*: Karabel (2005) defines “admissions policy” as the “criteria (academic, cultural, personal, etc.) that govern decisions of inclusion and exclusion, the procedures for assessing applications, and finally the practices of the office of admissions, which may not correspond to the official criteria and procedures” (p. 559). Related to admissions is the concept of “gatekeeping,” which Karen (1990) defines as “The process of developing and implementing criteria and practices that yields access to scarce resources” (p. 227). While I am not explicitly studying admission policies at Andover, I am studying institutional

policies and practice around access: specifically, whether they existed, and how they came to be.

- *Elite boarding school*: This study relies on Gaztambide-Fernández's (2009b) definition of elite boarding schools, which says that they are independent schools that offer unique and above-average teaching and learning opportunities beyond the traditional classroom, were founded before 1900, are located in rural New England, and enroll a largely high-income population of students.

### **Overview of the Study**

This dissertation consists of five chapters. Chapter Two provides a review of the relevant literature about elite boarding schools in America. The literature on elite boarding schools largely focuses on the organizational form of these institutions, the history of elite boarding schools in America, their relationship with elite colleges and universities, and what is known of the students that attend them. Chapter Three describes the methodology employed in this study. It specifically discusses the rationale for using a single case study and taking a historical perspective, the chosen methods of data collection and data analysis, and the limitations of the study. The history of access for low-income students at Andover is presented in Chapter Four. The history begins in 1778 with the founding of the institution, and concludes in 2011, when data collection ended. In Chapter Five I discuss Andover's unique organizational field, and explore the various sources of influence over the institution over time. Chapter Six provides a discussion of the findings from the previous two chapters, including an overview of the organizational saga and Andover's organizational environment, and the various sources of influence that

have been exerted over Andover throughout its history. I conclude with the implications of this research in light of the relevant literature and theoretical framework utilized, and outline a future research agenda based on this work.

## Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

While low-income students have always been underrepresented in elite higher education (Bowen, Kurzweil, & Tobin, 2005; Astin & Oseguera, 2004; Karabel, 2005), graduates of elite boarding schools have almost always been *over*represented in highly selective colleges and universities. In fact, graduates of elite boarding schools have traditionally had a much higher acceptance rate at elite colleges and universities than graduates of any other sector of secondary education (Stampnitzky, 2006). Myriad studies have been conducted on the admission practices of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, which are the most selective institutions in the nation, and largely considered to be the gatekeepers of the elite and to the elite. Elite boarding schools have played a seminal role in the histories of admission at these institutions, and therefore warrant careful scrutiny.

This literature review will provide an overview of the literature on boarding schools in America: what they are, where they came from, the nature of their relationship with elite colleges and universities, and who attends them. Erving Goffman (1961) wrote, “The total institution is a social hybrid, part residential organization, part formal organization; therein lies its special sociological interest” (p. 12). The total institutional aspect of elite boarding schools – along with their lengthy and storied histories, complicated relationships with elite colleges and universities, and potential to inhibit or promote social mobility – makes them particularly interesting subjects of study.

## **The Organizational Form of Boarding Schools**

This section will briefly describe the organizational form of elite boarding schools. While elite boarding schools are complex institutions (Kahane, 1988), they are also quite simply private secondary schools. These schools act as “total institutions” for enrolled students, meeting all of their basic human needs and promoting certain shared values. These attributes and characteristics are explained below.

**Private institutions.** Elite boarding schools are private institutions. As such, they are directly accountable primarily to their constituents: students, parents of students, staff, faculty, and alumni. While they are subject to the same reaccreditation standards from regional accrediting organizations as colleges and universities, this is the only external authority they are accountable to. Because elite boarding schools are private, they very rarely receive state or federal funding. Support for annual operating costs usually comes from a combination of interest from the endowment, tuition, and fundraising. Instead of being accountable to local, state, or federal authorities, elite boarding schools are dependent on their alumni and their current students as future donors for their financial viability.

Without the constraint of local or state governing boards, elite boarding schools have a level of flexibility in setting standards, determining curricula, and supporting faculty that public schools often do not. This is exemplified in a statement by the Cranbrook Kingswood School, a prestigious boarding and day school in Michigan: “As one of Michigan’s top boarding and day schools, we are proud of our independence from local, state and federal governments. This allows us to provide unparalleled opportunities

to develop challenging, innovative and creative educational programs” (Cranbrook Schools, 2009, “About,” para. 1). Elite boarding schools have the ability to adopt a particular program or curriculum based on the individual needs of their students, staff, or faculty, rather than a larger bureaucratic system.

Like many colleges and universities, boards of trustees govern elite boarding schools. Elected to terms of several years, trustees are often successful alumni of the school. They often do not concern themselves with the day-to-day affairs on the institution, fiduciary matters being their primary responsibility.

Many boarding schools claim that they are private institutions with a public purpose. While they offer a private good only to a select few, they serve a wider demographic by opening the doors of their athletic, arts, and cultural facilities to their local community, providing outreach programs to youth in neighboring low-income towns, sharing best practices with the educational community, and creating future leaders for the country and the world.

**Secondary schools.** Elite boarding schools are secondary schools, primarily educating students in grades 9-12. A few schools admit students into earlier grades, while many take students who have already graduated from high school for a post-graduate year, during which they may work on athletic or academic skills, or a combination of both, to improve their chances of being accepted into a competitive college or university.

**Total institutions.** Boarding schools are “total institutions,” a term coined by Erving Goffman (1961) to describe institutions that are all encompassing around individuals, defined as follows:

A total institution may be defined as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life. (p. 1).

At least half of the students at elite boarding school reside on campus full-time in residential houses and dorms. Faculty and staff, along with their families, also reside on campus. Meals are taken together, whether formally or informally, in centralized dining halls, and all students engage in some form of athletic or other recreational activity after a full day of classes. Study hours are organized each evening, and students have specific locations where they can be during that time, with all having to be back at the dorms by a certain hour. Even a time for “lights out” is enforced for students in lower grades.

Goffman (1961) proposes five groups of total institutions, including the following two: “institutions established the better to pursue some worklike task,” and “those establishments designed as retreats from the world” (p. 5). Most elite boarding schools fall somewhere in the middle of these two groups, as adolescents are cloistered away to engage in rigorous intellectual exercises in idyllic environments far from the crowds of the cities. Goffman explains the theory of a total institution further:

The central feature of total institutions can be described as a breakdown of the barriers ordinarily separating these three spheres of life [sleep, play, and work]. First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same authority. Second, each phase of the member's daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and

required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution. (p. 6).

The “total institutional” aspect of boarding schools not only isolates students from potentially deleterious external influences, but also allows for teaching and learning to take place in space and time far beyond the traditional classroom and school day.

The effects of the “total institution” are widely recognized to be quite strong on students. To that end, the model of the boarding school has increased in popularity in recent years. Some public schools that serve underrepresented populations have looked to boarding schools as models for educational innovation. For example, the Epiphany School (2011) in Boston provides twelve-hour days to students and parents, and school services include three meals a day, dental and health care, and Saturday and summer sessions for students. It provides not only an educational environment, but also a safe space for students to learn, grow, and thrive, all at no cost to the students, as the school operates completely on donations. Going a step further, the SEED School, a public boarding school for underserved urban youth, was founded in Washington, D.C. in 1998 (SEED, 2009). Even the recent expanded learning time movement infiltrating school districts across the nation has some roots in the academic and co-curricular models of boarding schools (Wilgoren, 2000).

## **The Organizational Functions of Boarding Schools**

Elite boarding schools have several functions, some constant, and some fleeting. First and foremost, elite boarding schools set out to prepare students for postsecondary education. Nearly all graduates of elite boarding schools go on to college (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009b). Therefore academic preparation is the cornerstone upon which boarding schools are built.

Another proclaimed function of boarding schools is to prepare students for leadership positions. While direct evidence of this is seen more in the historical roots of the institutions (specifically their early development), leadership development continued to be a theme throughout the twentieth century, and into the twenty-first. Many of the fact books and view books of boarding schools include long lists of illustrious alumni who presumably have enriched the nation through their endeavors. McLachlan (1970) concludes his history of American boarding schools with a quote from John Kennedy: “I think the success of any School can be measured by the contribution the Alumni make to our national life” (p. 298). Similarly, Martin Trow (2006) has noted, “the encouragement of ambition is a central distinguishing characteristic of elite higher education” (p. 251).

Another function of elite boarding schools is to prepare students for life in general. The founding constitution of Phillips Academy (Andover) speaks of teaching students values for the real business of living. Since the eighteenth century, boarding school has been seen as a way to create an ideal type of students, an “elite.” A total institutional environment allows for the shaping of the whole child – morally, academically, and athletically.

Historically, an additional function of boarding schools was to protect students from external influences. In the early nineteenth century there was a profound mistrust of the city and its effects on children, and boarding schools were seen as havens for urban school children whose parents could afford to send them away. Liberty and freedom were constrained in the dirty and crowded city streets, and wealthy parents preferred the pastures, fields, and forests in which boarding schools were situated as locales for their children to be raised in (McLachlan, 1970). Even today many boarding school campuses seem worlds away from the urban milieu and suburban sprawl.

Finally, a few authors (McLachlan, 1970; Cookson & Persell, 1985) have claimed that the major function of boarding schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was to isolate the upper class and ensure the social reproduction of wealthy families. A lengthier discussion of this perspective will follow in the historical section. Whether or not this is still a function of boarding schools is unknown, but it is important to recognize that this is a popular scholarly perspective.

**Definitions of elite boarding schools.** Authors tend to give similar if slightly nuanced definitions of what makes a boarding school elite. Gaztambide-Fernández (2009b) understands the term “elite” to indicate that these schools are “deemed to have high status among social groups that have the power to make such judgments and with whom, presumably, these schools “correspond” as educational institutions” (p. 1092), but notes that something is only elite when it is being compared or contrasted to another referent. David Karen (1990) wrote that elite boarding schools “are defined in terms of

the historic association of particular schools to the elite and their colleges” (p. 232), while Baird (1977) explained:

Historically...the independent schools have been elitist, in the sense of focusing on the preparation of students for the rigors of the college classroom. But the independent schools have also been - or at least have been accused of being - elitist because they train students from socially and financially select families. (p. xiii).

**Lists of elite boarding schools.** Determining which boarding schools are elite has been a favorite pastime for both popular and scholarly writers. Various criteria have been established, lists have been written and revised, and categories established. Many lists are subjective, as an excerpt from a reporter cited in McLachlan (1970) demonstrates quite aptly:

At the outset, I think I should define what I mean by a prep school, for there must be at least three thousand private schools in the United States today. I am not speaking of three thousand schools; I am not even speaking of the approximately two hundred schools that participate in the Secondary School Admission Tests program for entrance from the seventh through the twelfth grades; I am speaking generally of sixty boys' boarding schools in fourteen states and the District of Columbia, but more particularly of forty schools in six states and, quite candidly, only twenty-five of these schools really matter, and of these twenty-five perhaps seventeen are more central than the others, and of the seventeen a dozen at most influence the rest enormously, and several headmasters told me the list could

really be cut to nine and, finally, there are still quite a few people who maintain that if a boy did not attend one of five or six schools, he might just as well not have gone to school at all, or worse yet, gone to public school. (p. 7).

This quote illustrates the powerful role that reputations played in determining just which schools were good enough to attend; indeed, the popular perceptions of these schools usurped the need for any formal ranking system, which has never been developed.

The designation of being “elite,” “leading,” or even, for the purposes of this study, “selective,” lay in the legitimating myths that are manifested by boarding schools’ organizational characteristics, such as very high levels of selectivity, “collegiate” residential structures, small sizes and complexity in course offerings, particular formal curriculums, demographic structures and often pastoral rural or suburban geographic locations (Kamens, 1977).

E. Digby Baltzell (1958) has produced the most widely used list of elite boarding schools (see Table 3). Indeed his designation of the “Select 16” is often upheld as a list of the top schools more than half century later. He does not provide much in the way of explanation for the criteria that led to the construction of his list, but notes that it is these schools that “set the pace and bore the brunt of the criticism received by private schools for their so-called ‘snobbish,’ ‘un-democratic,’ and even ‘un-American’ values” (pp. 306-307).

**Table 3. Leading American Boarding Schools**

<i>Type of School</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Date Founded</i>	<i>No. of Students in 1940</i>	<i>Estimated Endowment in 1936*</i>	<i>Tuition in 1940</i>	
Old New England Undenominational	Andover	Mass.	1778	650	\$6,000,000	\$1,100
	Exeter	N.H.	1783	700	\$8,000,000	\$700-1,050
New England Episcopalian	St. Paul's	N.H.	1856	400	\$1,500,000	\$1,400
	St. Mark's	Mass.	1865	160	\$900,000	\$1,400
	Groton	Mass.	1884	175	\$1,500,000	\$1,400
	St. George's	R.I.	1896	175	**	\$1,600
	Kent	Conn.	1906	295	\$13,500	None to \$1,500
New England Undenominational	Taft	Conn.	1890	300	**	\$1,550
	Hotchkiss	Conn.	1892	300	\$400,000	\$1,500
	Choate	Conn.	1896	450	**	\$1,825
	Middlesex	Mass.	1901	150	**	\$1,650
	Deerfield	Mass.	1902	400	\$330,000	\$1,800
New England Catholic	Portsmouth	R.I.	1926	130	**	\$1,700
	Priory	Conn.	1915	130	**	\$1,700
	Canterbury					
Middle States Undenominational	Lawrenceville	N.J.	1810	450	\$290,000	\$1,500
	Hill	Pa.	1851	400	\$971,798	\$1,550
Southern Episcopalian	Episcopal High School	Va.	1839	250	**	\$1,200
Southern Undenominational	Woodbury Forest	Va.	1889	250	**	\$1,400

\*Estimates taken from *Fortune*, January, 1936.

\*\*No information.

All other material was taken from Porter Sargent, *A Handbook of Private Schools* (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1940-41).

Reprinted from Baltzell (1958), p. 30

More recently, Gaztambide-Fernández (2009b) constructed a list of the leading boarding schools in the United States. Gaztambide-Fernández's list contains all of Baltzell's (1958) original "Select 16" as well as a few additional schools. The author identified five criteria that elite boarding schools are often associated with being: (1) typologically elite; (2) scholastically elite; (3) historically elite; (4) geographically elite; and (5) demographically elite. Using these criteria, Gaztambide-Fernández constructed a list of schools that had all of these criteria. While this list is helpful as a reference, it is a bit expansive for analyses, as it includes thirty-two institutions altogether.

**Categories of elite boarding schools.** Within these previously defined lists of schools, categories have been established by some scholars, and have been provided by a few committees and groups. Various associations have been established out of shared common interests and shared markets of potential students. While possible groupings include around religious denomination, date of founding, or size of endowment, it is social exclusivity that has been the most popular sorting mechanism for scholarly researchers.

The professional associations –both informal and formal – provide some categorization that the schools themselves have instituted. There is the Ten Schools Admission Organization (TSAO), which consists of Choate, Deerfield, Hill, Hotchkiss, Lawrenceville, Loomis Chaffee, Andover, Exeter, St. Paul's and Taft, and whose purpose is "to collaborate in their outreach to prospective students and their families" (TSAO, 2011). Just a few years ago, the Eight Schools Association (ESA) was officially incorporated, after having met informally for more than three decades. Members of the

ESA include Choate, Deerfield, Hotchkiss, Lawrenceville, Andover, Exeter, St. Paul's, and Northfield Mount Hermon. The original purpose of the ESA was for "the purpose of mutual support and collegiality," and has evolved to share best practices and engage in generative conversations around financial aid, sustainability, and curricular development (Kim, 2010). Even more recently, Andover implemented a Candidate Profile that is shared with six other boarding schools (Deerfield, Groton, Hotchkiss, Kent, St. Paul's, Portsmouth Abbey), similar in vein to the postsecondary Common Application, but distinguished by collecting only preliminary demographic information, rather than essays, academic or extracurricular information (Gateway to Prep Schools, 2011).

Levine (1980) used three categories to group twelve schools for the purpose of his analysis:

- 1) The six most socially exclusive Episcopal schools, collectively referred to as "St. Grottlesex" (Groton, St. Mark's, St. Paul's, St. George's, Middlesex, and Kent);
- 2) Andover and Exeter, which had the reputation of being the most democratic and academically demanding of the schools, and
- 3) an intermediate group of schools (Lawrenceville, Hotchkiss, Hill, and Choate), somewhat more exclusive than Andover and Exeter, but less so than the St. Grottlesex schools. (p. 68).

While there are some popular references earlier (*Fortune*, 1936), it is in Levine's categorization that we see the first scholarly reference to Andover and Exeter being different from other elite boarding schools, and more importantly, serving more egalitarian functions. Empirical research on these differences, or even speculations as to

why Andover and Exeter were more democratic, more academic, and less socially exclusive, is nonexistent. But the difference was distinct enough that Useem and Karabel (1986) chose to exclude Andover and Exeter from their list of elite schools when examining the pathways of senior managers in corporations, naming their less socially exclusive admissions practice and high percentage of scholarship students as reasons for the exclusion. William Domhoff (1983) also made an exception for these two schools in his scathing analysis of the upper class, writing the following:

Though most [elite boarding schools] are socially exclusive and extremely expensive, a few have been open to minorities and have provided scholarships for low-income students. This more meritocratic emphasis has been especially the case with Phillips Exeter Academy and Phillip Academy Andover, which were founded in the late eighteenth century as academies to provide the necessary education for the rural populations in southeastern New Hampshire and northern Massachusetts. They became boarding schools with a focus on college preparatory courses in the first years of the twentieth century but maintained a concern for a less structured social atmosphere and a wider range of students. (p. 26).

Unfortunately Domhoff (1983) does not provide a source for his findings that Andover and Exeter were founded to educate “rural populations in southeastern New Hampshire and northern Massachusetts,” and he does not speculate as to why these schools maintained a commitment to serving a more diverse range of students as compared to their counterparts founded at the turn of the nineteenth century.

## **A Brief History of Elite Boarding Schools**

**The early development of elite boarding schools in America.** Boarding schools in America are nearly as old as the country itself. Some elite boarding schools that exist today were founded as academies in the years immediately after the Revolutionary War, and reflect the priorities of the nation at that time. A curious amalgamation of American, British, Swiss and German schooling traditions, several of these academies evolved into boarding schools at the turn of the nineteenth century, as new boarding schools emerged at that time. The reasons for the sudden proliferation of boarding schools in the years immediately before and after 1900 are varied and contested, but their profound and lasting influence on the development of elite higher education is not.

**The age of the academy.** The end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries was a fruitful time for American education at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. As Frederick Rudolph (1990) and John Thelin (2004) have noted, nineteen colleges that still exist today were chartered between 1782 and 1802, a doubling of the number from the previous 150 years. Many preparatory schools were also founded at this time: Phillips Academy (Andover), founded in 1778; Phillips Exeter Academy, founded in 1781; and Deerfield Academy, founded in 1797, among thousands of others (McLachlan, 1970).

These institutions – small academies located in rural towns in Massachusetts and New Hampshire – were designed to imitate Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s model of the idyllic, isolated retreat in nature, where adolescents could be reared in safety. To ensure adequate enrollment in the academies, students were drawn from both local and distant cities,

towns, and villages. Accommodations were provided by families in the local community for those students who could not commute to the school building easily. For both day and “boarding” students, strict institutional policies regarding student behavior aligned with the lasting Puritanical belief that young people needed to be shaped and guided to develop properly in both their spiritual and secular development (Mintz, 2004). Families that boarded students were expected to watch closely over them, so that students would not be unsupervised or enjoy unstructured time. McLachlan (1970) wrote:

The whole community served as an extension of the academy. In effect, the community was a school, transmitting informally its own culture to the students as surely as formal knowledge was being transmitted to them in the few hours a day they spent in classes. (p. 47).

Youth at these early academies were carefully shepherded through their adolescence, and the pastoral environs of the school buildings and small villages in which the schools were located were considered to be as influential as the instructors on the development of the students.

The main purpose of these early academies was to create Christian scholars and gentlemen who would go on to serve their country. Founders hoped that the graduates of their schools would strive to serve public interests, rather than private ones, and many of the schools’ mottos reflect this commitment to a Republican ideal (Hicks, 1996). For example, both Andover and Exeter share a motto of “Non sibi,” or “not for one’s self.” Deerfield’s motto in its early years was “Be worthy of your heritage.” These schools were reflections of the hope and ambition of the time.

For the first fifty years, boarding schools developed in America rather organically. However, the European influence was not held at bay for long. Joseph Cogswell, fed up with inadequate schooling options available in America at the turn of the eighteenth century, traveled throughout Germany and Switzerland to visit innovative educational institutions before opening the Round Hill School in Northampton, Massachusetts in 1823 (McLachlan, 1970). Round Hill differed from other academies at the time because it treated its students as children with whom great care needed to be taken, especially in their development as moral and ethical adults. Instructors acted “in loco parentis” for students, and rather than using coercion and fear to keep students in line, developed softer methods of instruction (McLachlan, 1970, p. 80). The incorporation of regular physical exercise was also a hallmark of a Round Hill education, and can be seen as a precursor for the organized athletics that would become such an integral part of boarding school life a generation later. While the Round Hill School only survived a few years beyond a decade, it influenced many of the schools that were founded in its wake.

The British model of “public” schools began to influence American boarding schools in the decades after the demise of Round Hill. Under Thomas Arnold at the helm of the Rugby School in Warwickshire, England in the 1830s, the model for prefects and proctors was developed, whereby the older boys would look after the younger ones (Kashti, 1998). In the 1850s, the “cottage system” took root under the leadership of Edward Thring at Uppingham School, in Rutland, England, whereby groups of twenty to thirty boys resided in houses with masters and their families (McLachlan, 1970, p. 153).

American schools adopted both of these customs. Other English “public school” customs infiltrated American boarding schools to varying degrees: some instituted the use of “forms” instead of grades, while others built chapels around which the campus both literally and figuratively revolved. Moreover, organized sports became very popular on American campuses.

**The rise of the boarding schools.** The period from 1880-1910 was a golden age for boarding schools. Ironically, at the very time public schooling was growing in prevalence and being adopted by cities and states across the nation, educational entrepreneurs were opening private boarding schools across the Eastern seaboard. Out of Baltzell’s (1958) “Select 16” boarding schools, ten were founded between 1880 and 1910: Lawrenceville, Groton, Woodbury Forest School, Taft, Hotchkiss, Choate, St. George’s, Middlesex, Deerfield, and Kent. While Phillips Academy (Andover) and Phillips Exeter Academy were both founded more than a hundred years earlier, they experienced large organizational changes at this time. Levine (1980) surmised, "Andover and Exeter survived by adopting many of the general characteristics of the recently founded boarding schools" (p. 65), including moving all of their students onto campus and into dormitories.

Although only a few educational scholars have focused on the rise and persistence of boarding schools in America, there are different perspectives on why so many boarding schools emerged at this time. According to one school of thought, the creep of industrialization had launched the American public comprehensive high school to new levels of importance by emphasizing its function of producing workers. This

development crushed the rationale for the small town academies that had traditionally prepared students for college, and many of them closed. This gap in the educational pipeline inspired many college presidents to work with educational reformers and donors to establish boarding schools, such as Lawrenceville in New Jersey (McLachlan, 1970, p. 198). While at least one scholar attributes the growth in boarding schools at this time to coincidence (Soares, 2007), from the collaboration and encouragement that these schools received at this time and for many decades after from elite colleges and universities, it is evident that the growth of these institutions was a bit more purposeful: they were designed to meet the needs of elite colleges and universities in providing pre-selected, highly educated, upper-income youth.

Another potential reason for the growth of boarding schools was that status attainment was increasingly important in a newly industrialized American society. According to Baltzell (1958):

The vital role which schools such as Groton have played in creating an upper-class subculture on almost a national scale in America is best understood if they are seen as surrogate families whose latent function is that of status ascription in an increasingly individualistic and centralized society. (p. 303).

Baltzell believed that the rise of industrialization and the advent of a national market demanded a single national upper class to manage it.

Baltzell (1958) also claimed that boarding schools were designed to be integrative institutions, mixing old and new money together. By choosing whom to incorporate into their fold, “old money” families could control the level and quality of infiltration by “new

money” families, and thereby preserve the original upper class. Here we see a possible enactment of Turner’s (1960) conception of sponsored mobility, under which “elite recruits are chosen by the established elite or their agents, and elite status is *given* on the basis of some criterion of supposed merit and cannot be taken by any amount of effort or strategy” (p. 856). Rather than lose their spot at the top of the hierarchy to the parvenus, old wealthy families decided that the best way to ensure their survival was to invite the newcomers to wealth to join them. Elite boarding schools were designated as a safe place for this mixing to occur.

The corresponding isolation – both literally and figuratively – that came with placing children of the upper class in boarding schools was a symptom of the “enclosure movement” that gained popularity at this time (Cookson & Persell, 1985, p. 23). While many schools were founded with the express intention of creating “bourgeois gentlemen,” the further intent was to preserve adolescent innocence by removing the sons of wealthy families from the temptations of the city and culture that went with it.

Boarding schools were seen as a way of insulating groups from the increasing diversity that the rest of America was experiencing. The idea of social enclosure is also used by Jerome Karabel (1984) to describe the exclusionary admissions practices at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton between World War I and World War II.

Cookson and Persell (1985) painted a rather dark picture of the late 1800s and early 1900s, in which families of high social standing felt that their way of life was in danger of extermination, due to the permeating influences of the immigrants and other poor thronging cities and towns:

The people who founded American boarding schools during the time of the robber barons were far from innocent or naïve about how the world worked, and deliberately chose heads that were adept at portraying the world in moral terms. The founders of the schools recognized that unless their sons and grandsons were willing to take up the struggle for the preservation of their class interests, privilege would slip from the hands of the elite and eventually power would pass to either a competing elite or a rising underclass. (p. 24).

The upper class was engaged in class warfare, and education was the best means to arm oneself against the enemy. A separate education ensured a separate life, and the founders set about creating schools that would ensure the preservation and isolation of the upper social class.

There is one other explanation for why so many boarding schools were founded in the years between 1890 and 1910: children were sent away to protect themselves from squandering away their own natural talents. In looking back at the history of boarding schools, David Hicks (1996), former rector of St. Paul's School, wrote:

Historically, one did not send one's son to a school like Groton to secure his place in society. That place was already secure. One sent a boy to Groton to save him from the selfishness and softness of his secure place. (p. 528).

The strict schedule, moral and ethical education, and strong disciplinary standards enforced in boarding schools contributed to the idea that boys became men at these schools. The early twentieth century obsession with strength, masculinity, and athleticism can be seen in Hicks' remarks, and was a strong current in boarding schools at that time.

**The influence of the elite boarding schools.** The influence of the private boarding schools extended far beyond their own campuses, as demonstrated by the presence of James C. Mackenzie, the headmaster of Lawrenceville, on the Committee of Ten (1974), a committee appointed to set national curriculum standards for public schools in America. The idea of a private school headmaster influencing public school curriculum decisions today would be considered anathema, but both boarding school headmasters and college presidents were considered important arbiters of educational curricula at the time. This was partially a result of boarding schools being cooperative and collaborative with educators, college presidents, philanthropists and businessmen. As a result, communication between these sectors was particularly strong. It is no wonder, then, that elite boarding schools and elite colleges and universities would enjoy such a strong relationship throughout the twentieth century.

### **The Relationship between Elite Boarding Schools and Elite Colleges and Universities**

It is widely known that graduates of elite boarding schools tend to go to elite colleges and universities (Baltzell, 1958; Cookson & Persell, 1985; Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009b). Less well known is how the histories of elite boarding schools have been intrinsically connected to the histories of elite colleges and universities in America. From their founding and early development, students, teachers, and donors were almost interchangeable among institutions. In the twentieth century, elite boarding schools relied on elite colleges and universities for legitimacy, while elite colleges and universities relied on elite boarding schools for applicants. Throughout the last two hundred years, the

relationship between these two sectors of education has been eventful – at times, conflicted, but more often collaborative. Overall, elite boarding schools and elite colleges and universities have maintained a mutually beneficial relationship for a very long time.

**A shared history.** Education in the 1800s was often predicated on relationships, not only in instigating families to send their children to a particular school where a family member or friend taught, but also in how faculty members were recruited, college presidents appointed, and endowments encouraged. John Phillips, the founder of Phillips Exeter Academy, was a great supporter of both Phillips Exeter Academy and Dartmouth College (McLachlan, 1970). His support to Dartmouth was so generous that he was named a trustee, and the first professorship at Dartmouth College was named after him. Tutors at Andover and Exeter were often recent Harvard graduates, and eventually the schools started recruiting Harvard professors in addition to recent graduates.

There were several similarities between academies and colleges in the late 1700s and early 1800s, from the demographics of their student bodies, the architecture of their buildings and campuses, and the educational background of their tutors, teachers, and professors. While Harvard was enrolling youth between the ages of 14 and 18 (or, in the case of Samuel Phillips, as young as 11), Joseph Leland enrolled at Andover in 1784 at the age of 27 (Phillips Academy, 2009). Students boarded at both the academies and the colleges, fulfilling an important custodial function for parents who were “unable to control sons between the ages of fourteen and eighteen” (Handlin, p. 51). Indeed, Oscar Handlin (1963) made the argument that this was the primary role of Harvard at that time:

“Most parents dispatched their sons to Harvard as they long had to English universities not for vocational but for custodial reasons” (p. 50).

Both academies and colleges at this time had endowments, even if meager ones, and were chartered by the states in which they resided. Many academies were founded by gentlemen who gave generous sums of money to support the future of the school. Philanthropy and “noblesse oblige” were the order of the day for members of the upper class of New England, and while the “gospel of giving” (Thelin, 2004, p. 122) was not to come for another century, academies, colleges, and universities alike benefited from the generosity of wealthy patrons in the late 1700s and early 1800s.

Thelin (2004) purports that college-going became especially popular in this era because it was a means of socioeconomic mobility, and allowed the newly rich to gain social standing and legitimacy: “The self-made man wanted his sons to have the shared campus experience that would position them to associate with young men from established, educated families” (p. 155). The latter is an echo of Baltzell’s (1958) explanation of why families would send their students to boarding school, and also is supported by John Dewey’s (1944) conception of sponsored education: “Any education given by a group tends to socialize its members, but the quality and value of the socialization depends upon the habits and aims of the group” (p. 83). Academies and colleges alike were considered prime opportunities for socializing the children of the wealthy with each other.

While many academies did not survive past the eighteenth century, those that did grew into boarding schools, and were joined by several new boarding schools created at

that time. Just as they had at the turn of the eighteenth century, one hundred years later these schools and colleges and universities were serving many of the same aims: to educate sons (and some daughters) for positions of leadership in commerce and politics; to provide a means of association for historically wealthy families as well as the newly rich; and to preserve and extend adolescence. The similarities between these two types of institutions promoted a shared understanding and exchange of ideas and students, which, eventually, would lead to a symbiotic relationship that would flourish for the next century.

**Striking a balance.** Colleges and universities that wanted to be successful in the late nineteenth century quickly realized that in order to thrive, they needed a particular kind of student to enroll and take advantage of all they had to offer: specifically, wealthy, highly educated students. According to Thelin (2004), “The university-builders had certainly underestimated their dependence on a base of primary and secondary education. The health of the American university was directly intertwined with the availability of the American public high school, an institution that was not universally accessible” (p. 134). Secondary schooling was needed by the great universities in order to survive, and public schools were not opening quickly enough or providing a high enough standard of education for subsequent admission to universities.

What would eventually become the “feeder system” between boarding schools and certain colleges and universities was established at this time, as informal articulation agreements abounded between headmasters and college presidents. Many boards of elite colleges and elite boarding schools shared the same trustees, facilitating communication

between the two types of institutions (Saveth, 1988). Because boarding schools such as Lawrenceville, Deerfield, and Hotchkiss were private, they had the ability to adapt their curricula to at least one market that demanded their products: colleges and universities. This flexibility allowed them to align their standards directly with those of elite colleges and universities, and ensure that a pipeline could run smoothly between the two. Entrance examinations established by the elite colleges were designed in collaboration with the headmasters of boarding schools (Stampnitzky, 2006, p. 465). Given this partnership, it is clear why elite colleges and universities relied so heavily on elite boarding schools for graduates, at times almost exclusively admitting boarding school graduates.

The extent to which elite colleges and universities relied upon elite boarding schools began to concern the college presidents at the turn of the nineteenth century, and led to the founding of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) in 1900. The CEEB was seen as a way to open up the possibility of admission to a wider variety of secondary school audiences, and subsequently to decrease the reliance on private secondary schools and other ascriptive characteristics in attracting their student bodies (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). While the CEEB was somewhat successful in getting a wider array of students to apply for admission to selective colleges and universities, well into the 1940s the most elite institutions were still heavily dependent on the elite boarding schools for students, as Karabel (1984) explains:

Among the large contingent of private-school students at the elite colleges, those who were graduates of a handful of the most prestigious boarding schools had been courted most actively by the Big Three. Attracting these students...was

crucial to the organizational interests of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. For among these students were almost certain to be found the future major donors and distinguished alumni crucial to the maintenance of institutional preeminence. (p. 21).

In this manner, elite colleges and universities had become resource dependent on elite boarding schools, which drove them to admit more and more graduates of these schools, in some cases regardless of their academic ability.

**Achieving symbiosis.** While elite colleges were becoming increasingly dependent on elite boarding schools, elite boarding schools were becoming just as dependent on elite colleges and universities. Writing in 1944, Donald Rogers describes the reciprocal relationship between elite colleges and boarding schools at that time:

Not only is preparatory education conditioned by the virtual directives of the traditional Eastern colleges, but the colleges themselves, in so far as they occasionally undertake educational experimentation and change, are restricted in the scope and success of their plans by the limitations of the prep-school students who comprise the major part of their student bodies. (p. 473).

This symbiotic relationship led graduates from elite boarding schools to continue to curry favor in the admissions offices of Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, even as these institutions were supposedly becoming more meritocratic. These three elite universities were particularly challenged in the years between the two World Wars, when they became “crucial sites for the maintenance of status-group cohesion” (Karabel, 1984, p. 8) in facing the so-called “Jewish problem.” Boarding school graduates were seen as satisfying

an organizational need as well as promoting social reproduction, and were therefore consistently relied on for graduates during this time.

Graduates of boarding schools enjoyed a boost in the admissions process throughout the twentieth century. Zweigenhaft (1993) analyzed the 25-year reunion entries of the 1960 class of Harvard graduates to see how a constructed set of variables determined the amount of social and cultural capital accumulated by prep and public school graduates. Zweigenhaft (1993) looked at the following factors: the highest degree obtained and number of years after graduation it took to earn the highest degree; present occupation; the number of marriages reported; the number and ages of children; the undergraduate college attended by spouses; and club memberships. He found that public school students at Harvard in the mid-1960s were less likely than prep school students to have come from upper-class families, but more likely to have had higher board scores than their prep school peers. Public school graduates were also more likely to have had higher grades and to be elected Phi Beta Kappa in college than their prep school counterparts. Additionally, public school graduates were much more likely than private school graduates to have gone on to obtain a doctoral degree. Zweigenhaft's findings imply that prep school students enjoyed an advantage in the admissions process even though their board scores were lower than those of their public school counterparts.

In analyzing the admissions process at Harvard University in the late 1970s, David Karen (1990) found that applications for admission were organized into docket, with each docket representing a category of student that the institution had a corresponding organizational interest in seeing admitted. Elite boarding school graduates

were organized into two separate dockets: one for the seventeen socially elite prep schools, and the other for Andover and Exeter. The level of achievement by a particular applicant was weighed in comparison to other applications within the appropriate docket. In his analyses, Karen (1990) found that applicants from private schools were admitted at a higher rate than those who attended public schools, and, more importantly, that the rate of admission for applicants from either of the two boarding school dockets was nearly twice the rate of those from public schools.

**The ‘true to school’ theory: A double negative.** Elite colleges and universities perceive the admission of graduates of elite boarding schools to be in their organizational interest because of the potential for future donations and important political and corporate support of these graduates. Colleges expect that after graduation these students will financially support their alma maters and act as indicators of excellence for these institutions in their illustrious careers, at least to the extent that they might support their secondary alma maters.

Ironically, research conducted by Zweigenhaft (1992, 1993, 2009) has shown that graduates of elite boarding schools are in fact less likely to support their college alma maters than their high school alma maters. Indeed, prep school graduates and public school graduates at elite colleges differed in their accumulation of social, cultural, and scholastic capital, often to the detriment of the college or university from which they graduated. Zweigenhaft (1992) found that prep school graduates who had matriculated into Yale University in 1960 were more likely to have accumulated social capital than cultural capital compared to their public school peers; conversely, public school

graduates were more likely to have accumulated cultural capital than social. Whether the private school graduates ended with lower cultural capital or just made fewer gains from a higher start isn't clear. He also found that public school graduates were more likely to continue their formal education after graduating from Yale than their prep school counterparts; that elite prep school graduates were more likely to go into business than other high prestige occupations (like medicine, law, and higher education); and that prep school graduates were more likely to be members of social clubs.

One of Zweigenhaft's (1992) most interesting conclusions was that there was a 'be true to your school' factor in how prep school and private school graduates felt about Yale University:

We assume that Yale played a central role in the upward mobility of public school graduates - attending Yale was in all likelihood a significant step toward greater economic, occupations and social status. In contrast, for graduates of prep schools, and especially graduates of the most elite prep schools, attending Yale was important, but was one of many experiences that led to greater, or continued, economic, occupational, and social status (for example, attending an elite boarding school, like St. Paul's, may have been every bit as important as attending Yale). (p. 313).

Unfortunately, Zweigenhaft's analysis does not take into consideration the socioeconomic backgrounds of the graduates from prep schools. One could hypothesize that low-income students who are admitted to prep schools felt the same way toward their prep school that public school graduates felt toward Yale, in terms of the role the

institution would play in their economic, occupational, and social status. It would be interesting to replicate this study with a nested analysis that factored in differing socioeconomic backgrounds of both the prep and public school graduates.

Several years later Zweigenhaft (2009) expanded upon his ‘true to school’ theory by analyzing the 40<sup>th</sup> reunion attendance and giving trends among graduates of Wesleyan University, once again distinguishing between prep school and public school graduates. Zweigenhaft found that a quarter of the public school graduates attended at least one of the two reunions, compared to less than a fifth of the private school graduates. Similarly, graduates of prep schools were less likely to give back to the University than graduates of public schools. He posits that “the prep schools play a larger part in their identities, and their colleges may play a smaller part than they would if they had attended public schools” (p. 747-748). Zweigenhaft’s research is important, but a study focusing on the giving patterns of boarding school graduates would offer greater evidence for his conclusion. Nevertheless, it is obvious that graduates of prep schools do often support their secondary alma maters, at least as evidenced by the frequent six and seven digit donations that elite boarding schools enjoy (Fabrikant, 2008).

### **Students at Elite Boarding Schools**

Traditionally, students at elite boarding schools have been White and upper class. With tuitions rivaling—if not exceeding—many elite colleges and universities, families that send their sons and daughters to boarding school without financial assistance are among the wealthiest in the country. Even today, when some schools provide financial assistance to a significant portion of their classes, usually at least fifty percent of each

student body is able to pay the full tuition. Many students have had relatives who attended boarding schools, and have highly educated parents (Cookson & Persell, 1985). Most enrollments draw heavily from the New England area, and the Eastern seaboard more generally, and fill out the remainder of spots with students from the rest of the nation and around the world.

Until the 1970s many schools were male only. Co-education in the 1970s went hand-in-hand with a more general opening of the schools to students that historically had been underrepresented: international students, students of color, and low-income students (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009a). While elite boarding schools today are much more diverse than they were forty or fifty years ago, the majority of students can still afford to pay the full tuition, which can exceed \$40,000 per year. This distinction means that these students are drawn from the very top of the economic class structure. It is well established that students at elite boarding schools tend to be White and wealthy (Cookson & Persell, 1985; Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009a). Rather than reiterate that literature, this review of literature will instead focus on African-American and low-income students at elite boarding schools.

**African-American students.** While a few boarding schools have admitted African American students since the early 1800s (Levine, 1980), many did not allow African Americans to apply or be admitted until the 1950s, when the tide of affirmative action was beginning to sweep through the nation's selective colleges and universities. Since that decade, the number of African American student enrollments has increased, albeit slowly. The percentage of African American students on many elite boarding

school campuses still does not equate to the percentage of their representation in the general population. Since 1996, the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education has kept a tally of the number of African American students enrolled at the elite boarding schools in America, as well as a tally of the number of African American faculty present at each school. At almost all elite boarding schools African American students make up a small percentage of the total enrollment, ranging from 4-12% depending on the school (JBHE, 2003).

Walton (2009) claims that that in the 1960s, campus agitation stemming from challenges to segregation – integration – along with the 1954 *Brown v. Board* decision, "compelled educators at the nation's top-tier predominantly White institutions to take stock of their power and privilege, and therefore responsibility to help redress glaring social and racial inequalities" (p. 155). Similarly, boarding schools started to develop policies and programs designed to attract African American students to their campuses. One such program is A Better Chance (ABC), which sends low-income urban students to selective independent schools. The headmasters of twenty-three selective independent schools founded ABC in 1963, originally under the name of the Independent Schools Talent Search (a tip of the hat to the federal TRIO program of the same name that was developed the same year). Funding for the organization initially came from government sources, foundations, private donors, and the schools themselves, with the schools financing the lion's share of the costs.

A Better Chance was almost immediately successful, and demand quickly outpaced the supply of students. Walton (1990) reports that though the program was able

to serve 450 students in 1966, by the mid-1960s one thousand applicants had to be rejected for lack of space at participating boarding schools, as well as a dearth of partnership funding. The first large-scale effort to increase the enrollment of African-American students on boarding school campuses, it was not the last. Similar programs such as Prep for Prep Scholars, the Steppingstone Foundation, and the TEAK Fellowship have developed over the years, and continue to serve the same purpose today as they did in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s.

The founding of A Better Chance in the 1960s coincided with the movement in private colleges and universities to engage in “need-blind” admissions (Thelin, 2004, p. 293). These programs and policies were significant because they were driven and funded by the institutions themselves. Examining the proliferation of affirmative action programs in the 1960s and 1970s, Grodsky (2007) developed a theory of compensatory sponsorship, explaining that, “In a contest system perceived by many to disadvantage some competitors unfairly, college personnel engage in affirmative action both to right a perceived wrong and to preserve the legitimacy of the contest” (p. 1662). Legitimacy is maintained by giving the impression that equal opportunity exists in the admissions game. According to this theory, elite boarding schools, along with elite colleges and universities, developed programs that would increase the pipeline of qualified African American applicants as a way of compensating for past discrimination and making admission to boarding school appear possible for many more students than ever before.

Because African Americans are relative newcomers to the world of elite boarding schools, Cookson and Persell (1991) have called them the “outsiders within.” Using a

subset of the sample they had collected for *Preparing for Power: America's Elite Boarding Schools*, Cookson and Persell (1991) analyzed institutional data for 45 African-American 9th graders and 61 African-American seniors, and examined responses to survey questions posed from the earlier study. They spent much of their analyses focused on the socioeconomic backgrounds of the students, and found that many of the low-income African Americans came from educated and professional families. While it is not clear how they draw their conclusions from the data presented in the article, they argue that African American students in elite prep schools are caught between two cultures, and are doubly marginalized as a result. They posit that even as African American students are obtaining scholastic and cultural capital, they are fated to remain socially and economically behind their peers.

Research by Datnow & Cooper (1997) did not focus on boarding schools, but instead on the peer networks that developed among African American students enrolled at predominantly white independent schools in the Baltimore area. Relying on interviews, document review, and observations for data collection, the authors found that formal and informal peer networks enabled the students to achieve more academically and socially within the school, as well as to affirm their own racial identities. Contradicting earlier studies, African-American students felt that it was socially acceptable and even popular to be smart. However, while strong peer networks allowed the African American students to overcome the unique academic, social, emotional, and psychological challenges they encountered in elite independent schools, they also experienced isolation from their

African American peers outside of their schools, and had trouble reconciling the two disparate worlds they inhabited.

In terms of outcomes, while there have been no longitudinal studies of the pathways that African American graduates from elite boarding schools take, David Karen (1990) found that African American graduates from elite boarding schools have an advantage in the admission process at Harvard University. He surmised that African American graduates from elite boarding schools represent a particular opportunity for elite colleges to admit minorities that have already been socialized into an upper class, predominantly White, academic environment: “This finding is important insofar as it underlies how gatekeepers respond to their environments while attempting to hold their values and those of their institutions” (Karen, 1990, p. 238).

While Karen’s (1990) research found that African American graduates of elite boarding schools experienced a boost when it came to college admission, there has been little research on how African American graduates do once they are enrolled in college. Alexander-Snow (1999) studied this very issue, examining how African-American graduates of predominantly White boarding schools did academically and socially when they enrolled in a predominantly White university. A qualitative study that relied on interviews, observations, questionnaires, and journaling to capture two female students’ experiences, this study found that while the White boarding schools had failed to adequately prepare the African American students for the cultural and racial clashes they would face in college, they had succeeded in academically preparing them.

There are a few limitations to Alexander-Snow's (1999) study, the first being that there is no comparative group, so it is difficult to ascertain what factors were directly attributable to the White elite boarding school, and how much of the experience of the two females could have been shared by other African American students at the same university. Second, the variables were further complicated by the geographic backgrounds of the students, and it is impossible to disentangle the effects that their geographical background (Southern) and the placement of the educational institutions (Northern for the boarding schools and Southern for the university) had on their experiences.

**Low-income students.** There has been little empirical research done on low-income students at elite boarding schools, which is not surprising given that they do not fit into the common perception of boarding schools. The popular – and often scholarly – perception of boarding schools is that they are havens for children of the rich and famous. While it is true that enrollments at boarding schools tend to be dominated by middle- and high-income families (McLachlan, 1970; Levine, 1980; Cookson & Persell, 1985), low-income students have been present at elite boarding schools virtually since their inception.

Scholarship students appear on lists of alumni within the first few years of the institution's existence at Andover, and at Exeter, only those students that could afford to pay tuition did so until 1802, when a cost of \$2.00 was ascribed to all students. A similar charge was assessed at other "free" schools (Mintz, 2004). In these early years the academies were considered public schools, and were designed to educate all who wanted

– and were able – to enroll in them. It was not until many decades later that significant tuition charges were assessed that prohibited some low-income students from attending boarding schools. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, boarding schools were able to set fees and tuition according to their own purposes, and like colleges and universities, some chose “tuition for those who could pay, free education for the poor and endowment where possible” (Katz, 1989, p. 54). Traces of this philosophy are found in Hungary’s 17<sup>th</sup> century institution, the Kollegium, which was “open to all classes of society, and by means of scholarships and arrangements in the school and the community, encouraged the education of the children of tenant farmers and the bourgeoisie together with those of the nobility” (Kashti, 1998, p. 351).

In the early 1900s, Claude Fuess (1917), future headmaster of Andover, wrote: “A wealthy boy may thus live beside one who is absolutely dependent upon his own labor for an education, and the surroundings being the same, neither feels any constraint in associating with the other” (p. 76). Several decades later, this sentiment was echoed at another elite boarding school. Writing about Deerfield Academy, John McPhee (1966) said:

The sons of rich people and of celebrated people compete to go here, and Deerfield accepts plenty of them, but it has a higher percentage of scholarship students than, for example, Andover, Exeter, Lawrenceville, Hotchkiss, Hill, Kent, Choate, Groton, St. Mark’s, St. Paul’s, and, for that matter, virtually every other major preparatory school. The average Deerfield scholarship is higher than

the scholarships of nearly all other schools, and local boys still go to the academy for nothing. (p. 6).

From these references, as well as work by Levine (1980), it is evident that low-income students were present at elite boarding schools. Interestingly, they are discussed as a category in and of themselves, denoting that they fulfill some organizational need for the school. As mentioned in Chapter One, Bourdieu (1984) claims that:

[A] group's presence or absence in the official classification depends on its capacity to get itself recognized, to get itself noticed and admitted, and so to win a place in the social order... The fate of groups is bound up with the words that designate them. (pp. 480-481).

While low-income students have long been present at some elite boarding schools, and have been officially classified as a group, they did not have the programmatic or policy support for admission that African-American students enjoyed post 1950s. One reason for this is that unlike African-American and female students, low-income students never organized themselves into a group to fight for admission. Karabel (1984) maintains that it is only through status-group struggle that a group can gain access to a highly selective institution if one is not from the upper class. Grodsky (2007) makes a similar claim:

“There is no evidence of a serious class equality movement in the United States during the 1960s or thereafter... Without a class struggle, there could be no class-based crisis to which colleges and universities had to respond” (p. 1698).

There is no distinction between low-, middle-, and upper-income students on the alumni rolls at these schools, and no empirical research has been conducted on whether

the outcomes differ for students from different socioeconomic classes who graduate from elite boarding schools. William Domhoff (1983) feels that these students are not accurate representations of elite boarding schools, or the system of social reproduction they represent. He calls scholarship students “false positives” which he defines as “those people who qualify as members of the upper class according to indicators even though further investigation would show that they are not ‘really’ members” (p. 48). Whether or not low-income students at elite boarding schools are false positives, as significant percentages of the student body at these schools they do deserve further study.

In the past several decades, elite boarding schools have implemented various programs and policies designed to attract more low-income students, with the goal of enrolling and graduating them. While some schools such as Choate Rosemary Hall offer specific scholarship programs such as the Icahn Scholars, others – such as Andover and Exeter – have instituted need-blind or similar admissions and financial aid programs. While there has been considerable popular press and some scholarly research on the implementation of these programs at the postsecondary level (Jaschik, 2010; Avery et al., 2006), there has been a negligible amount at the secondary school level.

**A look back: Boarding schools 1950-1980.** There was a surge of articles in the popular press in the 1960s and 1970s documenting a decline (Malcolm, 1971) and subsequent increase in popularity (Warren, 1974; Stent, 1976) in preparatory schools, and boarding schools in particular. From these articles we learn that in the late 1960s many thought that private schools were on the decline and possibly facing extinction (Stent, 1976), before seeing a dramatic increase in applications in the mid-1970s. Possible

reasons Stent cites for the increase were the growing dissatisfaction with public schools - many of which were becoming huge and unresponsive to individual student needs (academic and otherwise) - along with labor strikes that affected the classroom, increasing racial instability, school violence, and the pervasiveness of drugs and alcohol.

Parents and students alike were attracted to independent schools because they were seen as providing “nontraditional, experimental education, as opposed to the more regimented academic curricula of public schools” (Stent, 1976, p. 17). Stent includes a particularly illuminating quote from the headmaster of Deerfield, who attributed the increase in enrollment to “a growing dissatisfaction with urban life and a concern for ecology” (p. 17). Similarly, Kraushaar (1972) cited five reasons parents send their children to independent schools: for smaller classes, better teachers, better training in diligence and study habits, more academically challenging curricula, and a greater likelihood of admission to a college of their choice.

## **Conclusion**

There are several examples in the literature on elite boarding schools demonstrating that Andover and Exeter differ from the rest of the elite boarding schools in their academic standards, democratic ideologies, and more egalitarian philosophies (Baltzell, 1958; Levine, 1980; Domhoff, 1983). But there has been little empirical research into why these two schools differ so considerably from their peers in their commitment to low-income students. Baird (1977) wrote, “Age is important as a psychological fact. The schools have histories, stories, and traditions that influence the behavior of schools and teachers alike” (p. 1). Is it age alone that drove Andover and

Exeter to stand out from the other elite boarding schools, or a lasting commitment to fulfilling their historical mission of serving “youth from every quarter”? How were they able to retain their reputations as elite institutions while simultaneously holding a reputation for being more meritocratic, more democratic, and more egalitarian than their peers? These questions and others warrant further research, and findings from this dissertation will contribute to a broader understanding of access and opportunity at elite boarding schools, colleges, and universities.

### **Chapter Three: Methodology**

As discussed in previous chapters, there is limited understanding of admission and access for low-income students at elite boarding schools, both historically and today. To remedy this, this study seeks to examine the history of access at one elite boarding school, and contextualize this history within the institution's larger organizational field. By doing so, we will gain a greater understanding of the historical development—as well as current conceptualization of—access at one elite boarding school. This study is based on the premise that Phillips Academy's commitment to access has been primarily guided by an organizational saga, but has also been affected by normative pressures that arose in its organizational field.

In this chapter, I will explain the methodological approaches and theories that were utilized to investigate the history of access for low-income students at Andover during the twentieth century. I begin by presenting the research questions that guided this study, and then describe the qualitative design of the study. Next, I provide an overview of the case selection process, as well as a description of the case. My research approach primarily relied on historical analyses, and was supplemented with contemporary document review and semi-structured interviews. To explain this, I provide an overview of the data collection methods I employed, as well as the analyses I performed once the data had been collected. The chapter will conclude with the research issues I anticipated and a discussion of the limitations of the study.

## **Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to examine the history of access at an elite boarding school through the frameworks of organizational saga and institutional theory in order to enhance our understanding of how admission and financial aid policies and practices at elite institutions develop over time. Accordingly, the primary research question was:

- From what organizational contexts and pressures did the decision to adopt need-blind admission at Phillips Academy in 2007 emerge?

Exploration of this primary research question was guided by the following sub-questions:

- What is the history of access at Andover?
- What internal and external factors have influenced Andover's commitment to access over time?

## **Research Design and Methodology**

Studies of elite boarding schools have employed a wide variety of research designs. Cookson and Persell (1985) conducted the largest study of boarding schools to date by using a mixed methods approach that utilized a wide variety of data collection methods including surveys, institutional data, site visits, interviews and focus groups. While the study was comprehensive in scope, it lacked the depth needed to expose the nuances in elite boarding schools. Levine (1980) and Zweigenhaft (1992, 1993, 2009) focused on the graduates of elite boarding schools, and used quantitative methods to procure their data. In more recent years a spate of phenomenologies at boarding schools have been conducted (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009a; Khan, 2011), largely detailing the lived experiences of the students.

Studies of admission practices and policies at elite colleges and universities skew slightly more towards the qualitative side, although there have been several landmark quantitative studies as well (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Massey, Charles, Lundy, & Fischer, 2006). Some of the most prolific researchers on admission at Ivy League institutions have relied on historical analyses for their studies. Jerome Karabel (2005) conducted a thorough and meticulously researched study of admission practices at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Joseph Soares (2007) focused on Yale University, while David Karen (1990) focused on admissions policies and practices at Harvard.

It is with this qualitative line of research that I have aligned my study, as the research questions that guided this study were similar in scope to those posed by Karabel (2005), Soares (2007), and Karen (1990). Qualitative research is defined by Creswell (2004) “as an inquiry process of understanding a human or social problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting” (p. 2). Qualitative research is an inductive process, where categories and themes emerge through the research process. I wished to explore the history of access at Andover through such an inductive process, allowing the patterns and key points of access to emerge for themselves while analyzing two hundred and thirty four years of institutional history.

I selected the case study method as it is the most appropriate for answering the research questions posed. Yin (1993) explains that the case study method is appropriate when researchers desire to “(a) define topics broadly and not narrowly, (b) cover contextual conditions and not just the phenomenon of study, and (c) rely on multiple and

not singular sources of evidence” (p. xi). Seeking to understand the history of access at Andover, while limited to one institution, is nevertheless a broad topic because of the size and length of history of the institution. I purposely did not limit the study to one subsector of financially needy students (e.g. those that receive full scholarships) or one time period, but rather was interested in looking at the organization’s approach to access for low-income students in general over time. Finally, I relied on multiple sources of evidence to construct the history and identify institutional influences.

Yin (1993) also writes, “Case studies are an appropriate research method when you are trying to attribute causal relationships—and not just wanting to explore or describe a situation” (p. 31). In this study, I was interested in learning what contextual internal and external factors led to the decision to adopt need-blind admission in 2007 at Phillips Academy. But more generally, I was interested in learning why access appeared to be so important to the institution for so many years. What drove the institutional commitment to access over the decades and centuries? How was it sustained? How did it withstand external pressures to change? While these are all big questions, Andover as an organization presents a bounded system (Merriam, 1997), which is particularly useful in case studies as it allows one to draw lines and differentiate between internal and external influences.

This study is an historical organizational case study, as I investigated the development of the school over time. According to Merriam (1997), in an historical study “one still wishes to present a holistic description and analysis of a specific phenomenon (the case), but from a historical perspective” (p. 25). It was particularly important to look

at the entire history of Andover in determining the reasoning behind the institution's attitude towards access in the twenty-first century, because Andover continually evokes the founding Constitution as a justification for pursuing access. Additionally, while Andover is a contemporary institution, its structure, ethos, and culture are firmly rooted in the past. This is largely a result of the exceptionally long period of time that Andover has been in existence—indeed, it is one of the oldest educational institutions in the United States. Hannan & Freeman (1977) note the importance of this characteristic:

Even the largest and most powerful organizations fail to survive over long periods. For example, of the thousands of firms in business in the United States during the Revolution, only 13 survive as autonomous firms and seven as recognizable divisions of firms. (p. 960).

They conclude by noting that, “Presumably one needs a longer time perspective to study the population ecology of the largest and most dominant organizations” (Hannan & Freeman, 1977, p. 960). Andover is one of the largest boarding schools in the country, and arguably one of the most socially dominant. Therefore an historical case study was necessary if seeking to understand an important organizational attitude.

As with any research design, there are both strengths and weaknesses to the case study method. One of the strengths of case study research is its ability to generate theory. The insights derived from case studies “can be construed as tentative hypotheses that help structure future research” (Merriam, 1997, p. 32). This design is strengthened by the use of theory, which is prevalent throughout the entire case study process. Yin (1993) writes, “Theory not only is helpful in designing a case study, but it also later becomes the vehicle

for generalizing a case study's results" (p. xiii). On the other hand, case studies can also be "pedestrian, incorrect, or even fraudulent" (Merriam, 1997, p. 35) due to their limited scope and the implausibility of replication. However, both Yin (1993) and Merriam (1997) point out that the strengths outweigh the weaknesses when a case study is done correctly.

### **Selection of Unit of Analysis**

As has been discussed in Chapters One and Two, there are roughly 16 to 32 elite boarding schools in the United States. While many of these schools exhibit similar organizational and structural characteristics (e.g. low student to teacher ratios, extensive grounds and facilities, ample endowments, required athletics), within the organizational sector of elite boarding schools gradations and nuances exist in institutional missions, organizational cultures, and programmatic foci. Professional associations are one indicator of subgroups within the sector, but even the smallest of these, the Eight Schools Association, includes a fairly diverse group of institutions: Choate Rosemary Hall, Deerfield Academy, The Hotchkiss School, The Lawrenceville School, Andover, Phillips Exeter, St. Paul's School, and Northfield Mount Hermon. The group ranges in size from just above five hundred students, to over one thousand at Andover and Exeter. Some institutions have required dress codes and religious obligations, while others do not.

Within this group, Andover and Exeter make up a small subsector of their own for several reasons. First, they are the oldest of the elite boarding schools, both having been founded in the midst of the American Revolutionary War. Second, they are the largest of the elite boarding schools, both hovering around 1,100 students. Both of these factors

have contributed to Andover and Exeter having generous endowments that far outpace other elite boarding schools, and indeed rival, if not surpass, many small liberal arts colleges. Beyond these quantitative measures, there are several qualitative characteristics that differentiate these two schools from other elite boarding schools. For example, several scholars (Levine, 1980; Useem & Karabel, 1986; Domhoff, 1983) have pointed out that Phillips Andover Academy and Phillips Exeter Academy have more egalitarian admission practices and less socially exclusive atmospheres than other elite boarding schools. This is perhaps personified in the lack of a formal dress code at either institution, as well as the rugged independence that both schools promote. Finally, it is important to note that some would argue that Andover and Exeter are the best of the elite boarding schools. While there is no official ranking of boarding schools, the age, size of the enrollment, and size of the endowment often place Andover and Exeter near or at the top of any list.

I purposefully selected Phillips Academy Andover to be the single, explanatory case in this historical case study. The institution is similar to other elite boarding schools in that it meets all of the criteria that determine “elite” boarding schools (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009a). However, Andover is a special or unique case because of its lengthy history (nearly 125 years older than many of its peer institutions), more democratic and less socially exclusive culture (Levine, 1980), and strong relationship with Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (Karabel, 2005). As described below, there are a few other salient characteristics that make Andover different from other boarding schools.

## **Description of Unit of Analysis**

Phillips Academy (Andover) is an independent, coeducational, nonsectarian boarding school located in a quiet New England town just twenty miles north of Boston, Massachusetts. While the institution's official name is the above, as noted in Chapter One it is popularly referred to both as "Andover" and "Phillips Academy," and both names are used throughout this dissertation. Phillips Academy is one of the oldest schools in the country, having been founded in 1778, and enjoys a long and illustrious history peopled by famous statesmen, educators, writers, scientists, businesspeople, and artists who have graduated, taught, or led the institution. Today more than 1,100 students call the institution home, and are almost equally distributed between the 9<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades, with a handful of post-graduate (PG) students joining the academy for one year. Nearly three-quarters of the student body resides on campus, with the rest being drawn from a 15-mile radius of the school. The boarding population is drawn from 45 states and 19 countries. The student body is equally divided between males and females, and 40% are students of color.

Set on more than 500 acres of sprawling, idyllic campus fields, the buildings were constructed in the Georgian tradition, and often of red brick. Unlike other boarding schools the campus design appears to lack the sense of a master plan, and instead groups of buildings appear in fits and starts at odd angles to the campus's artery, Samuel Phillips Hall. Indeed, many of the campus's most important buildings (the chapel, library, dorms, and dining hall) were moved in the 1930s at the urging of a wealthy and powerful donor (Allis, 1979). Buildings that had previously blocked the view from the steps of Samuel

Phillips Hall were moved to provide an unobstructed view of Mt. Wachusett, and the “Vista” was born. Regardless, the campus offers all of the grassy quadrangles, open fields, and majestic elms that are often associated with popular images of college in America. While each summer there is the usual bout of construction, the most recent Head made it an informal institutional policy not to enlarge the footprint of the school; as a result, buildings are often either renovated or reconstructed on previous foundational outlines.

Andover is a resource-rich institution. At just over \$800 million as of June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011, its endowment is one of the highest in the country, and it draws its hefty operating budget from a combination of contributions to the annual fund, interest from the endowment, and tuition revenue. The instructors that populate the classrooms and playing fields are highly educated, with nearly 80% holding Master’s degrees and 30% holding Ph.D.’s. They are the highest paid faculty members in the Association of Business Officers of Private Schools (ABOPS) group, and nearly all live on campus in dorms and houses alongside students. While contemporary demands are straining the model, the “triple threat” of faculty, coach, and housemaster continues to be the ideal in faculty performance. Class sizes remain small, with most classes hovering around twelve students. The curriculum offers both breadth and depth, and students are encouraged to pursue their passions and develop their talents.

Andover is one of the most selective secondary schools in the nation. In 2010, the school’s acceptance rate fell to a historical low of 13%, and enjoyed a yield rate of 78%, a combination nearly unparalleled in higher education. Students come from all over the

country and the world, and are diverse in their socioeconomic and demographic origins. Tuition for boarding students was \$42,350 and for day students was \$32,850. Finally, there are nearly 25,000 living alumni of Phillips Academy today.

### **Subunits of Analysis**

While I reviewed the entire history of the institution, to capture pivotal moments in the organizational saga, I paid special attention to three different temporal subunits:

- **1778-1800.** The founding of Phillips Academy is of particular importance to establishing an organizational saga. As such I chose to closely examine the founding Constitution as well as the minutes from the meetings of the Board of Trustees during these years. I also explored the relationship between the founders of Phillips Academy and the elite colonial colleges, as I believed that the close ties between these two entities at the beginning of the history foreshadow their dynamic relationship throughout the rest of it.
- **1940-1960.** The twenty years that encompassed and followed World War II marked a time of great upheaval and change in secondary and postsecondary education. Jerome Karabel (2005) studied the admission practices at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton at this time, and found that these three institutions practiced social enclosure during this period by limiting the number of Jewish students that were admitted and embracing traditionally wealthy and White constituents, while at the same time they publicly supported meritocracy. In the latter half of this period Harvard, Yale, and Princeton all began to rely less and less on Andover

and other elite boarding schools for students, increasing pressure on Andover to remain relevant.

- **1990-2010.** The third and final subunit of analysis is the most recent twenty years in the institution's history. These most recent twenty years are significant for several reasons: For one, there have been major advances for low-income students in the form of the adoption of the need-blind admission policy, the Access to Success Initiative, the Outliers group, and other initiatives focused on increasing the access and attainment of low-income students to Andover; and two, most of the senior administrators interviewed have been at the institution for 15-20 years, offering a wealth of institutional memory and particular insight into the recent history of access at Andover.

In conjunction with an overview of the intervening years, findings and analysis of these units provided enough information to build a developmental history and organizational saga of the institution. The time periods were also sufficiently spread out to allow for generational changes, such that the major actors were not shared from one time period to the next, and reflected differences in generational values, etc.

### **Data Collection**

According to Yin (1993), "The important aspect of case study data collection is the use of multiple sources of evidence – converging on the same set of issues" (p. 32). To that end I used archival research, document review, and semi-structured interviews to construct the developmental history of access at Andover, and to explore the internal and external factors that influenced that history.

I conducted archival research in the Phillips Academy Archives to collect data related to the first two hundred years of the institution's existence. While there is an inherent ambiguity to any research that involves historical data, this section lays out a plan for data collection that rested on the supposition that useful data would be found in the Archives, and would offer enough information to construct meaningful analyses. Hill (1993) writes:

In archival work, what you find determines what you can analyze, and what you analyze structures what you look for in archival collections. This is blatantly circular – and points to the necessarily provisional and iterative essence of ongoing archival work. Investigations in archives simply cannot be predicted or neatly packaged in methodological formulas that guarantee publishable results. (p. 6).

Because of the “circular” and “iterative” aspects of archival research, I dedicated nearly a month and a half of full-time work to exploring the Phillips Academy Archives.

Permission to access the Archives was granted by the Head of School, and I sent an email introducing myself and the study to the Phillips Academy Archivist. As with all social scientific investigations, archival research is susceptible to deception by the archival operators (Hill, 1993). To avoid this, clear expectations for the use of the data were shared with the archivist, full permissions sought and shared by the Head of School, and I observed all of the rules and regulations of the archive. The Phillips Academy Archives are extensive and generous for research, and I was given full access to them. While I sought specific materials including strategic plans, official communications from the

Head of School to students, faculty, parents and alumni, admission publications such as view books, trustees' minutes, and development materials such as the Alumni Bulletin (see Table 4), I also conducted some randomized searches by exploring boxes and collections out of order. The Andover student newspaper, *The Phillipian*, was also a source of data. Archives of *The Phillipian* dating from 1878 to 2012 are publicly available online.

My preliminary search terms in the archives included the following: “access,” “charity,” “scholarships,” and “financial aid.” Hill (1993) writes, “Archives mirror the societies in which they are embedded” (p. 17), which means that only information that has been deemed important enough to keep and make record of appears in archives. Therefore, presence of information about institutional efforts towards access or financially needy students demonstrated that they were important to the school, whereas a lack of information might have implied that they were not important. Hill (1993) describes the process of what ends up in archives as “sedimentation,” and says that the researcher must sift through not only the archival records themselves, but also the particular contexts into which they were entered and categorized. The extensive nature of the Archives—especially as they pertain to scholarship students and other underrepresented students—was a first clue as to how much Phillips Academy has cared about this issue, and for how long.

While I used archival data for information pertaining to the years between the school's founding in 1778 and approximately 1980, for the past several decades I relied on document review and interviews as my primary data sources. My work at the

Academy over the year of my employment allowed me to familiarize myself with the universe of materials relevant to this study. Documents included the strategic plans from the last twenty years, vision statements produced by the Head of School, letters to the faculty from the Head and the Chair of the Board of Trustees, etc. (see Table 4). I also examined the public perception of Andover as documented by popular newspapers, magazines, and books during these time periods to get a sense of the school's image, and noted any likenesses or contradictions between the public's perception of the school and the institution's self-identification.

I conducted semi-structured interviews with the Head of School, five senior administrators, and one trustee. These administrators and trustees were purposefully selected as they represented the major decision-makers at the school. Additionally, most of the senior administrators that were interviewed had been employed at Andover for at least ten years, and offered a wealth of recent institutional memory. I conducted the interviews over the span of several weeks, at the Phillips Academy campus, in the interviewee's offices. Similar interview protocols were used for each interview, with some nuance due to the variation in positions, responsibilities, and levels of experience. Questions focused on the interviewee's perspective on the role of access in Andover's identity, the institution's commitment to access, knowledge of specific policies and programs devoted to access, and speculations on the future of access at Andover (see Appendix A for complete protocols).

The data collection process was facilitated by my employment as an Administrative Fellow-Analyst at Phillips Academy from August of 2010 through July of

2011. This unique position allowed me to gain the trust of the community and forge relationships with the administrators I interviewed, to conduct informal observations of life at Andover, and perhaps most importantly, gave me close proximity to the data. This position also gave me the unique status of being an “observer as participant” (Merriam, 2009): on one hand I was considered an employee and a member of the community, and enjoyed all the benefits of such (including on-campus housing and meals in the dining hall); on the other hand, I was a temporary addition to the school, and was always introduced as a doctoral student who was joining the Academy for just one year. My familiarity with the history and ethos, organizational structure, and even common language of Phillips Academy allowed for a high level of intimacy with the field of study, but the inherent distance of my temporary position protected against substantial bias in the collection and interpretation of the data.

**Table 4. Data Sources**

Method	Data Source
Document review	<p>Internal documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2004 Strategic Plan, and prior drafts as available</li> <li>• Vision statements, produced by the Head of School</li> <li>• Reports to the community on discussions of the Board of Trustees</li> </ul> <p>External documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admissions publications and view books</li> <li>• Development and fundraising materials for potential donors</li> </ul>
Archival Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents related to the founding of the school, including but not limited to the Constitution</li> <li>• Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes</li> <li>• Correspondence between senior administrators and college officials</li> <li>• Scholarship program announcements and bulletins</li> <li>• Issues of the <i>Andover Bulletin</i>, the alumni news magazine</li> <li>• Issues of <i>The Phillipian</i>, the school newspaper</li> </ul>
Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of School</li> <li>• Associate Head of School</li> <li>• Assistant Head for Enrollment, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Dean of</li> </ul>

	Admission) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretary of the Academy</li> <li>• Assistant Head for Academics and Dean of Faculty (Dean of Faculty)</li> <li>• Chief Financial Officer/Chief Operating Officer (Chief Financial Officer)</li> <li>• Chair of the Board of Trustees</li> <li>• Dean of Community and Multicultural Development</li> </ul>
--	---

Finally, in order to contextualize my research, I also used secondary sources relating to Andover’s history, as well as the history of elite colleges and universities. Two institutional histories were particularly helpful: Frederick R. Allis’ (1979) Youth from Every Quarter, and Claude M. Fuess’ (1917) An Old New England School: A History of Phillips Academy. Both of these histories were written by members of the Andover community, a faculty member and a headmaster respectively. As such, I treated them with caution, as they are likely biased pieces of work, but relied on them to provide historical context where needed. In some cases Allis used sources that I found particularly helpful for my own study; in these, I did my best to locate the original documents in the Phillips Academy Archives, but where unable, I’ve quoted them from Allis’ work, with the appropriate credit given.

Hill (1993) writes: “Parallel comparisons between the chronologies of several organizations or cohorts of individuals may reveal previously unrecognized spatiotemporal patterns” (p. 60). Ideally I would have had the time to conduct archival research at the elite colleges and universities that accepted the highest number of Andover graduates during the time periods in my analysis, but instead for this study I relied on secondary sources to construct comparative chronologies for analysis.

## **Data Analysis**

Merriam (1997) writes, “Case studies that are undertaken to build theory use an inductive rather than deductive mode of thinking about the problem and analyzing the data” (p. 59). Merriam recommends engaging in “ongoing analysis” throughout the data collection process, which I did by keeping detailed field notes. I kept extensive notes of all my data collection activities, reflections, and questions during fieldwork. I also recorded all of the interviews with a digital recorder, and then transcribed them myself. This allowed me to become very familiar with the data, and perform some “ongoing analysis” as I transcribed. I kept all digital recordings, interview transcripts, and documents in a password-protected folder, and used a backup server for security. While anonymity was not required by Andover, I received permission to use participants’ job titles rather than names. However, when a quote contained potentially sensitive information, then a participant was identified solely as “Senior Administrator.”

I used two frameworks to organize the data: a chronological timeline where events, policies, and programs were affixed to capture the temporality of the data, and the other the series of propositions relating to organizational saga and institutional theory, both of which were presented in Chapter One. Based on the data collected, I created a detailed chronological timeline in the Microsoft program Access. According to Yin (2004), “A case study is often the unfolding of events over time, and a detailed chronological rendition can represent a basic analytic strategy” (p. 205). This chronological timeline was used as the primary reference from which I constructed the developmental history of low-income students at Andover. The timeline was first

populated with references drawn from secondary sources (books and articles) that referenced my topic, and then filled in with archival and interview material.

The series of propositions proposed in Chapter One acted as “benchmarks against which actual data can be compared” (Yin, 1993, p. 39). I used focused coding to look for key words and themes, and coded in large chunks of text rather than line by line. I used Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) four-stage technique of constant comparative analysis as a model to generate categories and themes. In the first stage I compared incidents found in the texts and interviews with each other and generated tentative categories, such as “College Connections in Faculty” and “A Private School with a Public Purpose”. In the second stage, I compared incidents with the emerging categories, and in the third I collapsed similar categories and streamlined others. My goal was to fit each category into the overall framework posed by the set of propositions I set forth in Chapter One. Intermittently I checked to make sure that the categories that were being formalized related to my research questions. Finally, in the fourth stage I used the coded data to generate a history of access at Andover, as well as specific theories relating to the role of organizational saga and institutional theory in the evolution of the institution.

### **Validity and Reliability**

Attempting to ensure validity and reliability are important in any research study. One strategy of ensuring construct validity is to use multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 1993) to triangulate findings. By relying on evidence from archival research, secondary sources, and semi-structured interviews, I have attempted to achieve construct validity. According to Yin (1993), internal validity can be achieved through “the specification of

the units of analysis, the development of a priori rival theories, and the collection and analysis of data to test these rivals” (p. 40). In this Chapter I presented my data collection plan and discussed the methods I used to analyze my data, with the goal of working towards internal validity. External validity is achieved by generalizing from the case of Andover to broader theories (Yin, 2008) on the history of access and admission at elite institutions, as well as the development of organizations, which I do in the last chapter of this dissertation.

Reliability in qualitative educational research is tricky—indeed, Merriam (1997) calls it “not only fanciful but impossible” (p. 171). However, certain measures can be taken to promote dependable results, such as the development of sound protocols and instruments. I checked for the accuracy of the protocols and instruments used in the archival research, document review, and semi-structured interviews by conducting constant comparative analysis to ensure that useful and correct data was being collected. Yin (2008) also recommends documenting the data collection process systematically and thoroughly, which I have done.

### **Research Issues and Limitations of the Study**

One important research issue is that of researcher self-bias. In his ethnography of an elite boarding school, Gaztambide-Fernández (2009a) wrote about the difference between students who were “at Weston, not of Weston,” a position that he himself felt that he held during his time as a researcher at his site. I hold a very different perspective. While I am not a graduate of Andover, I am a graduate of another elite boarding school. I am “of” this world of elite boarding schools. Not only did I attend an elite boarding

school, I did so as a full scholarship student, and therefore have a favorable disposition towards these schools. To prohibit self-bias from contaminating the data I have attempted to exercise reflexivity throughout the process by writing memos. By acknowledging my positionality and inherent bias at the beginning of the research process, I have minimized the risk of bias towards my subject.

Yin (1993) also recommends identifying and presenting rival theories and explanations as the best means of preventing bias in case studies. To that end I have presented my findings to administrators at Phillips Academy, other graduate students, and my dissertation advisor, and asked these three disparate audiences to verify the connections I found between the data and theory.

One obvious limitation to this study is that it is about just one institution. As described in Chapter One, elite boarding schools enroll less than 1% of the entire population of secondary school students, and Andover enrolls less than 10% of that 1%. And yet there is much to be learned from a case study of this one institution, for the very reasons I presented in the section on Case Selection above: In short, Andover is representative of elite boarding schools, but also stands as a unique case among them. The findings from this study are not generalizable to other schools, but rather to theories on organizational development, saga, and evolution.

Another limitation is that I have chosen to focus exclusively on access as it pertains to low-income students. I have not studied the institution with an eye to gender, race, or religious exclusion. While these might be just as important components of Andover's history, my work is inspired by the possibility and promise of social mobility,

and therefore income has been my key variable of interest. At times in the history of Andover—and perhaps for much of it—race and income have been conflated, such that almost all students of color were low-income students. I have made note of these circumstances where they occur, but have not drawn any conclusions from them. There is enormous potential for further studies on the population of Andover graduates, specifically the African American population, but this dissertation does not focus on that.

## **Chapter Four: The History of Access**

In this chapter I provide an overview of the history of access at Phillips Academy, using the sources and data collection methods I detailed in the last chapter. I begin with a discussion of the founding of Andover, and the elements that specifically correspond with the initiation of an organizational saga. The history then transitions into the 1800s, exploring how access was manifested at Andover, and what it meant to be a scholarship student at the Academy during this time. Continuing with the 1900s, I explore how the idea of Andover as a national public school was emphasized, and how changes in American education, society, and politics impacted the Academy. I conclude with an in-depth look at the events of the last several decades, and how the meaning of access is being interpreted, negotiated, challenged and affirmed today. Throughout Chapter Four, I touch on events and changes occurring within higher education as well as the nation, in order to contextualize Andover's organizational development.

### **The Founding and Early Years**

The founding of Phillips Academy is integral to understanding the trajectory of the institution, as it laid the groundwork for how and why the school would develop over the next two hundred and thirty years. The founding and early years of Phillips Academy can be characterized by the following: 1) a commitment to serving 'youth from every quarter'; 2) a spirit of democracy inspired by the Revolutionary War; and 3) a burgeoning but important relationship with Harvard College.

Phillips Academy was established in Andover, Massachusetts in April 1778 by Samuel Phillips; his brother, John Phillips; and his son, Samuel Phillips, Jr. At this pivotal moment in time, the United States of America was in the midst of war with Britain, and the fledgling democratic nation's independence was at stake. Infused with the spirit of the Revolutionary War, the Phillips' hoped that the school would combat "ignorance and vice," promote knowledge and goodness, and teach students "the great end and real business of living." The school's Constitution stated clearly that the most important purpose of Phillips Academy was to promote piety and virtue.

The aspirational values of Andover's founders were similar to those of the few colonial colleges in existence at that time, including Harvard, Yale, and Dartmouth. According to Frederick Rudolph (1990), the broad purposes of the early colleges—those of promoting intellect and cultivating leaders for the young republic—prevailed over denominational purposes. The same broad purposes can be seen at Phillips Academy. While the founders were Calvinist, religion played but a minor role in the crafting of the founding Constitution, at least in the way that the organizational saga interprets it. Rather, the Constitution set out a commitment to certain ideals, including the education of 'youth from every quarter' in a 'public school or free academy.'

**'Youth from every quarter.'** Samuel Phillips was the primary founder of Phillips Academy, but was aided in the founding and day-to-day operation of the school by his colleague, Eliphalet Pearson. Interestingly, it was Pearson who shaped the school's commitment to access. Originally, Samuel Phillips was against having low-income students in the school, writing in one correspondence that "certainly the happiness of a

child (a rich one) is of as great consequence as that of a poor child, his opportunity of doing good greater” (Fuess, 1917, p. 59). Nevertheless, Pearson had come from a modest background himself: While he had attended Harvard College—as had Phillips—Pearson had been forced to delay college for two years while waiting for sufficient funding. In no small part due to his own experiences, Pearson supported the presence of scholarship students in the Academy from the very beginning.

Pearson’s strong opinion eventually swayed Samuel, and as a result the founding Constitution read: “This Seminary shall be ever equally open to Youth, of requisite qualification, from every quarter.” While this phrase could have been interpreted as calling for geographical representation, there are no archival materials or secondary sources to support this. As such, since the institution’s founding, the phrase ‘youth from every quarter’ has been understood to mean youth from all walks of life, and particularly from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds. Over the next two and a half centuries, this ideal would influence the development of the Academy, and become the cornerstone of Andover’s organizational saga.

**‘A public school or free academy.’** In addition to ‘youth from every quarter,’ the founding Constitution also stated that Phillips Academy was to be ‘a public school or free academy’<sup>4</sup>. With the signing of the Declaration of Independence just a few months after the founding of Phillips Academy, the spirit of the American Revolution pervaded the

---

<sup>4</sup> It is important to understand that the distinction between public and private schools as it exists today was not present during the early years of Phillips Academy. Indeed, while there were a few public secondary schools in New England, these were the exception rather than the rule (Bailyn, 1970). Academies and schools sprang up in small towns not by state or federal design, but rather by the inspiration of individuals such as Samuel Phillips. There were no standards or consistency between schools, and only a small percentage of the population attended them.

institution's Constitution. According to Rudolph (1990), the Revolution "may have become a movement for independence, but before it was over it was also a movement for democracy" (p. 34). The phrase 'public school or free academy' reflected Andover's founders' commitment to democracy and opportunity, similar strains of which were heard at colleges at that time. Colleges founded at the turn of the nineteenth century were perceived to be investments in the future of America, to the benefit of far more than the few who would be able to attend. Speaking in 1802, the President of Bowdoin College said, "It ought always to be remembered, that literary institutions are founded and endowed for the common good, and not for the private advantage of those who resort to them for education" (Hatch, 1927, p. 19). In this same vein, Andover was conceived as a contribution to the future of the new country, and as such embodied all of its hopes and ideals. Phillips Academy was to be a national school in the truest sense of the term: one that educated the very best students that America had to offer. This concept of a 'public school or free academy' combined with the tenet of 'youth from every quarter' to engender the institution's organizational saga.

**Harvard on high.** As noted above, both Samuel Phillips and Eliphalet Pearson had gone to Harvard College, a point of great consequence. Harvard was not just the college that received Andover's graduates—it was an institution that educated, influenced, and inspired the founders, donors, and instructors of Phillips Academy. Indeed, Harvard College was part of the very foundation of Phillips Academy, as integral a part of the Phillips' family tradition as Calvinism. For example, both Samuel Phillips, Sr. and John Phillips (Samuel Phillips Jr.'s uncle) were scholarship students at Harvard

College (Allis, 1979, p. 14). Some of Andover's first students went on to become presidents of Harvard, including two classmates in 1786: Josiah Quincy (great-nephew of John Phillips) (Allis, 1979, p. 49) and John Thornton Kirkland. At the end of that same year, Eliphalet Pearson left Andover to become a professor at Harvard, setting into motion events that would lead to an eventual rift between the two institutions ten years later.

Given that Harvard had survived for more than 150 years by the late 1800s, and had enjoyed rare success in comparison to other American colleges, it provided a compelling model for Andover. Indeed, Rudolph (1990) writes, "Higher education in America began with Harvard" (p. 3). Even with its "godless reputation" (Morison, 1986, p. 84), there was no better mentor for Andover than Harvard. Only twenty miles apart, Harvard and Phillips Academy were readily able to share ideas, faculty, students, and trustees. Many of Andover's first trustees were connected in some way to Harvard, and helped guide Phillips Academy toward its official incorporation in 1779, following in Harvard's footsteps (Allis, 1979, p. 59). Students from Andover would matriculate into Harvard, while Harvard graduates would come to Andover as tutors. In this way, a strong interorganizational relationship was formed from the outset. Each institution also benefited from the strong reputation of the other. For example, when considering where to send his nephews to college, George Washington recommended Andover, noting in his letter that Andover was in the same state as Harvard College (Allis, 1979, p. 95).

**Access in the early years.** Like many colonial colleges, Andover's fees were relatively low and not prohibitive for many students. Idealists that they were, the

founders had hoped that the school would be able to operate at no cost whatsoever to its students, and thereby be accessible to a wide swath of prospective students. However, within just a few years of operation, the institution's leaders realized that they would have to begin charging students in order to remain open. By April of 1780, Andover had assessed its first charge of \$2.50 on each student per quarter, in addition to an entrance fee of eighteen shillings (Allis, 1979, p. 78).

The introduction of the first tuition charge in 1780 correlated with the development of the first scholarship policy at Andover. Scholarship students were not unique to Andover, and were quite prevalent at New England's "hill-top colleges" such as Williams and Amherst. Indeed, according to Thelin (2004), 25-40% of students were receiving some form of scholarship aid at these colleges (p. 63). Notwithstanding the increase in opportunity for some underprivileged that the scholarships offered, Thelin argues that colleges were inadvertently creating elites: "Philanthropy, financial aid, and fundraising were central to the educational philosophy and strategy. What these colleges did contribute to American life was a reasonably affordable entrée into a new, educated elite. They helped to create an elite rather than to confirm one" (p. 69). Perhaps unbeknownst to it at the time, Andover was doing the same.

The trustees of Phillips Academy dictated both the level of aid and access in the late 1700s. The minutes of the trustee meetings from these early years list the names of each and every scholarship student considered by Phillips Academy, as well as the decision made of how much or how little they would have to pay (Executive Committee, 1780-1800). Interestingly, there is no record of how the means—or relative needs—of

students were assessed. What is known from trustee meeting records is that scholarship students were admitted for a probationary period of one to two terms. If the student performed admirably during this time, then he was formally accepted; and if not, he was released from the Academy. However, this probationary period does not appear to have been terribly strenuous, as nearly every single student admitted on probation was eventually admitted in full.

Philanthropic support for scholarships began early. In 1789, the institution received its first significant charitable gift in support of scholarship students. John Phillips—Samuel Phillips’ uncle, and the founder of Phillips Exeter Academy in Exeter, New Hampshire—gave the academy over 7,000 pounds “for the purpose of promoting the virtuous and pious education of youth (poor children of genius, and of serious disposition especially)” (Allis, 1979, p. 92). In 1794, another substantial gift for scholarship students came from William Phillips, Samuel Phillips’ father. The Trustees noted that this gift would “promote knowledge, virtue, and piety, and diffuse their benefits to those, who, without such aids, might remain ignorant, and of course exposed to irreligion and vice” (Phillips Academy, 1932). These two gifts provided a firm foundation for the support of scholarship students; a base from which the value would exponentially increase over the next two centuries.

By the turn of the nineteenth century, the divide between public and private entities in New England was beginning to become apparent. In particular, a popular regional program that gave land in Maine to public schools in New England illuminated burgeoning differences in how public schools and private academies were perceived.

Like most secondary schools, Phillips Academy applied for a portion of the available lands. Samuel Adams—Massachusetts Governor at the time—accused academies such as Phillips of being elitist and exclusionary. Adams wrote, “The particular advantage of such [public] schools is that the poor and rich may derive equal benefit from them, but none except the more wealthy, generally speaking, can avail themselves of the benefits of the Academies” (Marr, 1959, p. 23). The debate over the purposes of public and private schools in America was only beginning, and would continue for well over the next two hundred years.

### **Access in the 1800s**

Though Phillips Academy was initially a provincial academy that drew most of its students from Boston and the local townships around Andover, the school quickly began attracting students from far beyond the state lines, including Maine, Virginia, Nova Scotia, and the West Indies (Allis, 1979, p. 77). Even as its academic reputation grew, the Academy struggled with financial and operational problems. To meet the increasing costs of operation, and to help subsidize “charity” students, Phillips Academy raised tuition in 1810 for regular students to \$5.00 per academic quarter (Story, 1975). By 1818, Phillips Academy had accumulated \$3,000 in total endowment, but was faced with a setback when an important Academy building burned down that same year. Friends of the academy came together to gather funds to replace the building, and the institution eventually rallied.

While Governor Adams had lamented that private academies were inherently inequitable, Phillips Academy did what it could to remain affordable among its peers.

According to Story (1975):

Among the academies the Phillips schools, which assessed a boarder about \$60 as of 1820, were often cheaper in the early years than other academies, which generally required a boarder to pay from \$80 to \$100; at these rates many boys from poor families could and did attend. (p. 292).

As seen later in this chapter, keeping a relatively low tuition in comparison to other private schools became a recurring theme and point of pride for Andover. This was one just way that the institution interpreted its charge to educate “youth from every quarter.”

**Split with Harvard.** By the 1820s, the relationship between Phillips Academy and Harvard College had dissipated. As noted earlier, Eliphalet Pearson had left Phillips Academy in 1786 to become a faculty member at Harvard College. Pearson gained considerable prominence at Harvard, and in 1804 was named Acting President of Harvard College upon the unexpected death of the president. For Harvard, choosing the next president was as much a matter of symbolic importance for the institution as it was an operational one. Fledgling colleges around the nation watched to see in which denominational direction Harvard would go in (Rudolph, 1990). Pearson himself was a deeply religious man, and preferred that the next president be a strict Calvinist. However, the rest of the Harvard faculty embraced a more liberal outlook, and eventually chose Unitarians for both the Hollis Professorship of Divinity in 1805 and the presidency in 1806.

Pearson was so furious over the change in denominational direction that he resigned his position and returned to Phillips Academy (Fuess, 1917). Because of his prior relationship with the Academy, he was able to live rent-free on campus for the remainder of that year. The following summer, he began to have conversations with friends and faculty members at the Academy about the possibility of founding a strict theological seminary on the Andover campus (Fuess, 1917). Subsequently, the Andover Theological Seminary was founded in 1808. The Andover Theological Seminary was seen as a bastion of orthodoxy—the only place in the country dedicated solely to the training of ministers. During the first 25 years of the Seminary, the vast majority of students were graduates of New England colleges, including Yale, Dartmouth, Middlebury, Williams, and Amherst, while very few came from Harvard (Allis, 1979).

Pearson's break with Harvard and subsequent move to Andover had a profoundly negative impact on the two institutions' relationship. Pearson was vocal about his vitriolic opinion of Harvard, and it took only a few years for those opinions to saturate the Andover community. One can see this in the college-going trends of Andover students: For example, most of the fifty students enrolled at Andover in 1806 went on to Harvard, just as they had been doing since Andover was founded. By 1818, three hundred of Andover's 1,300 graduates had matriculated to Harvard. However, after 1818, one sees a shift, with the majority of students going to Yale (Allis, 1979, p. 163). While Allis (1979) attributes the shift to the next Preceptor, John Adams, who himself had graduated from Yale "and must have urged his charges to go there" (p. 163), his opinion would not of been so forceful if not carried by the momentum gained from Pearson's influence.

Another beam in the support for Yale came from one of its graduates: The Honorable Samuel Hubbard, who had been made a trustee in 1823, and eventually elected President of the Trustees. According to Fuess (1917), “Judge Hubbard represented the new era during which the influence of Harvard was to be less significant in Academy affairs” (p. 189).

Evidence of the waning influence of Harvard in the 1820s can be seen in the three graduates of Andover that went to Harvard in 1826, compared to the fifteen that went to Yale. And in 1829, not a single Andover graduate went to Harvard. Instead, the vast majority went to Yale, while a few others attended Dartmouth, Brown, Williams, Bowdoin, and Amherst. Ironically, at about this same time, John Thornton Kirkland (Andover Class of 1786) was President of Harvard, and made a financial contribution of \$3,683.83 to Phillips Academy to support the construction of a new academy building after the fire of 1818 (Fuess, 1917, p. 164). It appears that personal grudges couldn’t overcome Kirkland’s support for his alma mater.

The strained relationship with Harvard continued for the rest of the century, impacting both Andover’s curriculum and the matriculation trends of Andover graduates. In 1837, Principal Samuel Taylor (‘Uncle Sam’) took office at Phillips Academy, and carried on the tradition of deflecting students away from Harvard. Taylor “used his influence in preventing Andover graduates from going to Cambridge and...from modifying his curriculum in order to meet the Harvard requirements” (Fuess, 1917, p. 243). Taylor did so by specifically refusing to offer more than half the Greek and Latin classes required by Harvard. By contrast, Phillips Exeter matched its curriculum closely

to Harvard's requirements, and by 1845, preparing for college at Exeter “of course meant Harvard” (Story, 1975, p. 289).

As a result of this schism, Andover came to be associated not with Harvard—which had been so crucial to its founding—but with Yale. A colorful manifestation of these associations can be seen in the school colors of Andover and Exeter: Andover’s are blue and white, the same as Yale’s; Exeter claims crimson, the same as Harvard.

According to one alumnus, by 1855, “There was a deeply rutted road to Yale, and it was the only road in sight” (Bullock, n.d.). Regardless, a few Andover students still managed to end up at Harvard, albeit in much lower numbers in comparison to other schools.

Between 1801 and 1870, approximately 250 Andover students went to Harvard, in contrast to 750 from Boston Latin and 550 from Exeter (Story, 1975, p. 291). It was not until well into the twentieth century that the numbers of graduates from Andover and Exeter attending Harvard would again reach parity.

**Life as a scholarship student in the 1800s.** Scholarship students at Phillips Academy in the 1800s differed from full-paying students in several ways. For example, scholarship students had different responsibilities and regulations than full paying students. The Trustees believed that those students who were completely supported by the institution (as opposed to having external benefactors who paid their tuition) should have to work for their education. To that end, the “Scholar of the House” position was created. Students holding this title had to clean the house, manage the fires, and ring the house bell at sunrise and at meals. In return, the student was paid \$1.25 a day, later raised to \$2.00 a day (Allis, 1979). Scholarship students also had to get special permission from

the Committee on Charity Scholars before they could receive their diplomas upon graduation (Allis, 1979). While the “Scholar of the House” position would not survive the 19<sup>th</sup> century, later strains of it can be found in the “Self-Help” programs popular at Phillips Academy—and many colleges and universities—in the 1940s.

One perspective on the role of scholarship students at the Academy comes from former Harvard president, Josiah Quincy, who attended Phillips Academy as a child.

According to Quincy:

In the Academy were two classes of scholars - those whose expenses were paid by their parents, and ‘charity boys,’ as they were called, who were supported by certain funds controlled by a society for supplying the ministry with pious young candidates. These were persons who, having reached manhood, had determined to enter the sacred profession. They had served out an apprenticeship at some trade or in farming, and were generally uncouth in their manner and behavior. We, who were the real boys, never liked their sanctimonious demeanor. We claimed they were spies, and shrank from them with all the disgust which their imaginary calling could not fail to excite. (Quincy, 1883, p. 11).

Quincy’s account supports trustee records that reveal most of the scholarship students enrolled in the early 1800s were ministerial candidates. More importantly, Quincy’s statement illustrates the deep divide between scholarship students and full paying boys (i.e. the “real boys”) of that era.

In one respect, the divide between full-paying and scholarship boys was quite literal. Rather than boarding in town at private residences like the full-paying boys,

scholarship students resided in Latin and English Commons, which were constructed in the 1830s. According to Fuess (1914), “The six English Commons dormitories were occupied by eighty or ninety scholars...[and] those who boarded in Commons were required to labor at least two hours a day on the farm” (p. 216). Interestingly, Commons were also erected at Yale, Princeton, and Brown in the hope of attracting more poor students to campuses—a measure which ultimately proved unsuccessful (Rudolph, 1990).

As demonstrated by the presence of Commons at other colleges, Andover was not alone in its attention to scholarship students in the 1800s. A desire to demonstrate commitment to democratic principles was popular among many schools and colleges, fueled by a public that demanded the American college serve a greater purpose than ever before. Rudolph (1990) writes:

Thus Princeton in 1827, in order to attract students and dispel its reputation as a rich man’s college, simultaneously reduced tuition and faculty salaries. At Yale, President Jeremiah Day, worried about the moral and religious tone of a student body drawn too largely from the privileged orders, began in about 1830 to encourage the growth of charity or scholarship funds. To combat its reputation for wealth and snobbishness, Harvard, too, in 1852 launched a campaign for scholarship funds. Few colleges were spared the rich man’s reputation. They sought to overcome it by finding poor boys and persuading them to accept free tuition. (p. 199).

The idea that colleges should serve a public purpose was becoming increasingly important for Americans. Andover’s actions and policies concerning scholarship students

were certainly similar to Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. In a sense, however, Andover's development was more organic if considered to be a manifestation of its founding Constitution.

There are two accounts of scholarship students from the mid-1800s that became part of campus lore and legend. William Goodell, a young boy from Templeton, Massachusetts, was intent on attending Andover. Lacking the requisite funds, he moved to Andover and lived with a family in town for a year before procuring the benefaction of William Phillips, who sponsored Goodell's enrollment in Phillips Academy. Goodell had a successful tenure at Andover, went on to graduate from Dartmouth College, and eventually returned to Phillips Academy for seminary training (Allis, 1979). The story of William Person presents a stark contrast to Goodell's. An illegitimate child and orphan from Providence, Person decided to enroll in Phillips Academy at the age of 21. At the time he had enough financial aid so that little outside work was necessary to support his studies. However, Person subsequently lost his funding and became a "Scholar of the House." As noted earlier, this position entailed difficult and dangerous work, and Person performed hard manual labor for the rest of his time at Andover in order to meet his fees. After graduation, Person enrolled at Harvard, but died while a student there. The deterioration of his health and subsequent death allegedly was due to the terrible burden of hard work he had carried along with his studies at Phillips Academy (Fuess, 1917). To this day, Person's tale continues to be retold on Andover's campus, a symbol of the stark contrast between past and present lived experiences of scholarship students.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, the Andover experience had improved for some scholarship students. One account from 1871 paints a decidedly more optimistic picture of life as a scholarship student:

As we drew up before the first house of Latin Commons I saw with burning cheeks that our queer turnout aroused an amused curiosity in the group of nattily dressed boys, lounging about the door. As we carried my possessions up to my room, I caught glimpses of bright carpets and prettily furnished rooms...I found myself fitted into a comfortable and happy place in a great school. I soon saw that a meagerly furnished room and ill-fitting clothes did not count; that in Phillips Academy a boy was rated for what he really was, for what he was honestly trying to make of himself. (Allis, 1979, p. 209).

However, this portrait is somewhat contradicted by an alumnus of the Class of 1879.

When interviewed by a student in 1940, Loring L. Trull reflected on the changes he saw in 1940 compared to 1879: “Not only has the campus changed, but the whole basic idea of the school has been altered since my time. Then, scholarship boys were tabooed among the others, but now they associate freely with the other students” (Eno, 1940).

This latter reflection, reminiscent of Josiah Quincy’s perception of scholarship students in 1789, suggests that scholarship students were not universally embraced at Andover, even by the late 1800s.

**Access at the Centennial.** In the 1870s, Phillips Academy planned one of its largest celebrations to date: the Centennial. The event forced the school to turn a scrupulous eye to its affairs, and to take stock of its assets—which were meager—and its

debts—which were considerable. Debts were owed on the academy building, and faculty salaries were straining the already tight budget. The school’s reputation was at a major low point, with “at least six preparatory schools in New England with a finer equipment than Phillips Academy” (Fuess, 1917, p. 334). The Trustees even went so far as to advertise the school in magazines for the first time. Andover’s outdated curriculum had students struggling academically, as well.

Notwithstanding these areas of concern, when the Committee on Endowments and Scholarships prepared a statement on the Academy's needs, scholarship students were on the list of top priorities. The statement said that the institution needed to “pay off the outstanding debt, to provide for salaries adequate to attract and hold good teachers...and to maintain the policy, initiated by the founders, of never turning away a deserving boy because he could not pay the School's charges” (Phillips Academy, 1878).

The late 1800s were not all dire; they also brought the first official athletic competitions with other schools. Andover played its first baseball game against Phillips Exeter on May 2, 1878. The introduction of athletic competitions is important for several reasons. It marked the beginning of formal relations with other boarding schools, and particularly Phillips Exeter. It was the first formal, non-academic, school-sponsored activity at Andover (as well as at colleges), and it also created another venue in which Andover interacted with colleges and universities. Commentary in *The Phillipian* from these years includes detailed accounts of the competitions Andover engaged in with Amherst, Williams, Yale, and Harvard, among other schools. Formal athletic competitions increased the interorganizational relations between Andover, other boarding

schools, and colleges—relations which had been lacking for most of the nineteenth century.

### **Access from 1900-1940**

**The “spirit of democracy.”** By 1900, Phillips Academy had rallied from its low point at the Centennial, largely due to the careful stewardship of Principal Cecil Franklin Path Bancroft. Andover continued to grow its reputation for being more socially diverse than many of its peer independent schools. Principal Bancroft himself had an interest in “poor boys” (he disdained the term “indigent”), and sought to maintain socioeconomic diversity on the campus (Allis, 1979, p. 220). One alumnus provided the following account:

To Dr. Bancroft's administration is mainly due the sturdy spirit of democracy for which Andover is famous. Under his guidance the school assumed its present proportions as the most distinctly American institution of its kind; a school where wealth, antecedents, and locality count for nothing; where a boy is judged for what he is and for what he does; where character and ability are the only passports to distinction. It is good to know that in this miniature republic the son of the eastern capitalist is, on the field and in recitation, shoulder to shoulder with the ranchman's son; that the petted bearer of a great name is on a footing of equality with the plucky orphan whose destiny is in his own hands; that distinctions of north and south, rich and poor, city and country, are here subordinate to the supreme test of intrinsic worth.

He went on to provide a personal anecdote:

In my senior classes I sat between a fellow whose income was practically unlimited and one who for more than five years had slaved in the city to lay by money for his education. And yet we three—two extremes and the mean—were the best of friends; that a disparity of purse was any barrier to our intercourse and sympathies as men, never entered our heads; and with any one of us the consciousness of that disparity made for nothing but admiration that the others could be such good fellows in spite of it. Altogether, I believe that in all the world there is no place where wealth and name count less, and personal wealth more, than at Andover. (Struly, 1902).

Of course this is just one student's perspective. But it does infer that Andover's lofty ideals were becoming at least partially realized in its classrooms and on its playing fields, if only in the eyes of select members of its community.

**A community of thought emerges.** Andover's reputation was growing in part because of Principal Bancroft's interactions with so many other leaders in the educational community. Bancroft often consulted with other heads of school and presidents of colleges and universities on important matters, seeking advice and sharing best practices. In particular, the school's liberal financial aid policy—in conjunction with its low tuition fee—inspired awe from others. The Headmaster of Lawrenceville, James Cameron Mackenzie (1895), once wrote Bancroft:

As I figure on your funds and remaining expenses I marvel that you do not increase your tuition. I think it is a just principle that the rich should pay approximately what an education costs, and any income that comes to an

institution in this way could be used to give additional help to the meritorious indigent student. (Allis, 1979, p. 239).

Mackenzie's comment reflects more than just one headmaster's opinion of how aid should be funded. In this comment, we also see traces of the "gospel of wealth" so popular at the time, which held that the rich should subsidize the poor.

With the increase in communication between school headmasters, a community of boarding schools began to crystalize. This new community of boarding schools became a source of organizational support, as well as competition. Their presence also encouraged Andover to emphasize the characteristics that made it unique among boarding schools. In a report to the Andover trustees, Bancroft (1893) wrote:

The tendency is to the community life of minimum expenditure, as at Moody's schools [Mt. Hermon and Northfield] and at Kimball Union Academy, or to the conventual life of aristocratic flavor at St. Paul's and Lawrenceville. Andover is very likely to be the chief representative of a school ministering to all social classes from the richest to the poorest, and providing a wide range of accommodations for the various pecuniary ability of its pupils...

The school took great pride in being more democratic than its peer institutions, and would capitalize on this reputation in the following decades.

By the turn of the twentieth century the annual scholarship budget had grown to almost \$52,000, and fully subsidized forty boys each year. Tuition was \$150 a year (Board of Trustees, 1902a), approximately the same as at Yale (Pierson, 1983). The Board of Trustees was still heavily involved in the distribution of scholarships, and

continually requested data on the number of scholarships awarded, and to whom (Executive Committee, 1903). The presence of the Seminary often caused confusion over institutional priorities, as most of the Seminary students were in need of aid, and it was increasingly difficult to disentangle the Seminary aid from the rest of the institution. At one Trustee meeting it was “Voted that after the present year the appropriations for Seminary scholarships shall not exceed the income from regular scholarship funds” (Board of Trustees, 1903). And yet minutes from Trustee meetings after this point show that the trustees still struggled to balance aid between Seminary and regular students.

Persisting financial difficulties continued to prohibit Andover from achieving its goals. In 1904, the Trustees decided to reduce both faculty salaries and the number of students receiving scholarships (Board of Trustees, 1904). A year later, the Trustees voted the following measures:

That the total number of boys in the Academy to whom scholarship aid is granted for any reason from the present scholarship funds shall not exceed fifty (50) at any one time; 2) That scholarship aid shall be assigned at the beginning of each term on the basis of each boy's record of the preceding term, preference being shown to needy boys who have maintained a high stand in scholarship and deportment; 3) That the Principal may at his discretion grant aid to not more than twelve (12) deserving boys whose rank would not otherwise entitle them to receive scholarship aid. (Executive Committee, 1905).

These policies attempted to impose some order on a scholarship process that lacked any consistency. While Headmaster Fuess wrote, “It is only rarely that an intelligent energetic

boy does not obtain all the help that he needs” (1914, p. 76), there was little science used in identifying these “intelligent energetic” boys, let alone in assessing their needs. While some students with good grades were given grants with no practical work obligations, others had onerous work duties bussing tables and serving their fellow classmates in the dining hall. A few students made money by working for clothing stores, delivering newspapers, or selling ice cream in town.

A decade later, Trustees were still grappling with the issue when they met to discuss whether they should reduce the number of scholarship students in order to provide larger scholarships to a lower number of students. They believed that by providing fewer students with more funds, these students “would be enabled to devote more time to school work and hence be required to maintain a higher standing in their studies...” (Board of Trustees, 1916). The Trustees did not change the policy that day, and the issue of whether it is better to provide full scholarships to a few students, or partial scholarships to many, would continue to trouble school leaders for the next hundred years.

**Spaces and places for scholarship students.** Inequities on campus between scholarship students and full paying students also persisted, most obviously in where and how students were housed. As mentioned previously, scholarship boys lived in the Latin or English Commons—paying \$5 a term to do so—while full-paying boys boarded with families in town. The two different living situations caused friction on campus. In a report to the Trustees, Bancroft (1893) wrote:

The immediate danger is that the school will divide as some of the great English schools were once divided into a group of rich boys on the one hand, and a group of poor boys on the other. In the English schools the poor boys were gradually crowded out. It is our present obligation to make it possible for persons of moderate means to get good accommodations at Andover at a moderate price.

The Academy's first solution was to build a series of small cottages on the edge of campus that housed both boys and teachers as their supervisors. However, the cottages only served to further illuminate the differences between scholarship and full-paying boys. For example, one cottage, particularly well-outfitted, charged boys living there a fee of \$35-80 per room (Allis, 1979, p. 285), a fee that no scholarship student could afford. The variation in prices troubled several of the trustees, who debated the matter for much of 1905, and finally determined "that there was a strong feeling among those who had contributed to the Andover Cottage that the prices of rooms in this Cottage should have been gauged to meet the wants of the poor boys in the school" (Executive Committee, 1905). Rather than lowering the price of the expensive cottage, a new cottage was designed to be a cheaper dorm specifically for scholarship students. Unfortunately, this ostensibly well-intentioned decision only ended up segregating scholarship students even further.

The second solution to the housing problem came in 1910, when Andover moved all full-paying boys into dorms on campus, and prohibited anyone from living in private homes in town. Prices between the dorms were equalized further, so that discrepancies between the living situations were minimized. Claude Fuess (1914), a faculty member

and future Headmaster, ruminated that as a result, “A wealthy boy may thus live beside one who is absolutely dependent upon his own labor for an education, and the surroundings being the same, neither feels any constraint in associating with the other” (p. 76). To ensure that these interactions would occur, Headmaster Alfred E. Stearns insisted that scholarship students be distributed throughout all of the dormitories on campus in order “to prevent a special clique of mature, tough boys from dominating the School” (Allis, p. 623-624). However, room prices continued to vary depending on their quality, and it was not until 1934 that a standard rate for all rooms was determined.

A shift in the social standing of scholarship boys occurred in the early part of the twentieth century. By 1914, one of out every six students was receiving financial aid (Fuess, 1914, p. 75). Fuess (1914) noted that Headmaster Stearns referred to scholarship students as “the backbone of the school” (p. 75), and Allis (1979) concurred:

An outsider, unfamiliar with Andover, might think that the scholarship boys were second-class citizens, but nothing could be further from the truth. If anything, the boys formed an elite within the School; they held many positions of leadership and often were outstanding athletes. One former scholarship boy has this to say about his status: "The most outstanding characteristic of the student body...was their genuinely democratic outlook. No one seemed to care where you came from or what kind of pedigree you had. As a scholarship boy working in the Commons or at Jim Ryley's Grill for my board, I never heard anyone, in the two years I spent at Andover, make mention of the fact as a reflection or as a means of

harassment. Indeed, the opposite seemed to me to be the case; the surest way for a boy to be unpopular with his fellows was to flaunt his money. (p. 430).

Fuess (1914) also alludes to the high position of scholarship students, writing:

For decades the ‘Commons men,’ as they were formerly called, have been leaders in student government and on school organizations: they are welcomed everywhere on their own merits; and the gradual disuse of the term ‘Commons men’ indicates that even the nominal distinction between them and the others will shortly disappear. (p. 76).

Andover students seemed to have embraced the same “collegiate ideal” then popular at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, where students were lauded not for where they came from, but what they did during their time on campus (Thelin, 2004).

However, scholarship students were expected to perform well academically, and to uphold the highest standards of the community. One donor of a scholarship specified, “The beneficiaries of this fund must be young men of high moral character, who do not use tobacco or alcoholic beverages of any kind” (Board of Trustees, 1906a). This emphasis on academic and moral performance for scholarship students contrasts with their full-paying peers, who had no known obligations, academic or otherwise.

**The Andover Theological Seminary, removed.** In 1904, the Trustees made the important decision to divest Phillips Academy of the Andover Theological Seminary. A few years prior, Principal James Hardy Ropes had accepted the Presidency of Andover, but with the condition that the Theological Seminary be removed from campus, or an appropriate amount of funds be raised to sustain both institutions. The Seminary had

become an albatross around Andover's neck. Principal Ropes argued that the Academy was neglected under the current arrangement with the Seminary, and specifically decried the condition of housing for students (Board of Trustees, 1902b). Two years later, the Trustees hashed out a plan to remove the Seminary to Harvard, and purchased land near Harvard to erect a building (called Andover Hall). They stipulated that all five Andover Theological Seminary professors be hired by Harvard, and duly named the "Andover Professors in Harvard University." Finally, they also determined that Andover students would be allowed to take classes at Harvard, and vice versa (Board of Trustees, 1906b). The transaction was completed in April of 1806 (Phillips Academy Board of Trustees, 1906c). In addition to removing the Seminary, the Board also looked for other ways to increase revenue at the school. In 1910, the first application fee was required of all those applying to the school (Board of Trustees, 1910a), and an \$8.00 fee was charged to seniors upon their graduation (Board of Trustees, 1910b).

A **"democracy of opportunity."** Andover's leaders continued to emphasize the school's commitment to building a democratic community on campus. At an Alumni Dinner in 1913, Claude Fuess, faculty member and future Andover Headmaster, told the crowd:

When we speak of democracy at Andover, we do not mean the absolute equality of condition in its students. Nor do we mean that rich and poor, sons of somebody and the sons of nobody in particular, endure one another with a priggish altruism. We mean more than this; we mean that here boys find unrestrained liberty to do and to win, regardless of their family tree or family bank account. We mean that

here all have equal right, equal opportunity, and equal prompting to action, and that same chance to achieve leadership in all the activities of academic existence. This is the democracy of opportunity... We mean to maintain a school where potentialities are recognized and attainment acknowledged. We are free to admit that, like all genuine democracy, ours leads to a real aristocracy. (Fuess, 1913).

The message of Andover as a “democracy of opportunity” was spread much further than just to the alumni body. In 1914, Fuess penned an article for *The School Review* in which he explained that the “youth from every quarter” section of the Constitution was

the germ of the present cosmopolitan nature of the school, drawing, as it does, students from all over the United States, and from many foreign countries, and making room for all qualified applicants, regardless of race or nationality, religious principles, financial standing, or social position.

Fuess continued:

It was an indispensable part of the design, moreover, that aid toward education should be furnished to worthy scholars who might find themselves unable to meet the school expenses; and, in pursuance of this plan, funds have been generously donated by many benefactors. To this, more perhaps than to any other cause, the traditional democracy of the Academy may be ascribed. (p. 74).

Andover’s commitment to democracy—as interpreted in the founding Constitution—allowed the school to stand out from the rest of its boarding school peers, and subsequently became a source of institutional prestige.

The endowment for scholarships continued to grow thanks to the generosity of several donors. One donation of \$1,000 came from the daughter of a graduate of the Class of 1848, who wrote, “My Father, having had to work his way, under severe conditions, from early youth, had a sympathetic interest in other boys similarly circumstanced” (Board of Trustees, 1910b). Another collection amounting to \$3,800 came just a few years later, and was marked specifically for the use of supporting “deserving boys in the school” (Board of Trustees, 1912). Scholarship money sometimes spread beyond the four years of the Andover experience, as several scholarships were specifically designated for Andover graduates attending a certain college or university. A Chairman of the Board of Trustees provided a scholarship of \$300 “for a worthy member of the school preparing for Yale College” (Board of Trustees, 1918a). Just a few years later, another gift was made for a “Phillips Academy graduate of limited means during his freshman year at Yale University, the award to be made at the close of the recipient's senior year in the school on the basis of character and ability” (Executive Committee, 1920).

While access and affordability remained a priority, tuition did increase as operational expenses grew. From 1918 to 1927, tuition rose by \$150 to \$350, again keeping pace with Yale University (Pierson, 1983). However, the Trustees noted that the tuition increases were enacted “with the understanding that remissions made to scholarship boys in the school be increased proportionately, so that the expense to the individual boys of this group shall remain practically on the present basis” (Board of Trustees, 1927). In short, the burden of tuition increases did not fall on scholarship boys,

but rather on Andover. The institution was dedicated to supplying the financial aid necessary to offset any increase in tuition, a practice that continues today.

To meet the rising operational expenditures, Andover embarked on its first large fundraising campaign. In 1920, the institution raised \$1.5 million, the highest amount of any independent school at that time. Fundraising at colleges, universities, and boarding schools was becoming more strategic at this time, and fundraisers began to use specific institutional priorities to target prospective donors. At Andover, financial aid was a popular tool for fundraisers, attracting alumni donors who valued Andover's liberal financial aid policies. The school began asking donors to sponsor individual students, such that general use funds could be freed up, and additionally, "closer contacts would be established between the school and its alumni and a keener interest among the latter naturally aroused" (Board of Trustees, 1929).

**A compatriot in Exeter.** During this period interactions between Andover and Exeter began to increase as well. Prior to 1900, Andover had had little to do with Exeter. According to Allis (1979), Headmaster Samuel Taylor admitted that he had only met the Principal of Exeter once during his thirty-four years in office. However, as a group of elite boarding schools began to coalesce in the early 1900s, Andover became more aware of its peer in New Hampshire. Eventually, Andover and Exeter not only shared benefactors and provided each other with tutors and principals, but developed similar policies. For example, in 1830 the Trustees of Andover voted that students who had established good reputations could study unsupervised in their rooms during certain hours, a policy unique to Andover and Exeter among boarding schools (Allis, 1979).

Exeter also served as a benchmark level of comparison for Andover. In the early 1900s, Andover's financial aid program was generous by most measures; but in 1904, Exeter's financial aid program was twice as large as Andover's (Allis, 1979, p. 325).

Andover and Exeter often conversed on tuition rates and faculty salaries.

According to one 1918 report from the Andover Board of Trustees:

The Principal called attention to a recent discussion with Principal Perry of Exeter on the advisability of increasing the tuition rate before another year, and reported that the Trustees of Phillips Exeter Academy had decided to take this step and hoped that their sister school would adopt the same course. (Board of Trustees, 1918b).

Andover did subsequently raise tuition, but stipulated that "a considerable portion of the increased income should be devoted to scholarships which would make it possible to improve the scholarship standing of boys aided from the school fund." A short time later, another discussion took place among the Trustees about the possibility of increasing room rents, prompted by a report which showed that "the average of rents charged at present by the school is approximately fifty per cent lower than the average charged by Exeter" (Board of Trustees, 1921). As a result, room rents were increased by 25%.

Interactions between the two institutions would continue to grow over the next several decades.

### **Access in the Middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century**

**Reputations and realities.** Andover's reputation continued to increase in the 1940s, in part due to exposure in national publications. An article in *Fortune* magazine

lauded the school for its policies with scholarships: “Andover is not particularly a rich boy's school, but it is a rich school and has all the opportunities that institutional opulence has thrust upon it” (1944). A few years later, the *Saturday Evening Post* followed with a similar article which proclaimed:

In these days of crowded public schools, nobody can deny that the best private schools supply superior secondary education. What Andover is seeking to accomplish is to provide that education to the boys of the United States who really want and deserve it, not to those who can merely afford it. (Pringle & Pringle, 1947).

Andover had caught the eye of America’s popular media, and only benefitted as a result.

Part of Andover’s popularity might have come from its promise of a meritocracy, an ideal embraced by the nation after World War II. With international leadership in science and technology at the forefront of priorities, the United States required an educated elite, and it was the role of elite institutions to seek out and educate the most talented individuals in the nation. Identifying talented students—regardless of their ability to pay—became the overriding priority of many admissions offices.

Ironically, this national movement towards meritocracy also hurt Andover, as the elite colleges and universities that had long relied on Andover to supply their students began to turn to other sources, specifically public schools. In the years preceding World War II, Andover had enjoyed a golden period in elite college admissions: 93% and 98% of its graduates were accepted into Harvard University in 1930 and 1940, respectively (Karabel, 1984, p. 21), and 60% of its graduates ultimately enrolled at Harvard, Yale, or

Princeton in these same years (Karabel, 1984, p. 22). During the 1930s and into the early 1940s, it was in the elite universities' best interest to accept as many boarding school graduates as they could. However, in the second half of the 1940s and throughout the 1950s, the "feeder" school relationship that had developed over the last century and a half began to show signs of wear and tear. Harvard, Yale, and Princeton delved deeper into the pool of public school students and drew less from the private schools. The college admission results over the next several decades revealed that Andover would have to work harder to make the case for its graduates to be admitted into the nation's elite colleges and universities.

Andover students were not just competing for admission; they were also competing for financial aid. In the 1940s, Andover scholarship students found it relatively easy to attain college scholarships (*The Phillipian*, 1940). However, as hundreds of thousands more high school students began to apply to college in the years after WWII, the chances of Andover students obtaining a scholarship shrank. By 1953, half of all applications to Harvard—and almost all of the "trans-Mississippi candidates"—were applying for financial aid. Subsequently, elite colleges and universities did not look to Andover to supply their scholarship students—if anything, they would rely more heavily on Andover and its peer boarding schools to supply their full-paying students.

Andover became keenly aware that for low-income students on financial aid, the bridge to financial aid in college had become questionable; going forward, they would not necessarily receive the same, if any, aid to attend college. In some aspects, this

presented an ethical problem for the school. Some questioned if Andover should reduce the number of scholarship students it admitted, if not all were guaranteed financial aid in college. Others thought that Andover needed to diversify the type of school to which it was sending graduates. In 1953, the Dean of Students G. Grenville Benedict wrote an article in the *Andover Bulletin* entitled, “Can the Andover scholarship boy afford to go to the college of his choice?” In the article Benedict speculated:

What of the full scholarship boy who entered Andover as a Junior, who has spent four years in what might be called the “Big Three Culture pattern,” and who as a senior turns out to be only a rather tepid potato: with a class rank in the second quarter, a lukewarm personality, and no significant achievement on the playing field or in other activities? He will not find waiting for him at Harvard or Princeton or Yale the kind of money that he needs. Can we find a way to help this thoroughly worthwhile if rather undistinguished boy to adjust in all possible ways to acceptance of the state university or the local city college?

This was new territory for Andover. Not only was the school questioning how best to serve its students, but in a roundabout way it was also questioning whether it should be enrolling the type of “tepid potato” student Benedict mentioned. In the years following this article, Andover would place a renewed attention on seeking academic excellence and strength of character in the “youth from every quarter” that the future leadership of America required.

**Need-blind admissions: Part one.** Just as elite colleges and universities across the country were doing, Andover began to work harder to bring in the most talented

students possible. The fullest expression of Andover's intent in seeking "youth from every quarter" came in 1957, when Andover adopted a need-blind policy for the first time. Andover's need-blind policy stipulated that "Any deserving boy who can meet the Academy's requirements is assured of full consideration in the competition for admission, no matter what his economic, social, or racial background." In an address to the Newcomen Society, Headmaster John M. Kemper (1957) reminded the audience that "the ideal is that Andover be a national school—and a public one in the sense of its being open to any deserving boy..." Kemper went on to say of the need-blind policy:

It speaks, I believe, highly of the courage of the present Board of their real devotion to what has long been an Andover tradition that they have been willing to take this gamble, and I believe that this policy is unique among American educational institutions, both secondary and college.

This latter point is particularly important, as Andover was among the first institutions at the secondary *and* postsecondary level to declare a need-blind policy. Over the course of the next five years all of the Ivy League institutions, along with such colleges as Amherst, Williams, Wesleyan, Stanford, Pomona, Reed, Carleton, Swarthmore, Duke, and the University of Chicago, adopted the policy. According to Thelin (2004):

The need-based aid policies were significant because they were developed by the institutions themselves and relied largely on institutional resources. These private colleges and universities were ahead of federal programs and policies in making admission more a matter of talent than family income. (pp. 292-293).

Andover had once again lofted itself into collegiate company by aligning its policies,

practices, and values with elite higher education.

The need-blind policy was eventually translated into Andover's "Most Qualified" program. Prior to this decision, separate admissions committees had existed for scholarship and non-scholarship boys. Finding the best and brightest—regardless of their ability to pay—was of the utmost concern to the institution, and to that end the Admissions Committee and Scholarship Committee were merged in the late 1950s. The new admissions process required that each student be considered individually as well as in relation to the whole of the institution. One alumnus who participated in the process noted: "A boy is considered as an individual and in terms of what the school can do for him, what he can do for the school, and what kind of a human being he is likely to be later in life" (McLean, 1957, p. 3). Students were to be admitted on the basis of their personal and academic characteristics alone, and their financial need only assessed and met after an admissions decision had been reached.

Just like many elite colleges and universities in the 1950s, Andover's application pool grew by leaps and bounds each year. According to the President of the Alumni Council at the time:

The outstanding reason for the increase is the pressure of a rapidly growing population on an independent school system which is not expanding appreciably. Among the independent schools Andover feels the pressure perhaps more than some for a variety of special reasons, including pre-eminence, its low all-inclusive fee of \$1600, and its unique policy of admitting qualified boys regardless of their ability to pay all or a portion of tuition. (McLean, 1957, p. 3).

It is important to note that while pursuing an ambitious financial aid agenda and adopting a need-blind policy, Andover still strove to keep its relatively low tuition rate. Just as it had half a century earlier, Andover's low tuition (as compared to other elite boarding schools) was a point of pride for the school, indicating that it placed value on remaining affordable even as it pursued the distinction of being one of the greatest high schools in the United States.

That Andover's tuition fell on the lower end in comparison to other boarding schools was a point not lost on prospective students. A recent Chair of the Board of Trustees and a member of the Class of 1956, recalled that when he applied,

One of the more powerful facts that I realized...was that while the tuition at Andover was \$1400, when I went, the tuition at Deerfield...was \$2200. So there was an \$800 difference—and percentage wise—if you think about that it was huge. (Interview, December 19, 2011).

The former Chair perceived this as an attempt to be “more affordable across the spectrum,” a concept which would shape his view of the institution for the next sixty years. It appears that Andover's liberal financial aid policies were achieving the goal of attracting students of all financial means.

**Casting a wider net for “deserving boys.”** Beyond the “Most Qualified” program, Andover had several other programs for identifying talent and attracting “youth from every quarter” in the late 1950s and 1960s. One particularly interesting talent identification program was the “Newspaper boy program,” which operated from 1958 to 1967, and offered scholarships to qualified newspaper boys from around the country.

Newspaper boys were deemed to have the characteristics—“boys with the ambition and determination and brain power to take advantage of what schools like these can offer” (Adriance, 1968)—that Andover sought in its students.

Along with putting out a call to newspaper editors around the country for talented students, the program entailed extensive groundwork with mailings, visits to distant cities, and on-site interviews. Members of the Admissions Committee traveled to Illinois, Minnesota, Maine, Kansas and Iowa, where they interviewed more than thirty boys each year. Director of Admissions James Adriance wrote to one Editor-in-Chief,

We are particularly anxious to reach areas where there may be a chance of our being of real service to boys for whom local school facilities aren't adequate to provide a real challenge; and if such boys measure up in the nation-wide competition for admission they can be assured of whatever scholarship assistance is necessary if the family financial circumstances warrant it. (Adriance, 1958).

The newspaper boy program helped Andover tap into corners of America previously inaccessible to it, while also making the school available to many students who had never heard of Andover before.

A few years after the advent of the newspaper boy program, a similar program was introduced for sons of employees of the U.S. Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service. These two branches were considered to be populated by underappreciated federal employees from diverse backgrounds who often lived in remote areas—areas often without strong secondary schools. Prior to the inception of the program, one alumnus wrote to Adriance:

From what we have seen of the National Park people, chiefly engineers, naturalists, scientific specialists of varying kinds, meteorologists, etc., they are a very intelligent as well as devoted group of people, and I presume they would produce kids of the same order of intelligence. As we emphasized before, we have coupled with this elite body of people a very difficult problem of geographic isolation so that it would seem that if you are trying to pick out one group of federal servants who would find Andover a solution to their educational problems, you have a “natural” in the National Park Service. (Reynolds, 1958).

Letters went out to Forestry and Park Service offices around the U.S., including Alaska, California, and Arizona. While the Forestry and Park programs generated only a few students (in 1961 there were only four students from the National Park Service program (Adriance, 1961a), and by 1968 were only 9 graduates from the eight years of the program (Phillips Academy, 1968)), the program was symbolic of Andover’s commitment to finding new and innovative ways to identify talent.

Furthermore, while the breadth of the Forestry and Parks programs might not have been great, it had a profound impact on those that did participate. Quoted in a flyer advertising the program, one alumnus said:

My college record, as you can see from transcript and Questionnaire, is an unassuming one; but the fact that we can speak of “college,” and “transcript,” etc. is directly due to the funds made available to me by Andover to attend preparatory school. From Andover I went on to Dartmouth -- to another scholarship; from Dartmouth to William and Mary; from there to Tufts...I can truthfully say that if I

had not been given the chance to attend Andover, I should still be in Virginia milking cows. And if I had not been provided with a scholarship while at Andover, I should never have had the faith in my abilities to attempt anything on my own...A scholarship, such as the one provided for me, may often give a boy the first intuition that someone thinks enough of his abilities to give him the chance to develop them. By all means, tell these people that their money is doing a good that is immeasurable. (Phillips Academy, n.d.).

As the letter indicates, it appears that graduates of these two programs were generally very successful in the college admissions process. In a letter describing the achievements of some of the recent newsboy graduates, Adriance wrote:

Included in the more recently graduated Class of 1965 were 10 ‘alumni’ of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, and the Pittsburgh Press. These boys qualified in the most highly competitive college admission year in history for the following colleges (most of them with necessarily substantial scholarship awards): 3 to Harvard, 2 to Princeton, 1 each to University of Chicago, St. Olaf, Stanford, Washington University, Yale. (Adriance, 1965).

Elite colleges and universities valued the same qualities that Andover sought, and perhaps capitalized on the fact that Andover had done the hard work of seeking out and preparing these youth for college.

Andover’s commitment to seeking “youth from every quarter” and offering substantial financial aid continued to garner attention in 1960. In that year, an editor (and

Andover alumnus) from *The Boston Globe* approached Andover to discuss a potential article on Andover's scholarship program, which he wanted to pitch to a national magazine. While it appears that the article was never picked up by such a publication, the volume of correspondence around the article is quite telling of the energy surrounding scholarships at that time. The enthusiastic alumnus wrote an editor of *The New York Times* the following:

The trustees said – “Go out and get the best 250 boys and tell us what it will cost to educate them.” There are no restrictions on social, religious or financial standing. This year the program is running them \$250,000 and the anecdotes for the popular concept of a rich man's secondary school are certainly bold – a garbage collector's son, a Maine boy whose family was on relief, a Mexican boy sponsored by the Los Angeles Boys' Club who was literally clothed from the skin out. Equally readable are the anecdotes of Andover alumni who received financial help – an under-secretary of the Navy, a New York newspaperman, doctors, a Rhodes Scholar, a Negro killed flying a jet plane. (Dorman, 1960).

The alumnus paints a colorful picture of the scholarship program at Andover and its impact on students. There were several other scholarship programs at Andover as well: one worked with Boys' Clubs in the region, while another specifically targeted low-income youth in Lowell, a nearby working-class mill town. All of the programs sought hardworking boys of extraordinary intellect.

To identify talent, admissions officers used the standardized tests that had become popular in the previous decade (Phillips Academy, 1962; Phillips Academy 1967a). The

Secondary School Admission Test had been developed in the 1950s by ten independent school admissions officers, presumably in response to the development of the Standardized Achievement Test (SAT) that was being widely embraced by colleges and universities during the same time. Raw numbers on these tests were believed to be the antidote to biased admissions, as they measured intellect rather than social connections. The SSAT was quickly embraced by elite boarding schools.

Other requirements for admission to a scholarship program included “strong character” recommendations from local school authorities; a rank in the top 10% of their class or grades of A (or equivalent) in at least half of “college unit” courses; an I.Q. of 125 on a standard scholastic aptitude test; a favorable interview with an Andover official; and an evident desire to meet the challenge of a school of high standards of performance in all areas. The “strong character” recommendations reflect the same focus on leadership and “personal promise” at Harvard and Yale in the ‘50s and ‘60s (Soares, 2007). However, Andover did make concessions with lower test scores when students had “strong compensating qualities in one or more other areas” (*Andover Bulletin*, 1967).

The reach of the scholarship programs was quite extensive. According to an annual letter to Andover’s alumni and friends written by Director of Admission Adriance in 1961,

271 new boys starting in September include 22 day students and 249 boarders coming from 31 states, D.C., and 13 foreign countries. The percentage of this group receiving scholarship aid in whole or in part, depending on family financial need, is 30.7, for a total of approximately \$90,000. The estimated scholarship

budget for the school year 1961-62, for both new boys and old boys, is approximately \$281,000. (Adriance, 1961b).

Similar measures to attract diverse classes of students were taking place at elite colleges and universities, as the public called for greater equity in elite college admissions.

Harvard and Yale in particular were growing concerned that the pool of applicants remained weighted towards high-income students, and developed generous financial aid program and scholarship programs to combat this disparity (Soares, 2007, p. 61). They also started to reach farther afield geographically for their applicants, while admitting fewer boarding school graduates.

The increased pressure on elite colleges to diversify their student bodies brought a new level of competition between Andover and Exeter. Institutional research became popular at both institutions, and unprecedented levels of attention and resources were devoted to comparing the two institutions. Studies were conducted comparing how many students were accepted by each school and by both schools, where they enrolled (see Table 5), and where they went to college (see Table 6). Table 5 shows the number of students both Andover and Exeter accepted and the number that only one or the other accepted, while distinguishing scholarship from regular students. Between 1957 and 1960, both scholarship students and regular students had a slight tendency to choose Exeter over Andover, and Andover admitted more students that were rejected from Exeter than Exeter admitted students that were rejected from Andover. At the same time, a greater percentage of Exeter's graduating classes was being admitted into "hard colleges" between 1957 and 1960. Andover was sensitive to the fact that Exeter

graduates appeared to be faring better than Andover students in elite college admissions.

**Table 5. Comparison of Andover and Exeter Admissions 1957-1960**

	Scholarship				Regular				Total			
Class	'57	'58	'59	'60	'57	'58	'59	'60	'57	'58	'59	'60
Accepted by both schools, enrolled at PA	7	3	3	5	22	23	32	32	29	26	35	37
Accepted by both schools, enrolled at PEA	2	6	4	9	28	43	26	36	30	49	30	45
Accepted by PA, Rejected by PEA	17	10	20	12	32	26	21	25	49	36	41	37
Accepted by PEA, rejected by PA	-	-	1	3	22	28	27	35	22	28	28	38

(Phillips Academy, 1967b)

**Table 6. A Comparison of the Numbers at Andover and Exeter Admitted to "Hard" Colleges**

	Andover			Exeter		
Class	Number	Total in Class	%	Number	Total in Class	%
1957	127	218	58	165	230	72
1958	125	238	53	46	219	67
1959	122	223	55	139	220	63
1960	136	251	54	-	253	-

(Phillips Academy, 1967c)

One Andover report tellingly reads:

In the years 1957, 1958, and 1959, a significantly larger proportion of the Exeter Senior Class was admitted to colleges similar in selectivity and rigorousness to Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and Williams. That is, such colleges dug deeper into the Exeter classes than into the Andover classes. Apparently, a higher proportion of Exeter's Senior Class is able to perform creditably at the rigorous colleges than Andover's...It follows that, by the standard of measurable academic achievement at the most rigorous colleges, the Exeter group is better than ours. (Phillips Academy, 1961a).

Because fewer boarding school graduates were being admitted into elite universities, Andover and Exeter had to compete against each other more ferociously than ever. For the first time in institutional records, we see the two institutions pitted against each other for finite resources—that of elite university legitimation, stemming from the admission of their graduates. This competition would only increase over the next fifty years, as admission into elite universities became more and more difficult. Indeed, the statistical comparisons between where students were admitted and where they matriculated begun in the 1950s continue today.

**“A national public school.”** While Andover struggled to maintain its connection to the elite universities, it also tried to gain larger social relevance by emphasizing the democratic nature of the school at every opportunity. One letter to alumni described the student body as “representing a geographic, social and economic cross-section of American youth—with several foreign representatives for good measure” (Adriance,

1961c). An Andover faculty member agreed, saying,

Andover today can best be described as a *national public* school. It is *national* in two senses: it attracts its students from every section of this country; and it attracts them as well from every social, economic, and racial group in the land. It is also *public* in two senses: it is open to the public in that any qualified boy may get his schooling here; and it has as its goal service to the public, rather than to any private, interest. (Allis, n.d.).

This rationale was also used to advertise Andover's scholarship program. One flyer read: "Since fewer than 10% of American families today can afford an Andover education for their sons, a well-developed scholarship program plays a vital role in making Phillips Academy a national public school" (Phillips Academy, 1961b). Internal members of the Andover community weren't the only ones to pick up this theme: According to Allis, in that same year, Andover was featured in an October 26th *Time Magazine* article on "Excellence and Intensity in U.S. Prep Schools," which stated that: "By snubbing Social Register dullards and by combing the country for bright recruits of all races, religions, and incomes, they are fast becoming more democratic than homogeneous suburban public schools." From all of these references, it appears that Andover had informally launched a public relations campaign to be the most "American" of all secondary schools.

Why was access and socioeconomic diversity so important to Andover at this time? In 1965, Headmaster Kemper wrote that there were two main reasons:

First, so that any boy in this school can know other boys from different backgrounds, thereby enhancing his understanding of different points of view and

different ways of looking at things...My second purpose would be to have the school remain in the mainstream of American education, sensitive to the widest possible variety of needs, aware of changes in educational goals and methods, alert to varying mores of young people. (Brown, 1965, p. 2).

Another prominent faculty member gave several other reasons: to ensure national security by identifying and developing talented youth; because many other high schools were not equipped to educate the “talented tenth;” because Andover was a national school and supported a pluralistic society; because Andover must lead other schools as an institution and therefore not be afraid to take risks; and finally, “because it is socially and morally right” (Brown, 1965, p. 3). Still another faculty member wrote, “. . .Their main contribution lays not so much in their achievements as in their point of view. Generally, they are strongly motivated toward getting an education, and by their example help to motivate others” (Allis, 1966).

As a result of the increased attention to access, the Andover financial aid program flourished and matured. Between 1962 and 1966, the financial aid budget increased from \$260,000 to \$375,000, and went from serving 236 to 253 boys, including 22 on full scholarship (Adriance, 1962). The scholarship process also became more scientific. Scholarship students’ applications were read the same as non-scholarship students, but they were required to submit a detailed form similar to the CSS Profile. In determining need, Andover took into consideration other children in the family, as well as any other mitigating circumstances that could financially hinder a family—factors that only a few schools considered. Once distributed, Andover scholarships included a travel allowance

for each student that paid for three round trips home for the student, a practice that continues today. One example of the level of aid distributed by Andover is provided in a scholarship flyer: “If Annual Family Income (before taxes) was \$4,000, and there was only one child in the family, the Expected Family Contribution (EFC) was \$350. If family income was \$14,000, the EFC was \$3170” (Phillips Academy, 1961b).

**Tackling tough questions.** The scholarship program was not without its complexities, and the school constantly grappled with exactly how many students from disadvantaged backgrounds Andover should set out to help, and which classes of students it should target. Harvard had targeted its aid toward low-income students, while Yale chose to appeal more to middle classes (Soares, 2007). What should Andover do? How many students could the institution afford to fully fund? How many could it partially fund? Other questions revealed deeper issues of dominant cultural attitudes and educational ideals: How many scholarship students could Andover take without upsetting the culture of the institution? How many could it afford to take academically, without adding a lower-level academic track? These were all questions that arose in the *Andover Bulletin* several times over the next decade.

Eventually, in the late 1960s, Andover folded the Newspaper Boy Program into the Independent Schools Talent Search Program (*Andover Bulletin*, 1965). The Independent Talent Search Program was a collaborative effort initiated by several boarding schools to bring a wider ranging group of students to their campuses. In 1961, the headmasters of several elite boarding schools began a conversation with the Dean of Admission at Amherst College—which had its own talent identification program for

underrepresented students—about whether a similar program would be beneficial at the independent school level. In one letter from Headmaster John M. Kemper to the Amherst dean, Kemper wrote:

The business of searching out and finding the kind of kid you are talking about is a complicated one. Hammy Bissell at Exeter and Spike Adriance here, both spend much of their time in the effort to spot just such talent. Even so, I suspect that neither of them feels that he can more than scratch the surface of getting out the presumably hundred or even thousands of youngsters around the country who ought to be caught early enough to get them “college-minded” but never are. (Kemper, 1961).

The letter also copied the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the Donner Foundation in an effort to get their support. The Dean replied in strong support of such a program, writing several reasons for why such a program should exist:

It provides a real attempt to locate, early enough for action, those who clearly should go on for higher education. These young men are part of our nation's natural resources; 2) It gives independent schools a chance to play an enlarged role in the education of the underprivileged; 3) It would give the independent schools a better mixture of students from wealthy and poor environments.

Hopefully, to the benefit of each. (Wilson, 1961).

By 1968, there were 30 students at Andover who had arrived through these talent identification programs (Adriance, 1968), in addition to others who had found out about Andover’s scholarship program through word of mouth or advertisement.

**Equality (with exceptions).** With the diversity of opinions on the purpose of scholarship students, it is understandable that these students held a precarious position on campus: one of reverence, but also with high expectations and increased scrutiny. One alumnus from that period recounts, “I was proud of the fact that Andover had a broad spectrum of students—that one third were on scholarship—that P.A. was not an elitist school.” And yet he goes on to say, “It did not even strike me as strange that scholarship boys were set apart from the rest of us by having to do work around school - extended Commons Duty and so forth” (Allis, 1979, p. 576). A scholarship flyer from 1965 affirms this position, stating: “The parents of boys on scholarship need have no fear that these boys are in any way “second class citizens”; however:

Boys on scholarship at Phillips Academy are treated in exactly the same way as non-scholarship boys—with one exception. They are all asked to do about four hours a week of useful work around the school, as office boys, dining hall workers, library assistants, and so on.

The labor that scholarship students had to perform harkened back to the days of the “Scholar of the House,” albeit with a lesser amount of work than the latter position entailed.

Another contradiction existed in the academic expectations set forth for scholarship students:

The Scholarship Committee does not expect every scholarship boy to be on the honor roll. It does expect each boy to do the best he is capable of and to be a good citizen in the school community. If it believes that a boy is not taking full

advantage of his opportunities at Andover, it may decide not to renew an award, thus releasing the money for the use of a more deserving candidate. (Phillips Academy, 1961b).

Scholarship students were clearly held to different standards than their full-paying peers whom there was little question of being “deserving” of the Andover experience.

In spite of these issues, scholarship students’ experiences were largely positive. In 1972, the institution conducted a study of the effect of the Andover scholarship program as a whole upon scholarship students from the classes of 1952 through 1965 (Peterson & Broadbent, 1972). One hundred and sixteen scholarship students and 124 non-scholarship students participated in the survey, which asked a series of questions about the background of their parents, as well as their college and career outcomes after graduating from Andover. The study found that scholarship students tended to have better jobs than their parents, and specifically had moved “away from blue and white-collar to professional occupations,” while non-scholarship students moved from “blue collar” to “white collar” occupations. Perhaps most significantly, the study found that 35% of scholarship alumni had bettered their occupational classifications by two or three levels, and drew the reasonable conclusion that “the Andover experience of scholarship students had a significant upward effect upon their choice of occupations, and that it enabled them to achieve occupational equality with the non-scholarship classmates” (p. 7).

In terms of their actual experiences, scholarship students had a more favorable opinion of Andover than their non-scholarship peers, with nearly three-quarters of the scholarship alumni determining their Andover experiences as being “unqualifiedly good,”

as opposed to less than half of the non-scholarship students. When asked about the impact Andover had on their lives, the open-ended responses of the scholarship students remarked that Andover had “marked the turning point,” or “altered a life”; another said, “Without this my education would have been limited to that derived from a poor rural high school—opportunity for college would have been slim.” One alumna commented of the experience: “Profound; it enabled me to receive the best education possible, and PA was a substitute father since mine died when I was five.” Still others wrote that Andover was “Possibly the most significant single influence on my life,” and had “Completely changed the course of my life.” While Andover scholarship students might not have been treated the same as their full-paying peers in the 1950s and 1960s, the survey demonstrates that their experience benefited them even more so than those full-paying peers.

**Egalitarianism embraced.** In 1965, a Steering Committee on the future of Andover put together a final report that called for greater diversity in the social, economic, racial and ethnic backgrounds of Andover students. Greater diversity was needed in order to better reflect the nation, as well as to provide “a stimulating intellectual atmosphere, 2) a more catholic social experience and 3) a broader role for PA in American society” (Phillips Academy, 1965). Subsequently, the trustees abolished the work system for scholarship students—a decision met with some consternation from a few faculty members. According to Allis,

Some of the Faculty believed that this was going too far, that it was bad education to encourage students in the belief that the financial condition of their families

made no difference in life. These Faculty members also feared that the scholarship students would be in for a rude awakening in college, where such an egalitarian policy did not prevail. (p. 625).

The committee also dissolved class rankings, and established the 0-6 grading scale—a system unique to Andover, and still in place today.

Contextualizing this report is an interesting piece of commentary that comes from a faculty member who attended the National Association of Independent School's Conference on Summer Enrichment Programs in 1965. He wrote,

Overall I got the impression that we are seeing a rapidly expanding involvement on the part of the independent schools in the business of helping educate capable children from disadvantaged backgrounds. I would predict that by the end of next summer a strong independent school will have little difficulty justifying an involvement in this business—on the contrary, the difficult job will be to justify not being substantially involved. (Eccles, 1965).

And so it was. By the 1970s even the most staunchly conservative boarding schools were opening their doors to groups of students that had been up to that point prohibited or strongly discouraged from attending. In the following decades, access and outreach would expand far beyond Andover, and become catchphrases across most of K-16 American education. The niche that Andover had created for itself was widening, and Andover would have to work harder than ever before to prove its relevance in the national landscape of secondary education.

## **Access at the End of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

The 1970s brought political upheaval and social turmoil to the nation, and several challenges and changes to the Andover campus. Just one of these was coeducation, which was officially adopted in 1973. Ted Sizer, former Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, had been selected as Headmaster the previous year. Headmaster Sizer claimed that he had no interest in leading a single-sex school, and put coeducation at the top of the agenda (Allis, p. 669), thereby determining the immediate institutional priority for the next few years. In 1973, Abbot Academy, the all-girls school just down the road, was officially incorporated into Phillips Academy. Sizer didn't stop with coeducation, though. An educational reformer, he viewed Andover as a laboratory for his ideas. Sizer worked to bring down the invisible wall around Andover by bringing in students from public schools to attend classes and programs on campus for short periods of time. While just a few years earlier Andover had considered adding a year to become somewhat similar to a junior college (Phillips Academy, 1965), Sizer considered eliminating the 9<sup>th</sup> grade at Andover to increase efficiency and affordability. This idea, however, never gained enough traction to be adopted.

**The rise of race in access.** Building upon the institutional research begun in the 1960s, Andover continued to explore how its students from non-traditional boarding school backgrounds fared academically. In 1972, a report on “special students” (defined as “low testers,” blacks, A Better Chance, and disadvantaged students) found that these students were less likely than their peers to attain high grades, and more likely to fail classes. The report notes, “The greatest increase in failures, both among special groups

and the rest of the school, is in mathematics” (Peterson, 1972). This trend, which would unfortunately continue for many decades, is notable because it represents the beginning of institutional recognition of a preparation gap at Andover—a gap that would become one of the largest challenges the institution would face in its history.

According to one senior administrator who joined the Academy in the early 1970s, there was “an obvious correlation between race and socioeconomics” (interview, August 26, 2011). The Academy relied heavily on talent identification programs—such as A Better Chance—to bring low-income students to school. Because these programs often originated in urban areas (e.g. New York City, Washington, D.C., Richmond, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles), they were less likely to bring students from suburban or rural backgrounds; further, most of the students they sent to Andover were African American. Subsequently, according to one administrator,

It was easier for [scholarship] kids who weren’t kids of color who were on financial aid not to be recognized as such. Because we got here in the ‘70s, people were walking around with the holes in the jeans, and I mean you *really* couldn’t tell who was...it wasn’t until kids talked about where they had gone for their spring break or summer vacation that you would really know. (Interview, Associate Head of School, August 26, 2011).

As a result, race and socioeconomic status were often conflated in the eyes of the community, a broader trend seen throughout American higher education.

While the talent identification programs often involved preparatory work for the students before they arrived, once on campus there were few special programs and

services for low-income and underrepresented students. According to the Associate Head of School,

It wasn't that there was a sink or swim philosophy, it was that there weren't a whole lot of efforts specifically focused on helping kids who were coming from different backgrounds. There was a notion that if the kids were admitted to Phillips Academy, then they should be able to do the work. (Interview, August 26, 2011).

This latter idea is one that would take decades to unpack and dispel, and can still be found in some sectors of the school.

In the 1980s, specialized study hours and other programs for underrepresented students began to spring up on campus. According to the Dean of Community and Multicultural Affairs, who joined the campus around that time, the climate was more accepting of special interest programs:

There was a recognition, frankly, and a better understanding that because of the common class background of these students that most of them needed some time to adjust, transition, and their schools were not as equipped as an Andover, and therefore the readiness factor was questionable, and so there wasn't a big to-do about some 3's, or maybe even some 2's or 1's<sup>5</sup> early on as you transitioned, because the trajectory was that you would improve. You would still end up in a good school and a better place than if you'd stayed back home in a public school in Cleveland or Detroit. (Interview, September 28, 2011).

---

<sup>5</sup> Andover's grading system is unique. Students receive grades on a scale of 0-6, with 6 being considered outstanding, and 2 considered failing.

However, suspicion of programs targeting special groups was growing throughout the nation, and impacted Phillips Academy. Several senior administrators noted that they had attempted to institute a summer transition program for low-income and underrepresented youth at that time, but political pressure against such a program prevailed. Having special programs designated for one group was seen as anathema to the democratic nature of the institution, and soon many of the study groups and other academic supports were disbanded.

**Competing priorities.** While Ted Sizer had been focused on educational reform beyond Andover, Donald McNemar, the next Head of School, turned his attention to increasing Andover's global presence, both on campus and off. Andover attempted to adopt need-blind admissions again in the late 1980s, but didn't have the financial resources to sustain it, and each year admissions officers were forced to pull some financial aid students from the pool of admitted students to make way for those that could pay full freight.

By the early 1990s, Andover's enrollment had ballooned to over 1,260 students, making it one of the largest boarding schools in the nation. While the school enjoyed a healthy acceptance and yield rate of 45% and 60%, respectively, and maintained its strong academic reputation, the physical campus had deteriorated noticeably. The school was also losing ground to other elite boarding schools, as many students were choosing to attend other institutions instead of Andover. In particular the residential life program—or lack thereof—drew complaints. Andover was accused of being too independent and hands-off in its approach to student life on campus. As such, these problems defined the

priorities for the school for the next several years. Head of School Barbara L. Chase joined Andover in the midst of this renewal process. Speaking of that time, the Head of School said,

From the beginning there was a sense—I had the sense, the faculty had the sense, the trustees had the sense—that we wanted to do more [in terms of access]. And yet there were also other really significant competing priorities like faculty compensation, and at that point the campus needed a lot of attention. (Interview, August 31, 2011).

To that end, the Academy produced the Long Range Plan of 1993. While “youth from every quarter” was mentioned in the plan, it was not a cornerstone. Access remained important, but other institutional priorities took precedent, including shoring up the finances and physical structure, hiring strong faculty and staff, and widening the depth and breadth of the pool of students it attracted for admission. However, the plan does note that: “The school should always aspire to a ‘need-blind’ admission policy as a long-range goal and should follow a ‘need-sensitive’ policy when financial resources are constrained” (Phillips Academy, 1993). The Plan also made a strong statement against offering merit scholarships, noting that they were not in line with the ideals and ethos of Phillips Academy.

By all measures, the Long Range Plan was a success, and Andover at the end of the twentieth century was in an excellent place. The physical plant had been fortified and renewed, the student life program had been expanded and improved, and the academics continued to be of the highest quality. The institution was in a prime position to begin to

realize its greatest dreams for its student body, faculty, and campus.

### **Access in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

**A reaffirmation.** With the turn of the century, Andover began laying out the framework for its next strategic plan. The process was a collaborative one that involved faculty, staff, and trustees, and evolved over several years, finally culminating in the Strategic Plan of 2004. Phrasing from the founding Constitution was once again used to orient the direction of the school, as the preface in the 2004 Strategic Plan reads:

At the heart of this strategic plan is a reaffirmation of the school's historic and distinctive mission, first articulated in the Academy's Constitution of 1778 and then re-stated in the Academy's most recent Statement of Purpose, to educate 'youth from every quarter.' Our goal reflects the components necessary to accomplish this task in the twenty-first century. (Phillips Academy, 2004).

The Strategic Plan had one overarching goal: "To reaffirm the mission of Phillips Academy to be a school that educates outstanding youth from every quarter by effectively challenging them to develop their potential and to depart as thoughtful, versatile, responsible participants in the global community." One way that Andover would do this was by "ensuring access to the school for young people of talent, intelligence, and integrity from diverse cultural, geographic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds." The charge to educate 'youth from every quarter' was once again at the forefront of Andover's institutional priorities.

**Getting to the gold standard.** The decision to explicitly state need-blind admission as a goal was a difficult one. According to the Head of School, "As I

remember it, the Strategic Planning Committee went back and forth and back and forth on how we should say this, and whether we should actually say need-blind” (interview, August 31, 2011). The Committee knew that need-blind was a huge financial commitment on the part of the institution, and was unsure as to whether they should make it part of the formal plan. Finally the Committee decided to state that the goals were to, “Increase financial aid to provide sufficient funding to allow the Academy to admit the most highly qualified applicants from across lower, middle, and upper-middle income bands,” and “to offer admission without regard to financial need” (Phillips Academy, 2004). One of the subsequent tasks they needed to accomplish was to “Identify the cost and raise the financial resources, both in endowment and operating funds, necessary to enable the school to admit students without regard to financial need” (Phillips Academy, 2004). In other words, the Strategic Plan set need-blind as an abstract goal, but not a concrete one. While the language was ambiguous, the intent was clear: Moving forward, access would be a priority for the school.

Community members perceived the Strategic Plan as a bold step forward, but also as a return to the institution’s historical tradition. For example, the Chair of the Board of Trustees described the plan as “aspirational,” but also as a return to the “true nature” of the school. He described the Strategic Plan as going

back to what has been always the underlying ethos of the school. That in a sense, what went before the 10-12 years that went before had remediated whatever problems that were there, so we could take a fresh look at the fundamental values of the school. (Interview, December 19, 2011).

That access was seen as part of the “underlying ethos” and “fundamental values” of Andover is further proof of the existence of an organizational saga around access.

Because of the enormous cost and financial risk in having a need-blind policy, Andover was hesitant to adopt the policy too quickly. After releasing the Strategic Plan, the institution spent the next few years laying the financial groundwork to make this possible, including fundraising and introducing an “Affordability Initiative.” As part of the “Affordability Initiative” Andover increased its financial aid budget by 42% between 2004 and 2007, and removed all loans from the financial aid program. This move to eliminate loans from financial aid packages was also being embraced by several elite colleges and universities—including Williams College, Harvard University, and Dartmouth University—during the same period.

While need-blind was an abstract goal of the 2004 Strategic Plan, the idea gained serious traction in the following years as college after college adopted the policy. It was only a matter of time before elite secondary schools began to do the same. In 2007, St. Paul’s, Exeter, and Groton all declared a policy of being free for families with incomes under \$65,000 (a policy similar to Harvard University’s), and the senior administrators and trustees at Andover were propelled into action. Since Andover had been considering need-blind for some time, and had quietly been working towards that goal, the possibility of other boarding schools adopting it before Andover was unfavorable. Describing that time, the Head of School said there “was all this energy in the land” (interview, August 31, 2011) which catalyzed the push for need-blind. The senior administrative team worked out all of the operational details, and the trustees were brought together to make

the final decision. In November of 2007, the trustees voted that Andover would indeed adopt a need-blind policy for the 2008-2009 school year and beyond. At the time of its announcement, Andover was officially the only secondary boarding school in the nation to hold the distinction of being need-blind.

**Need-blind admissions: Part two.** What did adopting a need-blind admission policy really mean for Andover? What changed in the actual admissions process was that financial aid students were no longer “pulled” from the financial aid pool when money ran out. Prior to the decision, 20 to 25 students were removed from the pool of admissible applicants for each class based on their financial need, and were replaced with students who could pay full tuition. With the advent of need-blind, students were no longer pulled based on their ability to pay, and the financial aid budget was increased by approximately \$500,000. Applications of both financial aid applicants and regular applicants were read and decided in the same way as the other. Once financial aid students had been placed in the admit pool, their financial aid awards were created based on their estimated family contribution. And in keeping with the 2007 no-loan policy, financial aid students would only receive grants from Phillips Academy in their financial aid packages.

While the process of adopting the policy was a bit harried, the reception was overwhelmingly positive among both internal and external constituencies. According to the Head of School, “It was the thing to do because it was welcome—to say it was welcomed enthusiastically on campus, and in our alumni constituency, is an understatement. People were really, really thrilled with this” (interview, August 31, 2011). Many other administrators validate her perception. According to all interviewed,

staff, students and alumni cheered the decision, and faculty gave the announcement at a faculty meeting a standing ovation. Need-blind was not just the adoption of a particular policy or practice, but also an important symbol of the institution's priorities.

The Secretary of the Academy said, "In terms of serving moral imperative, and doing something really, really special with your financial wherewithal, need-blind represented a rally for this institution" (interview, September 21, 2011). Need-blind brought a new energy and enthusiasm to campus, some of which was tempered in the fall of 2008 when the bottom fell out of the financial market. Within a matter of months, the institution lost nearly \$100 million from its approximately \$800 million endowment. The market crash presented the institution with a financial crisis, and Andover's administrators were forced to make some tough decisions. Among them was the question of whether Andover needed to rescind its need-blind commitment, or if other sacrifices could make up the difference. In the end, other measures were taken so that the need-blind policy could be preserved. According to the Chief Financial Officer,

When the economic downturn happened, I think everyone was kind of queasy about whether we could maintain it [need-blind], but that was the first thing that we decided: That we would cut the capital projects budget and reduce that (which is what most places did) because we knew that the people that were here were probably going to need more financial aid, and some of the people who didn't need financial aid before were going to need financial aid too, so we really ramped up our financial aid. That was an area of the budget that actually increased during that time. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

The institutional priorities that had been set out in the 2004 Strategic Plan acted as guideposts for how Andover should handle the downturn. When asked how Andover survived the crash, the Head of School replied, “By keeping our sights on the things that we really just had to keep our sights on” (interview, August 31, 2011). Individual departments were asked to scale back their spending, and a Voluntary Retirement Program was offered, but the academic program went unharmed. Interestingly, one programmatic wound came in the form of the Summer Opportunities program, which was suspended because financial aid could no longer be offered for the program. Rather than face students being prohibited from participating due to their inability to afford it, the entire Summer Opportunities program was suspended until the summer of 2011.

**Andover today.** By 2010, forty-five percent of the student body was on financial aid, with twelve percent receiving full scholarships. Today, financial aid goes much further than it did in 1960: In addition to tuition, room and board, for students who are “full-fulls,” (full scholarship plus full expenses), financial aid packages cover all travel costs to and from school, laptops, athletic equipment and clothing, summer opportunity funding, and stipends for spending money during the school year. Financial aid also goes to a more diverse group of students today than it did in 1960: 44% of the students on financial aid are white, 24% are students of color, 18% are Asian or Asian American, and the rest are unidentified (Phillips Academy, 2008). Since 2003, the percentage of students on full aid has risen from 8% to 14%. As Andover has become more diverse socioeconomically, admission has also become much more difficult. In the 2010-2011

school year, Andover achieved its lowest admit and yield rates ever: 12% percent and 78% percent, respectively.

And yet Andover is facing some of its most daunting challenges yet. As the Dean of Community and Multicultural Development put it, everyone is “Recognizing more and more it’s not just getting in, it’s staying in, and *how* do you stay” (interview, September 28, 2011). The Dean of Admission explicated, saying:

I think the biggest problem for Andover is that as we went from a 45% admit rate to a 14% admit rate, from an 80% average SSAT total to a 94% mean SSAT total, it became harder for low-income students to survive at Andover. They can get in, they have the numbers, but they don’t fare well. And that’s why we’re doing the work that we’re doing. (Interview, September 14, 2011).

**Making success accessible.** The “work” that Andover is doing is the “Access to Success” initiative, which was announced in 2009. Access to Success is a bundle of programs designed to close the preparation gap visible in students entering from different backgrounds. While the preparation gap had been present over the last several decades, need-blind seemed to further emphasize the problem as senior administrators realized that financial aid was not enough to ensure the success of “youth from every quarter.” Many knew that socioeconomic status was the most accurate predictor of *access* to America’s elite schools, but that socioeconomic status might also predict the *success* of students at these schools was just becoming evident. Students from low-income and underrepresented backgrounds tended to perform at a lower level than their higher-income white and Asian peers, regardless of their prior GPAs and standardized test

scores.

Today, the entire Andover senior administration sees overcoming the preparation and achievement gaps as major priorities for the school. In each interview, when asked what that person would like to see from Andover in the future, every single administrator mentioned the preparation gap and the Access to Success initiative. The Head of School said, “We don’t want to limit ourselves to kids who are well-prepared, because [K-12] education is so uneven now. We have to be prepared to take bright kids that are not so well-prepared to do our program” (interview, August 31, 2011). However, because of the negative connotations associated with tracking and remedial programs in American education today, administrators are hesitant to provide services that can be seen as isolating or exclusive to low-income and underrepresented students. The Associate Head of School said,

As a school, I think that we will need to figure out how to provide each of our students with what he or she needs without stigmatizing them somehow...We’re figuring out that we’re really bringing 350 new kids every year here from many dozens of places, and dozens of experiences, and talent, and skill levels, and skill sets, and so it would make sense that we can’t take a cookie cutter approach.

(Interview, August 26, 2011).

One important step the Academy took recently was resurrecting its summer transition program for low-income youth for the first time in several decades. Beyond merely a summer component, the students also jointly enrolled in introductory biology—a notoriously difficult class at Phillips Academy. The Summer Transition Program was

tested as a pilot in the summer of 2011, but is expected to become a regular part of the institutional offerings.

While Andover administrators have been hesitant to separate heavy or full financial aid students from full-paying students, a few years ago several full aid students got together and started a group called “Outliers,” named after Malcolm Gladwell’s popular book. While the Dean of Community and Multicultural Affairs checks in on the group, it is almost completely student-initiated, and students self-select into the group. The “Outliers” group attracts both full scholarship and heavy aid students, and offers them an opportunity to come together in relative anonymity and share experiences. Speaking about the group, the Dean of Community and Multicultural Affairs said,

We’ve created a comfortable environment where they can say ‘I don’t know.’

That’s what Outliers does more than anything. Because you can’t act like you don’t know in the greater population, and kids cover a whole lot. They go not knowing and not learning because they’re so overloaded with what they’re trying to pick up on in this culture, that they don’t have the time to go look it up.

(Interview, September 28, 2011).

It is thought that a group like this is unique to Andover, although other boarding schools have expressed interest in creating something similar.

Each fall, Andover admissions officers fan out across the country looking for students. According to the Dean of Admission, over the past twenty years the institution has sought to “Broaden the reach and extend the socioeconomic representation so that we have wealthy, upper middle, middle, and lower class students applying” (interview,

September 14, 2011). They do this by visiting a wide variety of schools, both those that have traditionally sent students to Andover, and those that have never heard of Andover.

Says the Dean of Admission,

And so wherever we go when we travel during the day and visit schools—we can be in East L.A. in the morning and Beverly Hills in the afternoon—the idea is that every evening you have a reception that the kids and the families who had already inquired about the school get invited to, but also the students you meet during the day also get invited to. (Interview, September 14, 2011).

As a result, today Andover relies less than ever on talent identification programs to attract low-income and underrepresented students, primarily because many of the programs are based in New York and other metropolitan areas. Andover no longer has to work to attract students from these areas, but instead turns to new markets where students have never heard of the school.

The aforementioned preparation gap has forced the school to reevaluate its traditional approaches to teaching and learning. A small group of students each year pushes the curriculum higher and higher academically, and Phillips Academy is often quick to respond to these needs by providing higher level courses, even if for just a few students. Traditionally, Andover's curriculum has striven for intellectual excellence, and does not want to limit any student's capabilities by limiting the upper-reaches of the curriculum. However, even at Phillips Academy there are finite resources, and some wonder if the school would benefit from adding more classes at the lowest academic level—taking into consideration that even the lowest level classes at Phillips Academy

are quite challenging by most measures. One administrator said:

We've got to help kids demystify what we're doing; we've got to be an open book. We can't assume that they automatically know what goes on in a school like Phillips. And if we do that, then we can bring this whole wave of really great kids to a different learning preparation. We can bring them in here and they can enjoy it and take part in it...It's not just that we need to get the resources to do it and have the right policies, we've also got to have a commitment among the adults in the community to change the way they perceive educating and teaching. (Interview, September 28, 2011).

The question then becomes: How much should Andover change to accommodate the preparation gap? Because the problem isn't just one of academic preparation—but one of socialization, academic support, and, ultimately, even success.

While there is certainly a learning curve for all students, students from privileged backgrounds tend to hit the ground running at Andover, able to take advantage of all that the school has to offer because it isn't radically different from their previous schooling and extracurricular activities. Students from less privileged backgrounds have a more difficult road to traverse, as they must deal with a new campus, new academic standards, new social norms, and a new level of independence—all while being away from home for the first time. As such, these students often require more advising, mentoring, and support overall. And while the school wants to provide as much opportunity as possible, it also doesn't want to do a disservice to the students who do come by not offering enough support—an age old dilemma in education. The Dean of Admission worries

about this constantly:

How do we admit the class that's best suited for the school, as the school is learning more and more about how to support these kids? How many kids can you support *well*, when the pace here is unbelievable? It's not like we can go slowly and bring them all on board. The train is one thing: it's going, and everybody else can jump on board, but you've got to jump on and you can only jump on, and you can only have so many kids that you're running alongside the train throwing on.

That's a little bit where we're at right now. (Interview, September 14, 2011).

However, the Director acknowledged that it's a complicated issue because of the wide range of students, and later added:

We need to not be so worried about what happens to them. Because the kids who are on the upper end of the economic spectrum are super strong academically, and they are just pushing the curriculum all over the place, which makes these other kids look like they're not bringing much to the table in the classroom. But they are, and they bring an unbelievable amount to the community. (Interview, September 14, 2011).

What does "success" mean at Andover? The very definition is under debate today. Does it mean academic excellence? Does it mean campus involvement? Does it mean getting into a good college? Does it mean doing well at a good college? Getting a good job? Having a family and being an upstanding citizen who contributes to their community? For perhaps the first time in over two hundred years, faculty, staff, and administrators are unpacking how they define and perceive success, and what definition

they would like to use moving forward. Thus it is an exciting, exhausting, and bewildering time to be a community member at Andover.

**Analyzing access.** The term “access” is also under debate. What does it really mean to provide access at Andover? There is both the immediate access to the institution that is provided through admission and financial aid; but there are also all of the programs and resources on campus that can be used to effect change outside of the 500 acres that make up Andover Hill. While the institution has had a long history of outreach, today this concept is being crystalized and leveraged in new and creative ways. Words and phrases such as “outreach,” “innovation,” and “scaling up,” were popular in the year I spent on campus, and it has recently been announced that a Director of Outreach will be appointed by the incoming Head of School. The rationale for conducting outreach is very similar to that of providing access: Since Andover has the resources, capacity, and best practices, it should share these with as much of the educational community as possible. The Head of School says,

We need to learn how to scale up from how we do it. I think that’s a real question, and that’s going to be where we can get to a point where the institution can put more resources into outreach. I think we’ll be able to elaborate what we have here to make a bigger difference. (Interview, August 31, 2011).

The Chair of the Board of Trustees echoed this:

I think access should also be looked at from one other dimension, and that is that we have tremendous resources in terms of talent, and educational philosophy, approach, policy, whatever you want to call it, and these somehow should be

accessible to education at large, beyond the 1,100 kids that actually come to the campus. For example (MS)<sup>2</sup> [one of several outreach programs] has existed for 30-something years, and we need to scale that up somehow—perhaps by interesting other institutions in doing a program like this, and then teaching them how, giving them the manual on how to do it, what the curriculum and the teaching methods should be, the whole philosophy. If we find people that are interested, maybe bring them to campus and run them through the whole program, for example. *That* in a way is access to what we have, which is the know-how, the methodology, and the skills to have an impact on education more broadly.

(Interview, December 19, 2011).

Similarly, speaking of the conferences and educational symposia Andover has hosted in recent years, the Dean of Faculty says, “This kind of access begets more access, and enables other people to feel it’s possible to increase the circles in a concentric manner” (interview, August 26, 2011). Because of Andover’s great resources and capacity, there is always a sense that Andover could and should be doing more. Many of these same issues were raised in the 1960s, when Andover was considering how to have the broadest impact possible on American education.

However, then as now, outreach and access are occasionally competing priorities. How many can be served, and served well? What’s the best use of resources? And how can the school affect the most change? These are questions that senior administrators at Andover grapple with today. One senior administrator speculated:

It’s pretty hard to be relevant when you have such a rarefied group of people. And

that's an issue. That's a challenge with need-blind. Because do you say, 'Well, let's move away from need-blind and take \$1 million or \$2 million, and let's put it into being more of a player in the education conversations that go on in the United States'? Do we get involved in charter schools?...Because need-blind is a nice thing for the people who get it, which are the 1,100 people here. But it keeps you pretty restricted to those 1,100 people because it's a very big strain on your resources. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

Andover grappled with this same issue throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century: during the early 1900s, when the Trustees were deciding whether it was better to provide full scholarships to a few, or less generous scholarships to many; and during the 1960s, when the Steering Committee was trying to figure out what the right balance in the student body should be. Indeed, many of the issues that the Steering Committee grappled with in the mid-1960s are the same that Andover faces today, showing that these systemic inequalities that persist in America are not easily remedied.

**Access as an institutional value.** Based on interviews with the senior administration, access is just as important to Andover as ever. Every one of the senior administrators interviewed spoke passionately about the need to provide access and opportunity to as many students as possible. Nevertheless, their respective reasons for this commitment to access varied considerably: One administrator thought that given the state of national affairs today, it is necessary to have a diverse intellectual elite representing and leading America. Another viewed access as an investment in the future: "I believe Andover is investing in the infrastructure of the population" (interview,

September 14, 2011). The Dean of Faculty also spoke of the future:

And with need-blind – if anything, *anything* is a winner—it is this optimism. Fundamental to education is optimism, being optimistic, hopeful. And once you say ‘need-blind,’ you are saying ‘We are 100% optimistic in the future of education, and the future of these young people.’ *That’s* why we’re going need-blind, and I think our work with the preparation gap also falls along that same continuum of being optimistic. (Interview, August 26, 2011).

The prospect of social mobility was also important to several senior administrators. The Dean of Admission said:

We have a saying in the admission office that is, ‘We admit the students who have the most to offer, and who have the most to gain by being here,’ because everyone gets a scholarship. Everyone right off the top gets a \$30,000 scholarship, even if you’re wealthy. So you’re giving a place where every kid is basically going to be invested in \$70,000 by the school. Some of them are going to pay \$40,000 and change; others are going to be on a sliding scale considering their family income. And we’re going to be in the deciding chair, the sorting hat, the Harry Potter sorting hat, of who gets to come. Well what’s the upside? For me there is a sense that a school like this, which has these kinds of resources, should be investing in students who will go the farthest as a result, who get the most and progress the farthest, as a result of the 24/7 experience. (Interview, September 14, 2011).

The Dean went on to say that she believed that an Andover education could move some students up one or more socioeconomic classes,

Just by virtue of the education. It's like we are able to accelerate the progress more than one generation...And it may be that that kid, because he's going to go to college, he's going to have to take huge loans, he might not get to be a doctor...but he can be an engineer, and if he plays his cards right today in the United States as an engineer he can end up hugely successful. But we *know* that he's going to end up being able to take care of himself, his family, his parents, and to some extent his siblings. (Interview, September 14, 2011).

In an era when social mobility is decreasing in America, Andover's potential to change students' lives is seen as paramount.

### **Conclusion**

In this chapter I have provided an overview of the history of access at Phillips Academy. Archival research, document review and interviews with senior administrators and other school leaders revealed that Andover has a long and storied history of access. Access was present at the founding of the institution, with the inclusion of the phrase 'youth from every quarter' in the Academy's Constitution. The founding was also significant in that it took place at the end of the Revolutionary War, and as such was infused with the spirit of democracy that pervaded the young country at that time. Phillips Academy's close relationship with Harvard College at its founding was also important, as it created a unique organizational field for Andover: one populated both by private secondary schools and elite colleges and universities. This relationship would gain steadily in importance over the next 150 years, and dictate how Phillips Academy made sense of changes in its environment in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

After the age of secondary school-building between 1880 and 1910, when myriad boarding schools sprung up across New England, Andover began to emphasize its democratic nature and commitment to access. Its commitment to serving “youth from every quarter” allowed it to stand out from many other schools. While the 1940s and 50s were in some ways a “golden age” for boarding schools, these same years strained the relationship between Andover and elite colleges and universities. Andover invested in programs that brought talented youth to campus from previously unrepresented parts of the country and sectors of society, and grappled with how best to serve them during their time at Andover as well as beyond. The 1960s and 1970s brought increased competition with Phillips Exeter and a few other elite boarding schools, as competition for Ivy admission became fiercer. But it also brought a new layer of complexity to the issue of access, as the variable of race began to subsume that of socioeconomic status. By the end of the twenty-first century Andover was maintaining its reputation as one of the best boarding schools in the country, but was in need of a reinvestment in the physical campus and a re-imagining of the student experience. The late 1990s and early 2000s were devoted to shoring up the foundation of the school, and by 2005 the institution was in an excellent position academically and financially. In November of 2007, Andover declared itself need-blind, becoming one of the only secondary schools in the United States to hold such a policy. However, Andover is far from content with its work in promoting access and equity, and community members continue to discuss and debate the best ways to serve low-income students—and will probably do so far into the future.

## **Chapter Five: Institutional Pressures & Influences**

Beyond Andover's organizational saga of access, it is also important to understand the institutional pressures and influences that Andover faced during its development, and how these pressures might have influenced the decision to adopt need-blind in 2007. In this section, I use institutional theory to better understand why Andover may have adopted certain policies and practices around access. As stated in Chapter One, institutional theory "considers the processes by which structures, including schemas, rules, norms, and routines, become established as authoritative guidelines for social behavior" (Scott, 2004, p. 2). In this chapter, I will examine institutional pressures—both internal and external—on Andover that may have contributed to how access was conceptualized at Andover. The chapter will include an examination of Andover's changing environment, and how Andover chose to respond to those changes.

### **Institutional Pressures**

In order to understand the institutional pressures exhibited over Andover, we must first define its organizational field. According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), an organizational field is comprised of "those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life," including "key suppliers" and "resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products" (p. 148). The following sections will explore some of these areas in greater detail.

**Students.** At the simplest level, Andover has several “key suppliers,” one of the most important of which is the families that send their students to Andover. Historically, Andover has not had a problem with demand for its services. In the early years, Andover’s students were largely drawn from the local township and surrounding towns. While a small percentage of all school-age children were actually enrolled in school at this time, it was not uncommon for the sons of professionals to be sent to academies for their education, and Andover nearly always had an adequate pool of students to draw from. Throughout the 1800s, the number of students coming from around the country—as well as internationally—increased. The rise of public schools in the late 1800s increased the percentage of all school-age children attending school; however, rather than presenting a threat to Andover, the rise of the public schools more clearly delineated class structures, and increased Andover’s attractiveness to wealthy parents, who wished to protect their sons from increasingly dangerous urban areas. Between 1890 and 1910, many elite boarding schools were founded, and Andover’s community of peers coalesced. Within this pool Andover was known for being less socially exclusive than some of the other boarding schools, and by the early 1900s Andover had become somewhat selective; a selectivity which only grew throughout the twentieth century. While in the first half of the century Andover wasn’t terribly selective, in the second half the demand for a private boarding school education grew exponentially, and by 2010, Andover’s acceptance rate had fallen to 13%—a low percentage by any standard, and on par with the nation’s most competitive colleges and universities.

While the number and quality of applicants are more than sufficient today, other important factors do complicate admissions. Factors such as various levels of students' ability to pay, the desire for geographic diversity, and the presence of competing private day schools in urban and suburban areas across the United States place pressure on the Andover admissions office. Because Andover relies at least partially on tuition for its operating expenses, it will probably always be necessary for the institution to enroll at least some full-paying students. Traditionally, Andover has been able to draw a majority of its students from the upper classes, while still being able to accommodate a number of low-income students, with fairly little recruitment effort on its part. However, with changing economic times, and the rise of competition in the form of excellent public and private day schools, Andover has to work hard to make the institution known in more communities around the United States and world. According to one senior administrator,

Right now less than 2% of the population in the U.S. can afford to pay full tuition at a boarding school. And some schools' philosophies are that they're just going to go really hard after that 2%. They're going to try to get as many of those 2% as we can. I think that if you want quality, not all of that 2% is going to be high quality. You've got to look at *how* do you expand the pool—because who's going to apply to your school in the future? (Interview, August 21, 2011).

Instead of using a “barbell approach,” and recruiting students from just the highest and lowest income classes, Andover seeks to have a spectrum of income levels on campus. In this way the school can draw tuition revenue from middle class and upper class students, while still supplying financial aid to those in the lower middle and lower classes.

Geographic diversity is important for several reasons: it increases the pool of potential applicants, it is an indicator of institutional prestige, and it aligns with Andover's institutional identity as a "national public school." Like elite colleges and universities, Andover strives to enroll students from nearly every state and many different nations. With the rise of independent day schools in the last forty years, many high-performing American students now have excellent educational options in their own backyard. This desire for diversity places additional pressure on Andover to find students in previously unreached areas and new territories.

**Money.** Another "key supply" for Andover is money. Quite simply, the institution relies on money to operate. For the past several decades Andover has relied on a balance of tuition, endowment interest, and alumni fundraising to supply its operating budget. Tuition and the rate of its increases were established in the early 1800s when Andover aligned its tuition rates with Harvard, Yale, and other elite universities. Throughout its history, Andover's tuition has kept pace with that of Harvard and Yale.

However, one serious complication arose in the 1950s and 1960s when colleges and universities experienced an influx of federal funding. Suddenly, colleges and universities were able to depend less on their students for tuition revenue. As a private secondary institution, Andover did not receive any federal funds, and only had its students, endowment returns, and alumni to look to, all while the school's operating costs and tuition prices kept pace with colleges and universities. As a result, Andover had to rely more and more on full-paying students, which presumably led to the rolling back of the 1957 need-blind policy decision a few years later. Alumni became all that much more

important to the institution, as well as a few large foundations—such as the Ford, Donner, and Independence Foundations—that supported their work, particularly around access.

Today, the current economic climate makes endowment returns unpredictable. While returns have been strong in recent years (averaging around 20%, the same as many elite universities), there is always the possibility of another market crash. Tuition increases are not perceived to be a large source of revenue, because with each increase in tuition the financial aid budget increases proportionately, and the need-blind policy further reduces potential tuition revenue.

Therefore, the burden going forward is on alumni giving. According to one senior administrator, “If we maintain this [need-blind], we’ll have to be maintaining it through some serious philanthropy, and maybe some more creative programs on the current use side” (interview, August 26, 2011). While alumni support is more important than ever to the school, currying favor with alumni further complicates the admission process. As with elite colleges and universities, children of Andover alumni have long enjoyed a boost in the admissions process, but these legacy admissions conflict with the meritocratic ideals promoted by Andover. One administrator commented:

There’s a balance because you want to be able to take alumni children if they’re qualified. You don’t want people to think, ‘Well, my child is never going to be able to get in, so I’ll send them to the local day school.’ Then they stop supporting us. (Interview, August 21, 2011).

As a result, the role of alumni in supporting need-blind presents a contradiction: on one hand it requires their financial support, and on the other it decreases the likelihood of their own children being admitted.

**Andover's consumers.** The “consumers” of Andover’s products are colleges and universities, often the most competitive in the United States. Andover’s relationship with colleges and universities is a long and complicated one. The development of Andover closely mirrored that of many New England colleges and universities from its founding until the end of the 1800s. Early on, Andover was closely connected with the colonial colleges, and especially Harvard College. Both Samuel Phillips and Eliphalet Pearson attended Harvard, and drew tutors and trustees from the nearby college for their new academy. Andover’s function and form were not entirely different from colleges in the early years as well: both drew students from a wide range of ages, educated students to be leaders in American life, and suffered growing pains along with the young republic. By the time of Andover’s founding, Harvard had already survived for almost 150 years, making it worthy of emulation. By adopting some of Harvard’s practices, such as incorporation, Andover was increasing its odds of surviving at a time when educational institutions often failed within the first several years of their existence (Rudolph, 1990).

While Andover started out closely tied to Harvard College, with the religious split in the early 1800s, Yale College became the focus of Andover’s attention. Andover’s curriculum in the 1800s—slow to change as it was—reflected the Yale Report of 1828, which promoted a classical curriculum. As the century progressed, and more elite colleges became established, Andover graduates fanned out beyond Yale to other

colleges and universities. In the early 1900s, there was somewhat of a balance of power between Andover and elite colleges and universities: each perceived the other as an equal, or at least necessary for the successful functioning of the other. Andover relied on elite colleges to accept its students, while elite colleges relied on Andover to provide carefully selected and prepared graduates for their ivy-covered halls. Karabel (1984) explains the dependency of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton on elite boarding schools:

...Elite colleges—like other organizations—are likely to be most responsive to the claims of those external groups that control needed resources. Such a "resource dependency" perspective suggest that Harvard, Yale, and Princeton—to the extent that they are dependent on a steady flow of “paying customers” and on private donations—will be ill-situated to spurn the claims of such traditional “constituencies” as the elite private boarding schools and the alumni. To the extent, however, that they can diversify their sources of support, their autonomy vis-a-vis such groups will be increased and they will thereby be freer to pursue their own distinct organizational interests. (p. 5)

Indeed, with the influx of federal support in the 1950s, elite universities were “freer to pursue their own distinct organizational interests,” and did just that. Because of the close relationship enjoyed by elite boarding schools and elite universities in the first half of the twentieth century, when the elite colleges and universities began to pull larger percentages of their admitted classes of students from public high schools in the 1950s and 1960s, “few alternative partners” (Williamson, 1975, p. 40) remained for Andover. After the previous hundred plus years of close relations, students and alumni alike had

come to expect that Andover students would be accepted into Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. These universities, as well as other elite colleges and universities, had for years legitimated Andover by accepting vast numbers of its graduates. Andover had a national reputation of its own, but a large part of this reputation was tied to the fact that Andover students were accepted into elite colleges and universities at rates much higher than any other school in the nation. When the elite colleges and universities began to pull back from Andover, Andover's environment became unstable, and it sought ways to retain equilibrium.

One way Andover stabilized its environment was by emphasizing the “national, public” nature of the school in speeches and publications throughout the 1950s and 1960s. Andover made the case that it was not just for the precious few who could afford it, but rather was a school for the most talented students in America, regardless of their ability to pay. In this way Andover was protecting itself from claims that it was elitist and exclusionary, as well as expanding the market for the school well beyond the traditional bastions of old money in the United States.

While in some ways Andover's recruitment and admissions policies in the 1950s and 1960s demonstrate mimetic isomorphism with elite colleges and universities—by adopting standardized testing in admissions, developing talent identification programs, and formalizing the financial aid process—in other ways it preempted what colleges and universities did. For example, Andover adopted need-blind in 1957, several years before most other Ivy League colleges did so. This preemptive move implies that the issue is more complicated than Andover just mimicking what elite colleges and universities were

doing, as at times Andover led elite colleges and universities in setting trends in elite education. An earlier example of this lies in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, when the first African-American graduate of Andover subsequently became the first African-American to enroll at Harvard University, an important moment in the history of elite higher education in America.

**Regulatory agencies.** Institutional environments often constrain organizations, with laws and legal mandates prohibiting what institutions can and cannot do (Aldrich, 1976). Andover has managed to avoid many of the legal constraints that colleges and universities face by not accepting any federal aid for its core educational program. This decision is not an easy one for the school, as certain ancillary programs and facilities, such as the Addison Gallery for American Art, would benefit from federal support. The United States Supreme Court cases *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger*, which prohibited the use of preferential treatment for underrepresented minorities in education, sparked considerable change in higher education, as institutions disbanded many programs that practiced affirmative action. Shortly afterwards, Andover had the opportunity to receive some federal funding if it would promise not to practice overt affirmative action in one of its outreach programs, which the school refused to do. The Dean of Faculty stated, “If we start accepting federal government money then it would change everything. Now nothing wrong with that per se, but if you say that you are trying to correct a wrong, external factors should not make you change” (interview, August 26, 2011). Andover is unique among many educational institutions in that it is not affected considerably by changes in the political and legal environment. And yet, this makes the

institution all the more dependent on its other sources of revenue: its endowment, donations from alumni, and students who can pay full tuition.

**Independent day schools and public high schools.** Other organizations that produce similar services or products include other elite boarding schools, independent private day schools, and high-performing public high schools. Since the 1970s, independent and private day schools have grown exponentially in America. Today, Andover competes with top private schools in New York City, Los Angeles, and other urban areas. With excellent educational options nearby, parents are less apt to send their children to boarding school. As such, this has forced the school to ramp up its recruitment efforts in traditional markets but more importantly, to expand far beyond those traditional markets. The discussion of the role of competitor institutions influencing Andover is continued later in this chapter.

### **Institutional Influences**

**Faculty, staff, alumni and administrators.** Founders, heads of school, faculty, administrators and alumni have all contributed to Andover's history of access. One of the many interesting aspects about Andover's history of access is how consistently the message of access has been carried across the centuries. In 1778, Eliphalet Pearson advocated for low-income students to be admitted. In the early twenty-first century, Principal Bancroft rallied for "poor boys." In recent decades, Andover has benefitted from heads of school and trustees that have stood up for access. The Dean of Faculty said,

I think we've been fortunate in having three successive heads of schools that have held this notion of need-blind... To have these three who hold the same worldview when it comes to why schools like this should exist at all was very, very helpful. Because you're covering a span of many years... they shaped not just the culture but also the customs of Andover. (Interview, August 26, 2011).

Faculty have also embraced and promoted access. When asked about the role that faculty play in access at the institution, the Head of School replied,

You know, I think that people don't end up here by accident. I didn't end up here by accident, and I don't think faculty end up here by accident. They know what the place is like. We're nothing if not transparent about who we are and what we believe in. I do think that people end up here because these are the values that they believe in. (Interview, August 31, 2011).

Because the institutional culture is so strong and transparent, potential faculty members can see quickly if they will fit in. Faculty members are both selected to join the community, and self-select into the community, and then embrace and carry on the institutional culture of access. Andover has a fairly low rate of faculty turnover, such that many faculty stay for several decades. Because of the powerful role that faculty play in the institution, their support is integral to the success of institutional priorities and initiatives such as need-blind. "This whole access thing has so many different layers to it that the way to protect it is by making sure the faculty, the students, and the staff, all buy in," said the Dean of Faculty (interview, August 26, 2011).

One administrator commented in an interview that access often begets access at Andover, and that is certainly true for alumni. Some alumni and trustees who were supported financially when they were students at Andover feel particularly obligated to support access later in their lives. In an interview, one senior administrator commented,

Some of it depends on whether they were on scholarship or not as students. A lot of the trustees were on scholarship or on financial aid...and I think they support it because they were supported. If you were going to a school where most of the trustees were wealthy, and came from wealth, then, as trustees, there's going to be less of this feeling that that *needs* to be part of what you do. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

The Chair of the Board of Trustees also echoed this, by telling the story of how his first wife came to be a full scholarship student at Abbott Academy, Phillip's Academy sister school. Her experience, coupled with his own, has made him a devoted contributor to access initiatives on campus (interview, December 19, 2011). Several other current trustees were also scholarship students when they were enrolled at Andover, and today are ardent supporters of need-blind.

**Elite colleges and universities.** Andover occupies a unique position among public K-12 schools and postsecondary education. While the institution does not have a lot of external accountability in the way of federal or state oversight, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter Andover depends on a wide range of institutions for its students, faculty, staff, financial resources, and prestige and reputation. Some of the most important external influences include secondary institutions.

Over the years, institutional relationships between Andover and other schools, colleges, and universities have been forged in several different ways: by faculty, administrators, and trustees bringing their own secondary and postsecondary experiences to Andover; in admission policies at colleges and universities that affected Andover students, such as requiring certain courses for admission, entrance examinations, or accepting Advanced Placement; and where students matriculated after graduating from Andover. In various capacities, colleges and universities have served as peers, competitors, and role models, while Andover served as both a feeder of students and an incubator of educational ideas.

According to Galaskiewicz (1985), “One interorganizational strategy to enhance legitimacy is to have the organization identified with cultural symbols and/or legitimate power figures in the environment” (p. 296). This can also be explained as “co-optation,” in which representatives from external groups are brought into the advisory structure of an organization (Scott, 2004, p. 201). Andover gained legitimacy early on by having several college presidents sit on the Board of Trustees: In 1823, professors and presidents from Harvard, Yale, Union, and Dartmouth sat on the Board (Fuess, 1917), and one hundred years later both the President of Williams College (Board of Trustees, 1902c) and the President of Dartmouth University were on the Board (Board of Trustees, 1926). In an issue of the *Andover Bulletin* from 1927, the editor writes: “The recent election of President Ernest Martin Hopkins, of Dartmouth College, to the Board of Trustees of Phillips Academy will have the cordial approval of all Andover men. In the first place, it renews and strengthens the friendly tie between the two institutions. It will be

remembered that three of our ablest Principals,—Osgood Johnson, Samuel Harvey Taylor, and Cecil F.P. Bancroft—were Dartmouth graduates, and that one of our Founders, Dr. John Phillips, was also a generous benefactor of Dartmouth” (p. 1).

As the years went on, institutional affiliation became subtler. Some faculty left Andover to become administrators at colleges, such as Bill Bender, who taught American history at Andover in the 1930s, and later went on to become the Dean of Harvard College (Allis, p. 465), and Charles Dey, former teacher at Andover and subsequent dean at Dartmouth College, and also the Director of the ABC summer program (*Andover Bulletin*, 1965). More recently, the newest Head of School selected comes from a faculty position at Harvard.

Faculty members and administrators alike bring with them to Andover the rules, regulations, and ways of teaching and learning that they learned in their prior collegiate institutions. Historically, Andover’s faculty members have been drawn overwhelmingly from the ranks of the most elite colleges and universities in the country. Many of the early faculty members were drawn from the ranks of the graduating classes of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, while later in the 1800s larger shares came from Williams, Amherst, and other small New England colleges. While today the faculty represents a somewhat wider swath of higher education, the vast majority have been educated in highly selective colleges and universities. Because of Andover administrators’ and trustees’ familiarity with elite colleges and universities, these institutions were often used as benchmarks by which to measure progress. For example, in 1895 the Trustees determined that “the School paid as high as \$2000 [for faculty salaries’], which was about the average being

paid professors in the large universities during this period” (Allis, 1979, p. 245). And in the 1960s, Andover found that the average income of the family of a scholarship student at Andover (\$8,000) was the same as at Harvard (*Andover Bulletin*, 1965, p. 3), which served to legitimate their own tuition rate.

In the years leading up to the decision to adopt need-blind admission in 2007, Andover’s senior administration had been watching the growing list of colleges and universities that embraced need-blind over the previous decade. In the end, Andover made the calculated decision to offer a need-blind policy that was similar in nature to those at elite colleges, but different in some respects. One senior administrator explained,

There were colleges doing it but they were—for the most part—putting some sort of dollar amount on the money that a household could earn (e.g. \$60,000), starting with the colleges—Harvard and Princeton and various other places—and they were saying, ‘If your parents make \$60,000 or less per year, then you don’t pay for anything, you’re just going to be in for free.’ We looked at that, and there was this notion that we wanted to go farther. We wanted to jump higher, run faster, and so we ended up with, ‘We’re going to judge every kid on his or her merits.’ (Interview, August 26, 2011).

Instead of setting a limit to what people could earn in order to receive financial aid, Andover decided to award aid on a case by case basis, taking into account a myriad of factors in their decision. It should be noted that Phillips Exeter adopted the “limit” policy, which had been made popular by Harvard University. By choosing to adopt a need-blind policy rather than the “limit” policy, Andover was trying to distance itself from Phillips

Exeter as well as Harvard.

While the close relationship that Andover enjoyed with elite colleges and universities a century ago has changed, elite universities continue to be a large part of the Andover administration's community of thought. For example, when Andover decided to adopt need-blind admissions, the Dean of Admission at Andover consulted with the Director of Admission at Harvard University in order to learn how Harvard's policy had changed their admissions process (interview, September 14, 2011). The Andover Dean of Admission also makes sure to keep in touch with the directors of admission at several other colleges to know what challenges and best practices are being talked about in any given year.

While some administrators reach out to colleges and universities, just like faculty, others bring their prior experiences with them. In an interview the Secretary of the Academy said,

I have an advantage here in that I worked for Wellesley, and Wellesley was fully need-blind. At the time there were probably only six or seven institutions in America that were fully need-blind—I mean doing it right, no gapping. Just that, if you have the need, here it is. It was Wellesley, Princeton, Harvard, Stanford, and a few others, but not many. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

As the former head of development at Wellesley, the Secretary was able to bring the knowledge he'd gained from going through the process of becoming need-blind at Wellesley to his position at Andover, and thereby avoid making mistakes he'd seen earlier.

Other small liberal arts colleges also offer up important lessons for Andover. For example, the Dean of Community and Multicultural Development noted an important practice that she saw developing at Bates College, one where admissions counselors stay as the transition and house counselor for the class they admit, which can provide an important point of continuity for some students. The Dean speculated that Andover might consider a similar practice in a few years, and they were watching to see how successful it was at Bates (interview, September 28, 2011). The director of development for Andover also looks at small liberal arts colleges for comparison in the arena of development, saying,

Occasionally I look at Wellesley, Amherst, Williams and Wesleyan. And I might look at the Seven Colleges Plus group, which is the ‘Seven Sisters’ and Williams and Amherst. They’re very comparable. I mean we raise \$27-30 million a year, and if you look at most of those ten [colleges], half of them don’t. So data-wise we fit right in with them, even though our student body is 1,100, a couple of them are probably 1,200 or 1,400, but most are 2,000, and so their alumni bodies are a little bigger than we are. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

The Secretary also noted that a popular fundraising practice at Andover that supports need-blind came from Davidson College.

Hannan & Freeman (1984) write, “Nothing legitimates both individual organizations and forms more than longevity. Old organizations tend to develop dense webs of exchange, to affiliate with centers of power, and to acquire an aura of inevitability” (p. 158). The webs of exchange and affiliations with centers of power that

Andover developed with Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and countless other elite colleges and universities in the late 1700s and early 1800s allowed it to have a peer community unique among most secondary schools. Through the transference of staff, faculty, and students from institution to institution, these networks and affiliations have been sustained over time. This community then shaped and influenced the development of the school over the course of the next two centuries, allowing it to flourish well into the twenty-first century.

**Elite boarding schools.** Other elite boarding schools have been a source of strength and competition for Andover. Unlike Andover's relationship with elite colleges and universities, the relationship with other elite boarding schools did not develop until well into the latter half of the nineteenth century. One reason for this was that many elite boarding schools were not founded before 1890, and another was that there was little reason to correspond with these schools before the advent of formal athletic competitions, and more importantly, before the rise of the American public high school in the late 1800s.

It wasn't until the rise of the public schools that Andover began to seek and gain strength from its boarding and independent school peers. The increasing prevalence of public schools represented a threat to Andover, and as a result the institution began to engage in interorganizational relations (Galaskiewicz, 1985) with peer institutions. We see evidence of the increase of interorganizational relations in a several ways: an increase in the communication and cooperation of Andover and Exeter in the late 1800s, as well as the introduction of the Porter Sargent's "Handbook of the Best Private Schools" in 1916 (Executive Committee, 1916). Less than a decade after the first Handbook was released,

Andover sent funds to a private boarding school in Portland, Oregon to help support a court case that had risen all the way to the Supreme Court. While specifics of the case are unknown, the Headmaster told the Trustees that the private school under fire was defending not just its own existence, but “in a sense that of all private and endowed schools” (Board of Trustees, 1925). Another example of how Andover distanced itself from the public schools and aligned with the independent schools was by changing the title of the head from “Principal” to “Headmaster” in 1926 (Allis, p. 741).

Andover’s previous source of organizational strength had largely been elite colleges and universities. In the 1800s, colleges were seen as peers, and Andover shared influence with them. But in the 1900s, colleges became power manipulators over Andover, dictating the values and characteristics they wanted to see in students. As Harvard, Yale, and Princeton “democratized” their campuses in the 1950s by opening the doors to students from public schools and returning veterans at an unprecedented rate, Andover scrambled to get a foothold on the situation. It did so by dovetailing its recruitment programs more closely with the needs of elite institutions, and by working with other elite boarding schools. For example, the newsboy, forestry, and other talent search programs of the 1950s and 1960s were developed in conjunction with Phillips Exeter Academy, such that representatives from the two schools were in communication and could appeal to the same audiences, if not hopefully attract different boys. Another tactic was to introduce the SSAT in the 1950s, at the same time that the SAT was being adopted at elite colleges and universities, as a way to identify talent.

Andover has continued to increase its strength by formally aligning with other

institutions. In the early 1970s, at a time when many boarding schools were struggling, the heads of Choate Rosemary Hall, Deerfield, The Hotchkiss School, Lawrenceville, Andover, Exeter, and St. Paul's formed the Eight Schools Group. Northfield Mount Hermon was invited to join the following year. When asked why this group of schools in particular came together, one senior administrator from Andover said, "Part of it is geography, part of it is probably snootiness and tradition, and part of it is that it's the schools with whom you're competing for kids" (interview, September 21, 2011). The group requires the approval of every single member for a new school to join, which has not occurred since the addition of Northfield Mount Hermon. Originally formed to provide support to each other in troubled times, the group continues to meet today to share budget information, best practices and common problems, as well as offer professional development opportunities. While several other groups have sprung up since the 1970s, this group is particularly powerful for members. Former Head of Choate Rosemary Hall Ed Shanahan said, "We have been together for a long period of time and there's a great deal of trust and sharing" (Pasiliao, 2009). While the group has never wavered in its annual meetings, in recent years its importance has surged, as the group was incorporated in 2006, and elected a president for the first time in its history that same year. Accompanying the more formal structure was a litany of new efforts to bring the schools together, including a literary publication featuring student and faculty work, as well as various gatherings specifically devoted to particular academic departments or extracurricular activities.

The Eight Schools Group is just one example of the horizontal interdependence

many boarding schools are engaged in today, in which they compete with each other to obtain students, but do not have power over one another (Pennings, 1981). Another example is in the recruitment practices employed by many schools. Students are an important resource for all boarding schools: If students stop applying to and enrolling in boarding schools, then they will cease to exist. Furthermore, while Andover has a liberal financial aid policy, the school still needs students who can afford to pay full tuition. Other schools with less financial aid require even greater numbers of high-income students to apply. Since only a small percentage of the United States population can afford an Andover education, the pool of full-paying students that can afford these schools is certainly finite. In recent decades independent day schools have risen in popularity, further decreasing the pool of potential students.

Andover recruits students in several ways. In the most general way, it mails materials and brochures to students who express interest and sign up on the school's website. The school also spends considerable resources traveling to middle and high schools to recruit prospective students. Sometimes admission officers travel alone, but they also travel in groups with other schools. Being a part of a group of schools traveling to a distant part of the country, or even another part of the world, allows Andover to benefit from the collective attraction of the group. Students who may have never heard of Andover, but have heard of Groton, will then learn about both institutions.

Andover also relies on the strategic alliance (Scott, 2004) of a group of elite boarding schools to attract qualified students through The Gateway to Prep Schools website, essentially a common initial application. According to Scott (2004), "Alliances

involve agreements between two or more organizations to pursue joint objectives through a coordination of activities or sharing of knowledge or resources” (p. 203). Deerfield Academy, Groton School, the Hotchkiss School, Phillips Academy, and St. Paul’s School initially invested in the Gateway to streamline applications to their schools. Now a total of 21 schools are members of Gateway to Prep Schools. As with collective recruiting trips, Andover benefits from participating because it attracts a broader group of students than Andover might be able to reach on its own.

The other boarding schools offer strength in their combined resources and sharing of best practices, but also fierce competition. Faculty pay is one important gauge of institutional prestige, and throughout the nearly two hundred and forty years of the school’s history alternated between being a point of contention and one of pride. For example, in 1959, Head of School John H. Kemper set out to have the faculty pay higher than any other school, with a range of from \$4,000 to \$12,000 and with perquisites of \$1,000 to \$3,000 (Allis, p. 584). In 2004 the same goal was set in the Strategic Plan, and achieved by 2007.

Affordability is also an important point of pride and competition among the schools. Andover and Exeter compete to have the lowest tuition of their peer group, as the lower tuition aligns with their values around access. Having lower tuition became part of the organizational saga of the school decades ago. As mentioned in Chapter Four, the fact that Andover strove to be one of the more affordable boarding schools made a profound impression on the Chair of the Board of Trustees as a student, so much so that he mentioned it during a discussion of the possibility of raising tuition for the 2011-2012

school year at a board meeting (personal observation, October, 2010). As noted above, Exeter offers the lowest tuition among the Eight Schools Association, which is of particular importance to Andover. Says the Chief Financial Officer,

Our tuition is the second lowest among the ABOP's [Association of Business Officers of Private Schools] schools, and I think that's probably an area where we could go higher, but we haven't because Exeter is the lowest, and we wanted to keep ourselves relatively close. But, I think that's an area where we have some possibility to move to get more revenue. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

The desire to remain competitive in their reputation actually works against Andover operationally, as the institution loses out on the additional revenue a higher tuition would afford. But because low tuition has become part of the organizational saga of access, changing direction and raising tuition would be extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Phillips Exeter has played an integral role in the evolution of Phillips Academy. It is arguable that Andover without Exeter wouldn't be Andover at all. Exeter is not only Andover's chief athletic competitor, but also the benchmark against which almost everything at Andover is measured – applicants, yields, matriculations, faculty salaries, alumni giving rate, endowment performance, and college acceptances. Allis (1979) sums up the relationship in the conclusion of his history of Phillips Academy:

Yet none of this explains the importance of Exeter to Andover, which feels that if Exeter had not existed, it would have been necessary to invent it. The chances are that this feeling is reciprocated in New Hampshire. Exeter is important because it is a school of comparable endowment, comparable faculty, and comparable

leadership which will always serve as an institution for Andover to emulate. (p. 635).

But these two institutions share much more than just a friendly rivalry: they share a past. Their two histories are intertwined, and developments at one have affected the other. For instance, if their hadn't been a doctrinal dispute between Eliphalet Pearson and Harvard faculty in the early 1800s, the schism between Andover and Harvard might not have occurred, and Yale would not have become the feeder school of choice for Andover graduates while Harvard became that for Exeter graduates. This is just one example of how events at one institution affected the trajectory of the other.

Exeter's presence offers a unique level of competition for Andover. Imagine Harvard with another Harvard. While there are several other schools with which Harvard competes, it is nearly unrivaled in its resources and reputation. Harvard often sets the bar for every other school in the nation, and sometimes the world. By having an institution that is so similar that in some ways it is a mirror image of Andover, Exeter provides the ultimate in competition. While Andover and Exeter are similar in many characteristics, they are different in other important respects, which contributes to their long-term viability. They have different alumni and different feeder institutions. These two schools are just different enough to occupy the same niche without eliminating the need for the other.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter I have explored Andover's environment, as well as the ways in which it affected the development of the institution. I also reviewed some of the major

internal and external influences over Andover that impacted the school's commitment to access and the adoption of the need-blind policy in 2007. Andover has had many influences over the course of its history, including its own faculty, staff, administrators and alumni, as well as other boarding schools. The search for qualified students led the institution to expand its circle of recruitment first beyond Andover, then beyond New England, and finally to the whole world, along the full spectrum of socioeconomic levels. While the institution needs money, qualified students, talented teachers and staff, and supportive alumni, it has never truly suffered from a lack of any of these components. Therefore, the demand for resources has not really inhibited the development of the organization.

Perhaps most integral to the story of Andover's success was its relationship with and to elite colleges and universities. Andover gained legitimacy early on by its close relationship with Harvard and the colonial colleges, and maintained this legitimacy by having the majority of its students accepted into the most selective colleges in the United States. The relationships were further bolstered by Andover attracting faculty and staff from colleges and universities, who brought with them collegiate cultures and norms that then became ingrained in Andover. Andover's unique environmental field encouraged its development as an institution that looked and acted like a college or university throughout much of its history—with the clear exception of the ages of its students and the grades they were enrolled in. It is important to understand this context when considering the need-blind decision. In Chapter Six I will further discuss the relationship

between Andover's organizational saga and its environmental pressures and influences, and how these two forces acted and interacted to shape Andover's commitment to access.

## **Chapter Six: Discussion and Implications**

The purpose of this study is to examine the history of access at an elite boarding school through the frameworks of organizational saga and institutional theory to enhance our current understanding of how admission and financial aid policies and practices at elite institutions develop over time. Accordingly, the primary research questions for this study are: (a) What is the history of access for low-income students at Andover?; (b) What internal and external factors have influenced Andover's commitment to access over time?; and (c) Why did Andover adopt need-blind admission in 2007, and from what organizational contexts and pressures did this decision emerge? The first two questions were addressed in Chapters Four and Five, respectively. In the following pages I review the findings from these two chapters, and provide an answer to the third question, situated within the frameworks of organizational saga and institutional theory. I also explore the implications of this research for practice and theory, and conclude with a research agenda for future studies.

### **Summary of Findings**

In Chapter Four I provided an overview of the history of access at Phillips Academy. Archival research and document review revealed that Andover has a long and storied history in this regard. Access was present at the founding of the institution, with the inclusion of the phrase 'youth from every quarter' in the Academy's Constitution. The founding was also significant in that it took place at the end of the Revolutionary War, and as such was infused with the spirit of democracy that pervaded the young

country at that time. Phillips Academy's close relationship with Harvard College at its founding was also important, as it created a unique organizational field for Andover: one populated both by private secondary schools as well as elite colleges and universities. This relationship would gain steadily in importance over the next 150 years, and dictate how Phillips Academy made sense of changes in its environment in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Long before the modern era, however, other important events transpired at Andover. While at its founding the institution was closely tied with Harvard College, by the end of the first decade of the 1800s Andover had irrevocably split with Harvard due to important denominational differences. This split would lead Andover to become Yale's feeder school for the next century, and prohibit the institution from adapting more quickly to changes in curriculum standards at Harvard. During the 1800s, Andover had little interaction with the few other boarding schools and many private academies in New England. Rather, the institution turned its gaze toward higher education, as suggested by the trustees, instructors, and some policies and programs it shared with elite colleges and universities. This is evident in Andover's policies and practices concerning scholarship students, such as building "Commons" for scholarship students to reside in.

However, by the later third of the nineteenth century, Andover had become more aware of the other boarding schools that were already in existence, as well as the new additions. In preparing the list of the school's needs for the Centennial, it was noted that there were "at least six preparatory schools in New England with a finer equipment than Phillips Academy" (Fuess, 1917, p. 334). Andover slowly shifted from comparing itself to elite colleges and universities to comparing itself to other boarding schools, due in part

to the increasing number of such schools. As noted in Chapter Three, 1880 to 1910 was a golden age for boarding schools, with ten of Baltzell's (1958) "Select 16" prestigious boarding schools being founded during that period. At the same time, organized athletic competitions were growing in popularity among elite colleges and universities and boarding schools, who would often compete against each other. These formal athletic competitions increased the interorganizational relations between Andover and other boarding schools as well as between Andover and colleges and universities.

By the early 1900s, principals and headmasters of the New England boarding schools were engaging in discussion on a consistent basis, and relying on the group both as a source of support and of competition. During this time Andover began to strongly emphasize its democratic nature and commitment to access—the qualities that made the institution stand out from many of its peer schools. While boarding schools benefited from being part of the group, they also each sought to create their own niche, with their own preferred cities from which they drew students, and their own colleges to which they sent students. These schools also sought to differentiate themselves with regard to their respective missions. Andover's commitment to democratic principles, demonstrated by its generous scholarship policies, allowed the school to stand out from the rest of its boarding school peers—with the exception of Phillips Exeter, whose financial aid budget trumped even Andover's.

While Andover had been largely unaware of Phillips Exeter throughout the nineteenth century, with the emergence of a community of boarding schools came a strengthening of the relationship between the two schools. In 1918, minutes from a Board

of Trustees meeting note that Exeter hoped that its “sister school” (Andover) would raise its tuition as Exeter had done (Board of Trustees, 1918b). This is the only reference found in my research of one of these institution’s referring to the other as a “sister” school, although for the next several decades the two schools shared best practices and policies, and occasionally trustees and donors.

The 1940s and 1950s were in some ways another “golden age” for boarding schools, in particular for Phillips Academy. Ramifications from World War II placed greater emphasis on intellectual excellence and talent identification, and the national press seemed to fall in love with Andover, touting it as a place where opportunity was available to any able student worthy enough to deserve it. And yet, these same years strained the relationship between Andover and elite colleges and universities, as the latter backed off from “feeding” on Andover’s graduates and instead turned to new markets. As a result, competition between Andover and the other elite boarding schools grew, and Andover worked harder than ever before to distinguish itself. In 1957 the institution declared itself need-blind, making it the first among secondary schools, colleges, and universities to do so. While the policy would only last a few years, it was an enormously public demonstration of Andover’s commitment to access, and likely a catalyst for other schools that embraced the same policy shortly after.

The 1960s and 1970s brought increased competition with Phillips Exeter and a few other elite boarding schools, as competition for Ivy admission became fiercer. It also brought a new layer of complexity to the issue of access, as the variable of race began to subsume that of socioeconomic status. Talent identification efforts became more focused

on students of color from urban areas, and on campus the two became correlated, such that students of color were often assumed to be low-income. It would take the next several decades for race and socioeconomic status to be disentangled.

By the end of the twenty-first century Andover had maintained its reputation as one of the best boarding schools in the country, but found itself in need of a reinvestment in the physical campus and a re-imagining of the student experience. The late 1990s and early 2000s were devoted to shoring up the foundation of the school, and by 2005 the institution was in an excellent position academically and financially. By this time many colleges and universities were declaring need-blind or similar admission policies, and some boarding schools were beginning to make similar overtures. In November of 2007, Andover declared itself need-blind, becoming one of the only secondary schools in the United States to hold such a policy.

In Chapter Five, I examined the institutional pressures on Andover, including how the institution's basic need for students, money, and colleges and universities to accept its students impacted its development over the years. While Andover has seemingly never suffered a lack of students, it nevertheless experienced pressure over the years to identify and attract highly-qualified students from a wide range of geographic and economic backgrounds. In the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries it was enough for the institution to draw students from around the region and country, while in the 20<sup>th</sup> it became increasingly important to draw students from around the globe. While Andover relies in part on tuition to meet its operational expenses, its generous alumni and robust endowment make the institution less dependent on full-paying students than other institutions. However,

increasing social inequality in the United States is shrinking the pool of students that can afford an Andover education, and this trend does not appear to be reversing any time soon. As a result Andover has to think strategically about the types of students it will appeal to and be able to support in the future.

The same can be said for Andover's financial situation. With an endowment that rivals if not surpasses many colleges, and a broad base of alumni to draw support from, the institution has been able to fare well even in times of financial crisis. But like colleges and universities, operational expenditures continue to increase exponentially, and the institution must prepare for continuing economic instability in the markets. While both students and money are necessary for Andover to survive, the school has enjoyed a relative abundance of both in the course of its history.

Although it has had its ups and downs, Andover's relationship with colleges and universities has generally been strong. Andover was closely connected with the colonial colleges, and especially Harvard College, from a very early age, developing a relationship that would expand dramatically over the next hundred years. In the early 1900s, Andover and the Ivies were almost equal in their relationship with each other, as Andover relied on Harvard, Yale, and Princeton to accept its students (and legitimate its practices by doing so), while elite colleges relied on Andover to socially and academically prepare students for the elite college experience. This equilibrium was maintained until the 1950s, when elite colleges and universities were instead drawn to public high schools for their students, and relied less and less on Andover and other boarding schools. Since then, relatively large percentages of Andover graduates have

been admitted into elite colleges and universities, but nowhere near the levels reached before World War II.

## **Discussion**

**The role of the organizational saga.** The phrase “youth from every quarter” has been used continually throughout the 234 years of Andover’s existence, and as such has become imbued with profound importance for the school. The phrase connotes Andover’s deep and consistent commitment to serving students across the socioeconomic spectrum, and is embraced by community members as a symbol of what Andover stands for. The founding of the school holds a special symbolic purpose for many members of the institution, and has been drawn on as a source of strength and direction over the years.

All of these factors indicate that the story of access at Andover represents an excellent example of an organizational saga. As explained in Chapter One, Burton Clark (1970) defines an organizational saga as the following:

An organizational saga is a collective understanding of unique accomplishment in a formally established group. The group’s definition of the accomplishment, intrinsically historical but embellished through retelling and rewriting, links stages of organizational development...An organizational saga presents some rational explanation of how certain means led to certain ends. (p. 178).

The concept of an organizational saga fits well with the development of access at Andover because sagas are “rooted in history,” “claim unique accomplishment,” and are “held with sentiment by the group” (Clark, 1970). Access, and particularly the phrase “youth from every quarter,” is tied up with the very notion of Andover: it is part of its

historical tradition, ethos, and culture, and is intrinsically related to its core. Time and again throughout the two hundred plus years of the school access has been named as a key priority by school leaders, faculty, and alumni.

According to Clark (1970), there are at least two stages to an organizational saga: initiation and fulfillment. The initiation stage usually entails “a strong purpose, conceived and enunciated by a single man or a small cadre... whose first task is to find a setting that is open, or can be opened, to a special effort,” but can also occur in an “established organization that is not in crisis, not collapsing from long decline, yet ready for evolutionary change” (p. 180). Fulfillment occurs when the institution’s personnel, curricular and extracurricular program, external social base, and student subculture all embrace the saga. Based on the history presented in Chapter Four, I have updated the basic chronological timeline of the developmental history of access at Andover that I presented in Chapter One (see Table 7).

**Table 7. Chronological Timeline of Development of Organizational Saga**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Andover Event</b>	<b>Organizational Saga Stage</b>
<b>1778</b>	Phillips Academy is founded as an academy for local boys with a Constitution that calls for educating "youth from every quarter."	Initiation stage of the organizational saga begin when a “strong purpose” (Clark, 1970) is identified
<b>1880s</b>	Major structural and functional changes at Andover and Exeter as they adapt to new threat of public schools and differentiate themselves by focusing solely on college preparatory activities and increasing their residential facilities, becoming true "boarding schools" (McLachlan, 1970; Levine, 1980).	Initiation stage of the organizational saga concludes when the institution goes through “evolutionary change” (Clark, 1970)
<b>1890-1910</b>	The "Golden age" of elite boarding schools, as dozens are founded at this time, many rooted in strong Protestant values and supported by the nation's industrial successes (McLachlan, 1970)	
<b>1910</b>	One third of all Andover students are on financial aid at this time, and Andover is known at this time for being very	The beginning of fulfillment stage

	academic and admitting students based on scholastic achievement alone, rather than by other characteristics (Levine, 1980)	
<b>1957</b>	Need-blind policy is adopted for the first time	
<b>1960s</b>	Need-blind policy is abandoned	
<b>2004</b>	Andover's most recent Strategic Plan is released, and calls for a renewed emphasis on reaching "youth from every quarter" and sets the goal of achieving need-blind admission in the next few years	
<b>2007</b>	Need-blind policy is adopted for the second time	
<b>2010</b>	45% of students are on financial aid; 12% receive full scholarships (including all travel costs to and from school, laptops, athletic equipment and clothing, summer opportunity funding, etc.)	Fulfillment attained

Organizational sagas emphasize a unique accomplishment of the institution. For Andover, the unique accomplishment is a commitment to access present at the very founding of the institution—a commitment that has been maintained throughout its development. According to one senior administrator:

Some schools really were founded to basically be schools for people who had a lot of money to try to prepare the upper class, to become and take on their role as being the people who ran society. This school is more of an American school—more of a democratic community. That’s been a part of the philosophy for the whole time the school has been around. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

This quote reflects the administrator’s understanding that Andover is special and different from other institutions because of its commitment to access and democracy.

Organizational sagas also strengthen members’ commitment to organizations. As seen at the end of Chapter Four, Andover’s commitment to access in general—and need-blind in particular—is what has led some faculty to stay at the institution. For example, one administrator said, “When I got here I would occasionally have this struggle back and

forth between [working at a] public school and Andover, but what kept me here was the commitment, I felt, to ‘Youth from every quarter’” (interview, September 28, 2011).

Andover’s organizational saga has profoundly shaped its culture and identity. Through the decades, heads of school, alumni, and faculty referred to the founding Constitution regularly and enthusiastically. For example, in letters to the Andover community calling for donations and nominations for the “Most Qualified” program, language from the Constitution is used to rationalize the program (Adriance, 1963). The latest two capital campaigns have used the catchphrase “building on the surest foundation,” the latter part of which appears in the founding Constitution. And several of the senior administrators brought up the history of the institution. Community members are not only aware of the length of time that the institution has existed, but also what Andover represented during that time. The Associate Head of School said, “Even though it’s a place with 233 years of experience and history, it’s also a place that asks questions of itself all the time. We never rest on our laurels here” (interview, August 26, 2011).

According to Karabel’s (1984) iron law of admissions, “an institution will retain a particular process of selection only so long as it produces outcomes that correspond to perceived organizational interest” (p. 26). Accordingly, Andover could have stopped supporting low-income students long ago: For several decades the institution has received more than enough qualified applications, has had a fine reputation, and has been on excellent financial footing. Other elite boarding schools have not had any commitment to low-income students and continue to offer limited financial aid, while enjoying

prestigious reputations, a healthy supply of applicants, and generous alumni. Why, then, did Andover continue to support access for low-income students for so long?

When asked what differentiated Andover from most other boarding schools with respect to attitudes toward access, the Chief Financial Officer replied, “I think it’s the founding...I think that’s basically in the heritage of the school” (interview, September 21, 2011). Discussing Andover’s decision to go need-blind, the Associate Head of School agreed, saying,

Let’s do that [need-blind] and then let’s go beyond that to Access to Success because everybody seemed to think it’s who we are. I think the identity of the school—I think it’s very important for each school to know who they are, and I think we’ve pretty much figured out who we are. (Interview, August 26, 2011).

In sum, as the Dean of Faculty said, “It’s not just Andover’s culture, it’s the customs and mores of this place” (interview, August 26, 2011).

Organizational sagas are powerful instruments in the evolution of institutions.

Clark (1970) writes:

The more unique the history and the more forceful the claim to a place in history, the more intensely cultivated the ways of sharing memory and symbolizing the institution. The saga is a strong self-fulfilling belief; working through institutional self-image and public image, it is indeed a switchman (Weber, 1946), helping to determine the tracks along which action is pushed by men’s self-defined interests. (p. 182).

The founding Constitution of the Academy, written in 1778, has played a starring role in shaping Andover's organizational saga over two hundred and thirty three years. By using the phrase "youth from every quarter"—and staking a claim in promoting access and democracy in the private school—the Constitution created just the kind of "normative agreement" that Meyer (1970) says can constrain and dictate how an organization adapts to environmental constraints. According to Hannan & Freeman (1977), "Organizations face constraints generated by their own history. Once standards of procedure and the allocation of tasks and authority have become the subject of normative agreement, the costs of change are greatly increased" (p. 931). The Constitution provided the school with an agenda that Andover aspired to follow, even when that agenda wasn't popular or fiscally responsible for the institution. The Constitution also shaped the school's reputation, leading the school to be known as more democratic and less socially exclusive than many other elite boarding schools.

While Andover has been subjected to numerous sources of pressure over the history of its existence, its powerful organizational saga—as well as the reaffirmation of this saga by multiple leaders—has predominated over external pressures from the environment. Indeed, need-blind admission can be seen as one institutional response to these organizational pressures. Several senior administrators emphasized that the school needed to expand its market in the nation and the world. Need-blind not only expands the market, but also differentiates the institution from the rest of its organizational cluster of elite boarding schools. This also explains why Andover declared the need-blind policy first in 1957, when competition with other elite boarding schools in elite college

admissions was at its most fierce. The need-blind policy allowed Andover to stand out and distinguish itself when it most needed to.

Since the most recent need blind policy was introduced, Andover has seen an increase in both full-paying applications and financial aid applicants. One senior administrator said, “Actually, our full-pay pool has increased more than our need blind pool has increased as a result of being need blind” (interview, September 21, 2011). He expanded on the comment by saying,

Parents recognize the fact—at least the parents that are applying here—that it’s helpful to have a mix of kids at the school and a high quality academic program, and they want their kids to go to that. It’s a little more rough and tumble, a little less rarefied than some other schools might be. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

As a policy, need-blind appeals to a broad spectrum of applicants: to low-income students because of the financial aspect, and to upper income families because it serves as an indicator of the kind of community the school values. Perhaps more importantly, it indicates that the school has abundant financial resources, and acts as a marker of institutional prestige, as it is the “gold standard” of admissions policies. Need-blind has become an effective marketing tool, as well as an effective admissions policy.

However, as mentioned previously, need-blind is also expensive and risky for the institution: it places an additional burden on endowment returns and alumni giving to make up the difference in lost tuition revenue. Because the financial markets have destabilized in the past few years, and endowment returns, while healthy, are no longer as

dependable as they once were, many administrators speak with cautious optimism about the future of need-blind. One administrator said,

I think we've done right. Whether you can sustain it or not, god knows. I do know that, unfortunately, we're trying to do it all. What are you going to give up at some point if you want to absolutely sustain this? Because we're doing it at the highest level. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

Another administrator said,

I think need blind is a really difficult thing to maintain...The more people know about you being need blind, then the more kids you have applying that need money. They're highly talented, they're highly desirable, and all of a sudden you have a bigger issue. I think it's a very difficult balance, maintaining a need blind admission policy. (Interview, September 21, 2011).

There is a fear that the demand for financial aid could outpace supply, which is certainly warranted. Maintaining need-blind takes a delicate balance of institutional funds, and makes the institution more susceptible to financial upset. The precariousness of need-blind is demonstrated by the recent decision of Wesleyan University to revoke its need-blind policy, which was then applauded by Moody's Investor Services (*Inside Higher Ed*, 2012). Other elite colleges and universities have also rolled back their no-loan policies, including most recently Cornell University (Jaschik, 2012). Some claim that these colleges and universities had no business instituting such policies in the first place. One unnamed expert on higher education recently said, "There was this kind of reaction. When the big boys did it, everybody else said, 'We should move in that direction as

well,' and I think there was a less than fully analytical approach to doing it" (Jaschik, 2012).

The reasoning behind such decisions is important because it informs the sustainability of particular policies. In Andover's case, the decision to go need-blind wasn't merely a result of isomorphic pressures, but also the result of a strong organizational saga of access that aligned with just these very pressures. As such, for Andover the risks of need-blind were minimized and the rewards maximized—at least in the eyes of school leaders. Karabel (1984) writes, "Since what is in the 'interest' of the organization is, however, not a matter of objective reality it is crucial to understand the values and perceptions of those who have the power to define what is 'good' for the organization" (p. 5). As explained earlier, organizational saga increases the commitment of members of an organization to an established value, belief, or story about the organization. Andover's powerful organizational saga of access is embraced by senior leaders of Andover, and has deepened their commitment to the historical traditions of the institution. Andover's organizational saga has also attracted faculty and administrators who value access, and may have been scholarship students themselves. Furthermore, some former scholarship students are now in positions of power and influence on Andover's Board of Trustees, and within the administration. In this way, Andover's organizational saga has overpowered its rational self-interest, and become the dominant influence in organizational decision-making. While it is certainly in Andover's self-interest to attract more highly qualified students regardless of their ability to pay (which need-blind accomplishes), the financial risk and commitment that need-blind requires is

not in the institution's best interest—unless the organizational saga is considered. Then, as the Head of School said in the announcement to the Andover community, need-blind becomes not just “the right thing to do,” but “the *only* thing to do.”

**The role of the organizational field.** For all organizations, fields can be important sources of organizational change. Andover in particular has been susceptible to its organizational field changing because of the unique constitution of its organizational field, made up of both secondary boarding schools and elite colleges and universities. From the beginning, Andover enjoyed a close relationship with Harvard and other elite colleges and universities, and engaged in mimetic isomorphism with Harvard by using the college's incorporation and other characteristics as a model, which solidified Andover's legitimacy and improved its chances of survival. As such, Phillips Academy “grew up” alongside these institutions, and for the first one hundred years of its existence, there were few differences between Phillips and the leading colonial colleges. It wasn't until the rise of the American public high school in the late 1800s that the differences between the two became distinguishable and important.

During this second important phase of institutional development, rather than aligning itself with secondary schools around the nation and becoming just another “high school”, Andover became part of an organizational cluster of elite boarding schools in the Northeast. An organizational cluster is “any set of two or more organizations of a common type located in the same geographic area” (Fennell, 1980, p. 485). The emergence of this organizational cluster encouraged each of its members to engage in isomorphic tendencies, as evidenced by similar residential policies, governance

structures, tuition rates, curriculums and academic requirements, and even common terminology (e.g. “headmaster” or “head of school” instead of “principal,” and “forms” instead of “grades”). The elite boarding schools that made up this small community maintained close relations with elite colleges and universities, and eventually became the “feeder” schools from which Harvard, Yale, and Princeton drew the majority of its graduates from the end of the nineteenth century until the middle of the twentieth. While Andover’s organizational legitimacy was somewhat threatened by the decision of the Ivies to pull away from enrolling the majority of Andover’s graduates, Andover’s scholarship policies in the 1950s and 1960s helped keep the institution relevant to the Ivies, as well as the nation in general. While Andover may have been one of the leaders in this movement for access, its sharing of best practices with Phillips Exeter and the deans of admission at elite colleges and universities also helped portray these practices as rational and appropriate (Meyer and Rowan, 1978).

According to Scott (2004), “Environments directly affect organizational outcomes, which in turn affect subsequent perceptions and decisions. Environments influence organizations, but organizations also modify and select their environments” (p. 147). As an elite boarding school, Andover straddles two environments: while it is essentially a private high school, it is also inextricably linked to elite colleges and universities through its history and its function as a feeder school. Andover’s dual-environment state has offered both opportunities for it to maintain its identity, as well as certain constraints. Andover’s organizational field and environment allowed the school to maintain its institutional identity as a national school that educated “youth from every

quarter.” When the institution was considering whether to go need-blind in 2007, other elite colleges and universities had already set the precedent for such a policy. As part of the same organizational field, it was not surprising that Andover should embrace such a policy as well, especially when it matched so well with the institution’s organizational saga. On the other hand, the dual environment-state has constrained Andover in that any attempts to move too far away in behavior from its private boarding school peers or the expectations of its elite college and university feeding schools would make the school susceptible to risk and failure.

**The interaction of the organizational saga and organizational field.** Without knowing the history of access at Andover, one might assume that pressure from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, as well as other elite collegiate institutions influenced Andover to adopt need-blind admission. However, the organizational saga of access at Andover long predates the relative popularity of need-blind admission at elite colleges and universities in recent decades, so normative pressures from elite colleges and universities must not be solely responsible for the decision. Andover’s organizational saga of access had encouraged a need-blind policy well before the 2007 decision, but it took the aligning of institutional resources, organizational saga, and values within the organizational field for the policy to be embraced. It can thus be concluded that the decision to adopt need-blind admission in 2007 was a combination of the organizational saga reaching fulfillment *as well as* normative pressures that led to isomorphism in the organizational field. When organizational sagas and institutional values align with normative pressures in the

environmental field, the result is a powerful and meaningful organization that cannot only survive, but thrive in a given environment.

### **Implications**

The findings from this study contribute to some theories of organizational change. Karabel (1984) believes that elite institutions reach out to disenfranchised groups at moments in the history when “the legitimacy of the system itself is in question.” While Andover has been consistent in its commitment to access over the years, at two points in history the school went need-blind: 1957 and 2007. Both of these times can be seen as moments when the legitimacy of elite education was being questioned. In 1957, there was a national push for meritocracy and increased opportunity for previously oppressed classes, as well as a suspicion of elite education. In 2007, need-blind might have been in response to the questioning of the relevancy of elite institutions of education. Access in general had become a hot topic, and for elite institutions, need blind was a way that they could justify their continuing exclusionary practices. But while institutional preservation might have been one reason for adopting need-blind in 1957 and 2007, it wasn’t the *only* reason: need blind also aligned with Andover’s organizational saga. In this sense the findings of this study align well with Farnum’s (1997) theory, which expanded Karabel’s (1984) theory by stating that an organization’s history, culture, and ethos matter in how an organization responds to status group struggle.

Findings from this study contextualize some of the previous work done on elite boarding schools, especially studies done on elite production in the United States. As one of the largest elite boarding schools in the United States, Andover is an important conduit

of elite production and reproduction in America. With 234 years of history, and nearly 25,000 living alumni, its impact is significant. From the time of Andover's founding through today, when one considers the high percentage of Andover graduates who went on to elite colleges and universities, along with the high percentage of Andover students receiving financial aid, it changes our understanding of what was being "fed" into elite colleges and universities historically. For example, Useem and Karabel (1977) used the "selective sixteen" as one variable in their study of elites in America, finding that high percentage of elites had attended one of these schools. Andover and Exeter are significantly larger than the other fourteen schools included in the selective sixteen, and their graduates far outnumber those from the other schools. Knowing that a relatively high percentage of Andover (and Exeter) students were on aid both in 1967 and today complicates Useem and Karabel's assumptions about these schools as bastions of elitism and wealthy students.

In terms of practice, this study demonstrates the importance of contextualizing key policy decisions at institutions within their organizational history. If an external observer were to look at just the immediate years preceding Andover's decision to go need-blind, that observer could assume that Andover made the decision just because it was popular among elite colleges and universities. And while this is partially true, there is much more to the story. A fuller picture of Andover's reasoning, motives, and institutional development is only reached when widening the historical perspective. This is particularly important for heads of school, college presidents, administrators, faculty and staff new to a particular institution. Understanding the organizational saga of an

institution is critical to understanding how that organization responds to environmental changes.

School leaders should examine critical questions that the institution has faced in the past. Often, the same tough questions present themselves over and over again. For Andover, the question has always been how to provide access to “youth from every quarter,” as well as how to balance access with excellence. In the 1960s, and again in 2000s, administrators have asked: How many low-income students can Andover afford to enroll, while still maintaining financial and cultural balance within the institution? Andover uses highlights from its historical narrative to support institutional priorities and reaffirm the institutional culture. Leaders of other educational institutions would also be served by engaging with their unique institutional histories to identify potential solutions to perennial problems.

Finally, in order to preserve America’s commitment to social mobility, access, and opportunity, elite institutions must formalize and institutionalize their commitment to these same values. If they become part or the whole of the organizational saga of a given institution, then we can be assured that—as at Andover—these values will stand the test of time.

### **Future Directions**

One of the questions that sparked this study was if—and to what extent—Andover and other elite boarding schools are levers of social mobility for low-income students. A quantitative study would lend itself particularly well to exploring this question.

Historically, what jobs were Andover graduates able to procure after their postsecondary

education? What were their incomes? Did they reach elite status in the general public? Did they send their children to private schools? Measuring the real, socioeconomic impact of attending an elite boarding school on a scholarship student would be a valuable contribution to the literature on social mobility and elite education in America.

Additionally, Cookson & Persell's (1985) landmark study of boarding schools remains one of the seminal texts on boarding schools in the United States. However, it is more than thirty years old, and with the profound changes that have taken place in the world, in higher education, and in boarding schools since then, it needs to be updated. Many of the more recent studies focus on just one school (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009a; Khan, 2010), while the seminal texts (McLachlan, 1970; Cookson & Persell, 1985) are several decades old. A comprehensive study of elite American boarding schools today would be incredibly useful for exploring this sector of education.

## **Conclusion**

Today, many are asking whether social mobility still exists in America. In November 2011, *Time Magazine* published an article entitled, "What Ever Happened to Upward Mobility?" (Foroohar, 2011). The Brookings Institution has also launched a group dedicated to exploring the opportunity agenda in American policies. It seems as though everyone is asking, "Is social mobility in America dead?" The story of access at Andover proves that social mobility does indeed still exist. According to David Karen (1990), elite colleges and universities "create the opportunity structure that confronts individuals, insofar as they determine the nature, number, and likely trajectory of available positions in given organizations" (p. 229). The same can be said of elite

boarding schools, which have the ability to be a “critical first step in upward mobility” (Cookson & Persell, 1985, p. 186) for low-income students. Elite boarding schools provide low-income students with the social, cultural, and academic capital they need to access and succeed in elite higher education. Simultaneously, boarding schools also ensure the social reproduction of elites and other members of the upper class. This dichotomy is present in each elite boarding school, and presents a challenge for school leaders—one among many.

A little over a decade ago the former rector of St. Paul’s School, David Hicks (1996), sounded a funeral call for boarding schools. Hicks claimed that the pervasiveness of technology, the changing nature of the American elite, the growth of the “student as consumer” movement, battles between individualism and pluralism, and an increasingly strict legal environment have all changed the environment in which boarding schools operate. Hicks warned that unless significant changes took place, then the years of the American boarding school were numbered:

The fate of the American boarding school is not sealed, but the resurgence and possible leadership of boarding schools in American education depend...on a bold reassertion of their individuality and an innovative use of their resources. They will save themselves individually, not collectively...The boarding school with the best chance to prosper will be the one that reclaims the key elements of its original mission. (p. 535).

This study demonstrates the power of an organizational saga in institutional survival.

Andover’s organizational saga is based on “key elements of its original mission.” This

profound saga, oriented toward access for low-income students, has enabled the school to survive and thrive for hundreds of years, and surely will continue to do so in the future.

While the overarching story of these schools in scholarly literature and the popular press focuses merely on their capacity to reproduce elites, this study seeks to shed light on the social mobility function of some elite boarding schools. This leads to not only a fuller understanding of elite boarding schools, but also enriches our knowledge of access in higher education. While this study provides just one institutional case study, it will hopefully spark additional scholarly research on this unique sector of education.

## Appendix A: Interview Protocol

### Introduction:

As you know, I'm conducting a study on the history of access for low-income students at Andover for my dissertation at Boston College. Thank you so much for taking the time to meet with me today. As part of the study, I'm interviewing senior administrators and trustees to gain an understanding of what access means at Andover. You are one of ten people selected to be interviewed. Today, I'd like to hear about your perspectives and experience in Andover related to access.

I have designed the interview to take no more than 45 minutes of your time. Does that timing work for you? [Adjust the time to accommodate the interviewee's needs].

I want to inform you that you will be identified by your position title [example] in the dissertation. If you would prefer not to be identified at all please let me know at any time during the course of the interview.

I have two copies of a consent form, which was also previously emailed to you. As you can see, the consent form provides you with much of the information I just mentioned, including detailed information about the study, confidentiality procedures, and contact information for questions or concerns you may have. One copy is for your records. The second copy will be used for our records. Please take a minute to read it and let me know if you have any questions. After you have finished reading, I'd like you to please sign and return one copy for our records.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

As part of the data collection procedure I'd like to record our discussion if you are willing to grant us permission. Only I will have access to this recording and the resulting transcription. If you agree to allow me to record our conversation, please know that if at any point during our interview you would like me to turn off the recorder, just let me know. Is it ok if I record our conversation? [If ok, commence recording].

### General Information and Impressions of Andover

1. Please give me a bit of background information about your position and experience with Phillips Academy (Andover).
  - a. Thinking back to when you when you first learned of the position at Andover, what attracted you to this school?

2. I'd like to learn more about your impressions of Andover today. Can you describe the school for me?
  - a. Beyond the official purpose statement, what do you perceive to be the mission and purpose of the school? What makes Andover unique?

#### Andover and Access

3. Tell me a bit about what access means at Andover.
4. How has the perception of and importance of access changed over the course of your employment with Andover?
  - a. How do you think it's changed for the administration? Faculty? Students? Alumni?

#### The Strategic Plan of 2004 & Need-Blind Admission

5. Can you tell me about the process of crafting the Strategic Plan in 2004?
  - a. Who took part in that process?
6. Can you tell me about adopting need-blind admission at Andover? How did Andover come to make the decision to adopt this policy?
7. What was your role in the formation of this policy?
8. In your opinion, has the policy changed Andover? If yes, how?

#### Access to Success

9. Can you tell me about the Access to Success initiative?
  - a. Can you explain to me how Andover defines success?
10. Can you tell me about other efforts and initiatives you are aware of targeted towards increasing access?
11. What do you think drives access policies and programs at Andover (e.g. the Head of School, faculty, students, alumni)?

#### Conclusion

12. Is there anything else you would like to add about access at Andover?
13. Is there anyone else that you think I should speak to about this project that is not already being interviewed?

Thank you for your time. I really appreciate your willingness to participate in this study.

## **Appendix B: Informed Consent Form**

Title of the Study: Access Through the Ages at an Elite Boarding School: A Case Study of the Evolution of Phillips Academy

Purpose: This study is being conducted by Samantha Carney as part of her requirements for the Ph.D. program in Higher Education at Boston College. The goal of this study is to investigate the history of access for low-income students at Andover. This study seeks to provide a broader perspective on the history of access at an elite boarding school, and the internal and external factors that have influenced the developmental history of this institution.

Approach: In order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the historical and contemporary role of low-income students at Andover, I am conducting a study comprised of archival research, document review, and interviews. I will interview selected senior administrators and trustees of Phillips Academy, identified as being primary arbiters of policies, programs, and initiatives targeted at low-income students. This study will provide a detailed look at how Andover's culture, mission, and environment determine its approach to access. The data collected will unveil information about the use of specific priorities, initiatives, and practices at the institutional level that have contributed to the organizational saga of access at Andover. Additionally, to the degree possible, comparisons of Andover to other elite boarding schools and elite universities will be made. This analysis will shed light on the unique position that Andover has taken in regards to access for low-income students and will contribute to the knowledge of elite boarding schools. In addition this analysis may be of interest to other institutions engaging in organizational change centered around access.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Samantha Carney, Graduate Student at Boston College by phone (516-835-2124) or email (carney.samantha@gmail.com).

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant, contact the Institutional Review Board, Boston College Office for Research Protections (which is responsible for the protection of project participants): at [617-552-4778](tel:617-552-4778) or [irb@bc.edu](mailto:irb@bc.edu).

Directions: You are being asked to take part in a research study about the access at Andover. You have been selected as an interview participant because of your knowledge, experience, and position at Phillips Academy. If you agree to participate in this study it will require you to participate in a one-on-one interview. The purpose of the interview is

to obtain your general thoughts, ideas and perceptions about the role of access at Andover, the process of developing the Strategic Plan, and the process of adopting need-blind admission. The interview will take less than 45 minutes.

There are no reasonable foreseeable (or expected) risks associated with your participation in this study; however, the study may include risks that are unknown at this time. There is no cost to you to participate.

You have been given two copies of this informed consent. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study. If you agree to participate, please sign and date each copy. This signature indicates that you have read and understand the information within this consent form and your willingness to participate in this study. I will keep one copy of this informed consent. Please keep the other copy for your records.

Consent for Voluntary Participation: You volunteer to participate in this research study and understand that:

1. You will be interviewed by Samantha Carney, a graduate student from Boston College, for the purposes of her dissertation research.
2. The questions you will be answering address your views on issues related to access and low-income students at Andover.
3. The interview will be recorded to facilitate analysis of the data as a supplement to note-taking during the interview.
4. Your name will not be used, but you may be identified by your position and title. If you choose to not be identified by your position and title (and therefore not identified at all), please let me know either before or during the course of the interview. There is no penalty for choosing to not be identified.
5. You may withdraw from part or all of this study at any time.
6. You understand that the results from this interview will be included in Samantha Carney's dissertation on access at Andover.
7. You are free to participate or not participate without prejudice. Deciding not to participate will not impact your relationship with Samantha Carney, Andover, or Boston College.
8. There is no compensation associated with your participation.
9. The investigator will make every effort to keep your research records confidential, but it cannot be assured. Records that identify you and the consent form signed by

you, may be looked at by the Boston College IRB or Federal Agencies overseeing human subject research.

10. The results of this research may be presented at meetings or in published articles.

By signing below, you acknowledge the following: “I have read the contents of this consent form and have been encouraged to ask questions. I understand the possible risks and benefits of this study. I know that being in this study is voluntary and I can stop at any time. I give consent to participate in this study. I have received a copy of this consent form.”

Participant’s Signature:

Date:

Participant’s Printed Name:

Researcher’s Signature:

Date:

## References:

Adriance, J. Letter to R. Marx. January 20, 1958. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Adriance, J. Letter to R. Lee. October 21, 1960. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Adriance, J. Letter to B.L. Rasmussen. June 20, 1961a. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Adriance, J. Letter to Friends of Andover. June 1961b. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Adriance, J. Letter to Friends of Andover. September 1961c. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Adriance, J. Letter to Friends of Andover. October 1962. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

- Adriance, J. Letter to Friends of Andover. October 1963. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Adriance, J. Letter to Friends of Andover. July 1965. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Adriance, J. Letter to Hinton. 1968. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Aldrich, H. (1976). Resource dependence and interorganizational relations: Relations between local employment service offices and social services sector organizations. *Administration & Society*, (7), 419-454.
- Alexander-Snow, M. (1999). Two African American women graduates of historically White boarding schools and their school integration at a traditionally White university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, (68)1, 106-119.
- Allis, F.R. (n.d.). Freedom in education: A national public school. Files of Frederick R. Allis, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Allis, F.R. (1966). The Andover scholarship program. *Andover Bulletin*, April, pp. 1-5. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Allis, F.R. (1979). Youth from every quarter: A bicentennial history of Phillips Academy. Lebanon, N.H.: University Press of New England.

- Andover Bulletin*. (1927). Hopkins elected to board. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Andover Bulletin*. (1965). Should Andover change its course? August. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Andover Bulletin*. (1967). A report on the Steering Committee. August. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Astin, A.W., & Oseguera, L. (2004). The declining "equity" of American higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(3), 321-341.
- Aurini, J. (2006). Crafting legitimating projects: An institutional analysis of private education businesses. *Sociological Forum*, (28)1, 83-111.
- Avery, C., Hoxby, C., Jackson, C., Burk, K., Glenn, P., & Mridula, R. (2006). Cost should be no barrier: An evaluation of the first year of Harvard's financial aid initiative. (Unpublished working paper). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bailyn, B. (1970). *Education in the forming of American society*. Charlotte, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Baird, L.L. (1977). *The elite schools*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Baltzell, E.D. (1958). *Philadelphia gentlemen: The making of a national upper class*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Bancroft, C. (1893). Report of the Principal to the Board of Trustees. Files of the Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, MA.

- Benedict, G.G. (1953). Gone...is the Edwardian era: A commentary on college admissions, today and in the future. *Andover Bulletin*, November, p. 1. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Board of Trustees. Phillips Academy. (1902a). Meeting Minutes, February 22. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1902b). Meeting Minutes, March 10. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1902c). Meeting Minutes, February 13. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1903). Meeting Minutes, October 19. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1904). Meeting Minutes, November 4. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1906a). Meeting Minutes, June 12. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1906b). Meeting Minutes, October 6. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1906c). Meeting Minutes, April 7. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1910a). Meeting Minutes, October 18. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1907-1915, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1910b). Meeting Minutes, April 12. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1907-1915, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1912). Meeting Minutes, October 12. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1907-1915, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1916). Meeting Minutes, January 11. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1916-1922, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1918a). Meeting Minutes, March 11. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1916-1922, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1918b). Meeting Minutes, April 16. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1916-1922, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1921). Meeting Minutes, January 11. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1916-1922, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1925). Meeting Minutes, June 11. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1922-1930, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1926). Meeting Minutes, October 7. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1922-1930, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1927). Meeting Minutes, January 15. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1922-1930, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1929). Meeting Minutes, October. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1922-1930, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Boarding School Review. (2011). Percent students financial aid. Retrieved from [http://www.boardingschoolreview.com/highest\\_percentage\\_students\\_financialaid/sort/1](http://www.boardingschoolreview.com/highest_percentage_students_financialaid/sort/1).

- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of judgment and taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bowen, W.G. & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bowen, W.G., Kurzweil, M. A., & Tobin, E. M. (2005). *Equity and excellence in American higher education*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Brown, W.H. (1965). Should Andover change its course? *Andover Bulletin*, October. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Brubacher, J.S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bullock, R.A. Letter to Claude M. Fuess. (n.d.). Files of Claude M. Fuess, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Clark, B.R. (1970). *The distinctive college*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Committee of Ten. (1974). Committee of Ten. In S. Cohen, (Ed.), *Education in the United States: A Documentary History*, Vol. 3. New York: Random House, 1974.
- Cookson, P.W. & Persell, C.H. (1985). *Preparing for power: America's elite boarding schools*. Basic Books.
- Cookson, P.W., & Persell, C.H. (1991). Race and class in America's elite preparatory boarding schools: African Americans as the "outsiders within." *Journal of Negro Education*, (60)2, 219-228.

- Cranbrook Schools. (2009). About us. Retrieved from <http://schools.cranbrook.edu/> on December 12, 2009.
- Creswell, J.W. (2004). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluative quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Datnow, A., & Cooper, R. (1997). Peer networks of African American students in independent schools: Affirming academic success and racial identity. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 66(1), 56-72.
- Dewey, J. (1944). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- DiMaggio, P.J., & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Domhoff, G.W. (1983). *Who rules American now?* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Dorman, W.E. Letter to L. Markel. September 27, 1960. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Eccles, F. (1965). Impressions of the NAIS Conference on Summer Enrichment Programs. Files of the Office of Research and Evaluation, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Eno, A.L. (1940). Loring L. Trull, one of oldest P.A. graduates recollects the “good old days” at Andover. *The Phillipian*, LXIV(32), 1,4.

Epiphany School. (2011). Innovative programming. Retrieved from

<http://epiphanyschool.com/innovative-programs/full-service-programming/full-service/>.

Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1780-1800). Meeting Minutes, Files of the Board of Trustees, 1780-1800, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1903). Meeting Minutes, December 21. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1905). Meeting Minutes, January 9. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1907, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1916). Meeting Minutes, May 8. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1916-1922, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Phillips Academy. (1920). November 9. Files of the Board of Trustees, 1916-1922, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

Fabrikant, G. (2008). Schools call on alumni networks to help fill coffers. *The New York Times*, January 26th.

Farnum, R. (1997). Elite college discrimination and the limits of conflict theory. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3).

- Fennell, M. L. (1980). The effects of environmental characteristics on the structure of hospital clusters. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(3), 485-510.
- Foroohar, R. (2011). What ever happened to social mobility? *Time*, November 14.
- Fortune*. (1936). Twelve of the best American schools. January.
- Fuess, C.M. (1913). Commencement & the alumni dinner. *Andover Bulletin*, July. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Fuess, C.M. (1914). Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts. *The School Review*, 22(2), 73-81.
- Fuess, C.M. (1917). *An old New England school: A history of Phillips Academy Andover*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Galaskiewicz, J. (1985). Interorganizational relations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, (11), 281-304.
- Gateway to Prep Schools. (2011). Member Schools. Retrieved from [www.gatewaytoprepschools.com](http://www.gatewaytoprepschools.com) on Saturday, January 22, 2011.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2009a). *The best of the best: Becoming elite at an American boarding school*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2009b). What is an elite boarding school? *Review of Educational Research*, 79(3), 1090-1128.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situations of mental patients and other inmates*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.

- Grodsky, E. (2007). Compensatory sponsorship in higher education. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(6), 1662-1712.
- Handlin, O. (1963). *The Americans: The new history of the people of the United States*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 929-964.
- Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, (49)2, 149-164.
- Hatch, L.C. (1927). *The history of Bowdoin College*. Portland, ME: Loring, Short & Harmon.
- Hicks, D. (1996). The strange fate of the American boarding school. *The American Scholar*, Fall.
- Hill, M.R. (1993). *Archival strategies and techniques*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Sage Publications.
- Inside Higher Ed*. (2012). Moody's praises Wesleyan for ending need-blind policy. June 12<sup>th</sup>. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2012/06/12/moodys-praises-wesleyan-ending-need-blind-policy>
- Jaschik, S. (2010). Going need-blind. *Inside Higher Ed*, March 8<sup>th</sup>. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/03/08/hamilton>.

- Jaschik, S. (2012). 'No loans' revisited. *Inside Higher Ed*, July 6<sup>th</sup>. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/07/06/cornell-restores-loans-those-family-incomes-above-60000>.
- JBHE. (2003). Young blacks at the nation's highest-ranked private boarding schools. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 41, 56-59.
- Kahane, R. (1988). Multicode organizations: A conceptual framework for the analysis of boarding schools. *Sociology of Education*, 61(4), 211-226.
- Kamens, D.H. (1977). Legitimizing myths and educational organization: The relationship between organizational ideology and formal structure. *American Sociological Review*, 42(2), 208-219.
- Karabel, J. (1984). Status-group struggle, organizational interests, and the limits of institutional autonomy. *Theory and Society*, 13(1) 1-40.
- Karabel, J. (2005). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Karen, D. (1990). Toward a political-organizational model of gatekeeping: The case of elite colleges. *Sociology of Education*, 63(4), 227-240.
- Kashti, Y. (1988). Boarding schools and changes in society and culture: Perspectives derived from a comparative case study research. *Comparative Education*, 24(3), 351-364.
- Katz, M. (1989). *Reconstructing American education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Kemper, J.M. (1957). *Phillips Academy: A National Public School*. Speech presented at the Newcomen Society, Boston, Massachusetts. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Kemper, J.M. Letter to E. Wilson. March 1961. Files of J.M. Kemper, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Khan, S.R. (2011). *Privilege: The making of an adolescent elite at St. Paul's School*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kim, J. (2010). The Eight Schools Association: Who? What? When? Where? Why? *The Choate Rosemary Hall News*, May 14.
- Kraushaar, O.F. (1972). *American nonpublic schools: Patterns of diversity*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Levine, S.B. (1980). The rise of American boarding schools and the development of a national upper class. *Social Problems*, 28(1), 63-94.
- Mackenzie, J.C. Letter to Cecil Bancroft. January 1 1895. Files of C. Bancroft, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, MA.
- Malcolm, A.H. (1971). Prep school enrollments are declining. *The New York Times*, January 14th.
- Marr, H. (1959). *The old New England academies founded before 1826*. California: Comet Press Books.
- Massey, D.S., Charles, C.Z., Lundy, C.F., & Fischer, M.J. (2006). *The source of the river: The social origins of freshmen at America's selective colleges and universities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- McLachlan, J. (1970). *American boarding schools: A historical study*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- McLean, D.H. (1957). From a study of the files and facts an alumnus reports on admission to Andover. *Andover Bulletin*, p. 4. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- McPhee, J. (1966). *The headmaster: Frank L. Boyden, of Deerfield*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Merriam, S. (1997). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyer, J.W. (1970). The charter: Conditions of diffuse socialization in schools. In W.R. Scott (Ed.), *Social Processes and Social Structures* (pp. 564-78). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Meyer, J.W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, (83), 340-363.
- Mintz, S. (2004). *Huck's raft: A history of American childhood*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Morison, S.E. (1986). *Three centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Pasilliao, A. (2009). Shanahan joins trustees to review financial woes at Eight Schools Association meeting in Exeter. *The Choate News*, May 15.
- Pennings, J.M. (1981). Strategically interdependent organizations. In Nystrom, P., & Starbuck, W.H. (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Design*, Vol. 1. London: Oxford University Press.
- Peterson, F.A. (1972). Analysis of 1971-1972 year grades of special students compared to those of other students. Files of the Office of Research and Evaluation, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Peterson, F.A., & Broadbent, M.A. (1972). The Phillips Academy alumni scholarship survey. Center for Field Research and School Services, Boston College. Published by Phillips Academy, Andover, MA.
- Phillips Academy. (n.d.). Competition for scholarships at Andover. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1878). *Centennial History*. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, MA.
- Phillips Academy. (1932). *Terms of Trusts*. Prepared for the use of the Trustees, pp. 38-39. Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, MA.
- Phillips Academy. (1961a). *The Standards Committee: The performance of Andover graduates in college*. May 14. Files of the Office of Research and Evaluation, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.

- Phillips Academy. (1961b). The Andover scholarship program. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1962). O'Donnell Scholarships at Andover. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1965). *Steering Committee report*. Files of the 1965 Steering Committee, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1967a). Boys' Clubs of America: Opportunities at Andover. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1967b). *A Comparison of the Numbers at Andover and Exeter Admitted to "Hard" Colleges*. Files of the Office of Research and Evaluation, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1967c). *Comparison of Andover and Exeter Admissions 1957-1960*. Files of the Office of Research and Evaluation, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1968). National Forest Service opportunities at Andover. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (1993). The long range plan. Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts.

- Phillips Academy. (2004). *The strategic plan*. Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (2008). *Report from the Composition of the Student Body Committee*. October 2008. Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Phillips Academy. (2009). Notable alumni: The long list. Retrieved from <http://www.andover.edu/About/NotableAlumni/LongList/Pages/default.aspx>.
- Phillips Academy. (2011). Access & Affordability. Retrieved from <http://www.andover.edu/Admission/TuitionAndFinancialAid/Pages/AccessAffordability.aspx>.
- Pierson, G.W. (1983). *A Yale book of numbers: Historical statistics of the college and university 1701-1976*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Pringle, H.F., & Pringle, K. (1947). America's oldest private school. *The Saturday Evening Post*, September 1947, pp.100-107.
- Quincy, J. (1883). *Figures of the past: From the leaves of old journals*. Boston, MA: Roberts Brothers.
- Reynolds, M. Letter to J.R. Adriance. October 16, 1958. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Rogers, D.W. (1944). Private schools in American life. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 15(9), 472-475.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college & university*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

- Saveth, E.N. (1988). Education of an elite. *History of Education Quarterly*, 28(3), 367-386.
- Scott, W.R. (2004). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- SEED. (2011). Seed school. Retrieved from <http://www.seedfoundation.com/index.php/seed-schools>.
- Soares, J. (2007). *The power of privilege: Yale and America's elite colleges*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Stampnitzky, L. (2006). How does "culture" become "capital"? Cultural and institutional struggles over "character and personality" at Harvard. *Sociological Perspectives*, 49(4), 461-481.
- Stent, A. (1976). The prep school boom. *Change*, 8(7) 16-18.
- Story, R. (1975). Harvard students, the Boston elite, and the New England preparatory system, 1800-1876. *History of Education Quarterly*, 15(3), 281-298.
- Struly, E. (1902). *My three years at Andover*. Mayhew Publishing Co.
- The Phillipian*. (1940). Generous scholarships offered by colleges. *LXIV*(31), 1,3.
- Thelin, J.R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Trow, M. (2006). Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII. In J.F. Forest and P.G. Altbach (eds.), *International Handbook of Higher Education* (243-280). Springer Publishing.

- TSAO. (2011). Ten Schools Admission Organization member schools. Retrieved from <http://www.tenschools.org/home/>.
- Turner, R.H. (1960). Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system. *American Sociological Review*, 25(6), 855-867.
- U.S. Census. (2009). School Enrollment – Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/school/cps2009.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2011). Office of Postsecondary Education: Federal TRIO Programs Current Year Low-Income Levels. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/trio/incomelevels.html>.
- Useem, M., & Karabel, J. (1986). Pathways to top corporate management. *American Sociological Review*, 51(2) 184-200.
- Walton, A. (2009). Building a pipeline to college: A study of the Rockefeller-funded "A Better Chance" program, 1963-1969. *American Educational History Journal* 36(1), 151-169.
- Warren, V.L. (1970). After 25 years, the waiting lists at girls' boarding schools begin to thin out. *The New York Times*, May 31st.
- Weber, M. (1946). In H.H. Gerth, & C.W. Mills (Eds.), *Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford.
- Wilgoren, J. (2000). The bell rings but the students stay, and stay. *The New York Times*, January 24th.
- Williamson, O.E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies*. New York: The Free Press.

- Wilson, E.S. Letter to J. Kemper, F. Boyden, and W.G. Saltonstall. March, 1961. Files of the Office of the Assistant to the Headmaster: James R. Adriance, Phillips Academy Archives, Andover, Massachusetts.
- Yin, R.K. (1993). *Applications of case study research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R.K. (2004). *The case study anthology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R.K. (2008). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Zweigenhaft, R.L. (1992). The application of cultural and social capital: A study of the 25th year reunion entries of prep school and public school graduates of Yale College. *Higher Education*, 23(3), 311-320.
- Zweigenhaft, R.L. (1993). Prep school and public school graduates of Harvard: A longitudinal study of the accumulation of social and cultural capital. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(2), 211-225.
- Zweigenhaft, R. L. (2009). Prep school and public school graduates: Who attends college reunions, who donates, who doesn't, and why. *Sociological Spectrum*, 29, 742-750.