

Assessing the Efficacy of Test-Optional Policies in Enhancing Socio-Demographic Diversity in Higher Education Institutions

Kai Cui¹, Liangchen Mei² & Changrong Du³

¹ Springfield Commonwealth Academy, United States

² University of London, United Kingdom

³ University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

Correspondence: Kai Cui, Springfield Commonwealth Academy, United States.

doi:10.56397/JARE.2023.11.08

Abstract

This study offers a comprehensive analysis of the interplay between standardized testing and the burgeoning holistic admissions approach within higher education admissions. We systematically examine the inherent biases present in standardized tests—spanning economic, racial, linguistic, and cultural sectors—and their potential implications for widening socio-demographic disparities. Utilizing the University of California system as a case study, the paper contrasts this with the holistic admissions approach which endeavors to encapsulate a multifaceted perspective of prospective students by factoring in both academic milestones and personal narratives. While this approach emerges as a promising alternative, we also discuss its innate challenges, especially concerning ensuring objectivity and uniformity. By evaluating these methodologies within the contemporary admissions ecosystem, the study emphasizes the urgency for transformative admissions strategies that champion both diversity and equity.

In the realm of higher education admissions, the efficacy and equity of standardized testing have long been subjects of contention. Initially designed to provide a uniform measure of student achievement, these tests are now under scrutiny for potentially perpetuating socio-demographic disparities. As institutions grapple with the implications of such biases, there's a growing inclination towards more holistic admissions approaches that aim to capture the multifaceted nature of a student's potential. This paper delves into the inherent challenges and biases of standardized tests, examines the nuances of the holistic admissions approach, and explores the interplay between the two in the modern admissions landscape.

Keywords: social justice, test-optional policies, diversity and equity

1. Standardized Testing Biases

Standardized tests, with their origins in the early 20th century, have been established under the

premise of offering a universally applicable measure of student ability and achievement. Yet, in the ever-evolving landscape of education, the validity and fairness of these tests are frequently

contested (Mislevy, 2003). One of the most pervasive concerns is the potential biases these tests present against certain socio-demographic groups.

Standardized testing, although touted as an unbiased measure of student capability, often reveals distinct performance trends across diverse socio-demographic backgrounds. The underlying factors that contribute to these disparities span economic, racial, ethnic, and linguistic dimensions.

Historically, test scores have reflected a persistent advantage for students from wealthier families. These benefits extend beyond mere financial capacities, as economic affluence often translates to increased access to high-quality educational resources, exposure to a broad array of extracurricular activities, and a reduced burden of chronic stressors. This access and exposure grant students a critical edge in their preparedness for these exams (Duncan & Murnane, 2011; Crosnoe & Huston, 2007). However, it's not just economic factors casting a shadow on test outcomes. Racial and ethnic minorities, especially African American and Hispanic students, grapple with long-standing academic performance divides when compared to their white peers. These divides, underpinned by structural issues such as differing school resources, racialized tracking, and even unconscious biases in teaching, come to the fore during standardized testing scenarios. The complexities of these divides are further deepened by psychological factors like the stereotype threat, wherein minority students may underperform due to anxieties about confirming negative racial or ethnic stereotypes (Noguera, 2003; Steele & Aronson, 1995).

Further complicating the landscape are English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities. ELLs, while proficient in their subjects, often confront the dual challenge of showcasing their knowledge in a non-native language. Even with certain accommodations like extended time or dictionaries, tests can still remain linguistically or culturally biased, making true equity elusive (Abedi, 2008). Students with disabilities, though sometimes provided with accommodations, find that these measures might not adequately cater to their unique needs, especially when tests lack universal design principles (Thompson, Johnstone, & Thurlow, 2002).

As the discourse on standardized testing evolves, addressing these multi-dimensional disparities remains paramount to ensuring fairness and truly reflective outcomes.

2. Intersecting Factors Influencing Test Performance

Cultural nuances play a pivotal role in how students approach standardized tests. Many of these tests inadvertently presuppose familiarity with Western cultural norms, presenting scenarios such as Thanksgiving shopping in mathematics problems or using distances in miles instead of kilometers. Such biases are not limited to overt cultural symbols but extend to subtle linguistic nuances. For instance, idiomatic expressions or culturally specific terms prevalent in standardized tests, like the SAT's historical reference to "regatta", can act as unintentional stumbling blocks, favoring students familiar with certain socio-economic or cultural contexts (Santelices & Wilson, 2010). Furthermore, some cultures prioritize collaborative learning, a stark contrast to the individualistic emphasis of most standardized tests. When these collective orientations are not acknowledged or accommodated in the test structure, it can lead to cognitive and ethical conflicts for the test-takers (Nasir & Hand, 2008).

The economic backdrop against which a student grows up can profoundly shape their test-taking experience. Affluent families often possess the means to invest in diverse educational experiences such as trips, diverse literature, technology, and extracurricular programs. These exposures can bolster background knowledge, giving these students a leg up in handling varied test questions (Dumais, 2006). In contrast, persistent environmental stressors, such as financial instability, are common in disadvantaged households. This 'toxic stress' from prolonged exposure to adversities can hinder executive function skills, memory recall, and cognitive processing—core competencies essential for excelling in standardized tests (Blair & Raver, 2015). Moreover, the immense pressure and expectations borne by students from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds can amplify their performance anxieties, potentially acting as a hindrance during test-taking scenarios (Steele, 1997).

Educational backgrounds, too, cast long shadows over standardized test performances. A student's school may not have the resources to

offer advanced courses or lab-based sciences, creating gaps in their knowledge that become evident during testing (Oakes, 2005). Additionally, teacher turnover, limited professional development opportunities, and larger class sizes often characterize schools in economically challenged areas. Such environments can lead to inconsistencies in the quality of instruction, affecting a student's preparedness for standardized tests (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Privileged students often benefit from enriched learning experiences like debates and research projects that hone their analytical skills. These experiences prepare them to handle complex test questions better, assessing their higher-order thinking abilities (Newmann, Bryk, & Nagaoka, 2001).

The crux of educational equality revolves around providing all students with fair opportunities to achieve their full academic potential. However, an undue emphasis on standardized testing can ironically act as a roadblock to this ideal. Many higher educational institutions, in their quest to maintain or elevate their prestige and rankings, have traditionally leaned heavily on standardized test scores as a primary metric for admissions. This focus, while seemingly objective, has inadvertently favored students with resources to engage in extensive test preparation, access to advanced courses, and other privileges often inaccessible to socio-economically disadvantaged students (Bowen, Chingos, & McPherson, 2009).

By prioritizing test scores in making crucial decisions about admissions, scholarship distributions, or placements in advanced academic programs, institutions may inadvertently uphold barriers for marginalized groups. For instance, economically disadvantaged students may not only lack financial resources for comprehensive test preparation but might also grapple with external stressors that further hinder optimal test performance. As a result, despite potential and talent, these students might be overlooked in favor of their more privileged counterparts (Darling-Hammond, 2007).

Moreover, the lingering effects of such systemic biases aren't limited to missed opportunities. Over time, consistently underperforming on standardized tests, a consequence not of capability but of systemic disadvantages, can erode students' self-belief. Such experiences can instill a debilitating mindset, leading some

students to prematurely conclude that avenues of higher education or elite programs are unattainable or not designed for them. This psychological phenomenon, often termed as "stereotype threat," has been shown to further decrease performance and engagement in academic pursuits (Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002).

Additionally, there's the ripple effect on educators and educational institutions. Schools, in pursuit of improving their average test scores, might channel more resources towards test preparation, often at the expense of a holistic education. Such a narrowed focus can disadvantage students in the long run, leaving them ill-prepared for the multi-dimensional challenges of higher education and beyond (Nichols & Berliner, 2007).

In sum, while standardized tests were designed to offer a consistent measure of student achievement, an overreliance on them without considering the broader socio-demographic contexts can perpetuate and even deepen the trenches of educational inequality.

3. Holistic Admissions Approach

Modern college admissions processes have witnessed an essential evolution in their methods of assessing student potential. While once admissions may have been an arithmetic game of grade point averages and test scores, there's a rising acknowledgment of the inadequacy of these metrics in capturing the multifaceted nature of a student's aptitude and promise.

A prime exemplar of this transformation is the University of California (UC) system. The UC campuses, noted for their rigorous academic programs and diverse student bodies, have been at the forefront of refining the admissions procedure. Their shift from a heavily numbers-driven process to a more comprehensive review captures the essence of holistic admissions. In their holistic review, UC admissions officers peruse beyond the academic metrics, diving into personal essays where students delineate life challenges, achievements, aspirations, and unique experiences. The significance of extracurricular activities, leadership roles, community service, and even special talents are weighed alongside the academic achievements, offering a panoramic view of the student as both a scholar and an individual (Geiser & Santelices, 2007).

Yet, the very strengths of the holistic approach, its breadth and depth, also introduce intricacies. With the vast spectrum of experiences and backgrounds presented by applicants, achieving uniformity in evaluation is an uphill task. While the UC system might have rigorous guidelines to direct admissions officers, the inherent subjectivity of interpreting personal narratives, experiences, and qualitative indicators can sometimes blur the lines of objectivity, leading to concerns about implicit biases or potential disparities in the admissions decisions (Saatcioglu et al., 2011). Moreover, the holistic review is resource-intensive, demanding significant time and expertise. Institutions must invest in training their admissions teams to evaluate applications with an equity lens, ensuring that all narratives, irrespective of their cultural or socio-economic origins, are given due consideration.

Nevertheless, the rewards of a well-implemented holistic review are manifold. By acknowledging and valuing the varied paths students tread on their educational journeys, universities can cultivate a richly diverse academic community. Such diversity extends beyond racial or socio-economic lines, embracing cognitive diversity, a mosaic of experiences, and a tapestry of insights that can only serve to enrich academic discourse and foster a more inclusive environment. Furthermore, in the broader socio-educational milieu, adopting holistic admissions signals a shift towards equity. By moving away from an over-reliance on standardized tests, which have their own inherent biases, institutions can offer opportunities to those who may have faced systemic barriers, enabling access to higher education for a broader swath of the population.

Yet, as the academic world inches closer to embracing a more holistic ethos, it is vital to continually reflect, refine, and reassess. While the holistic approach has its merits, striking a balance between comprehensiveness and objectivity, between narrative richness and evaluative consistency, remains the perennial challenge for institutions worldwide (Buckley et al., 2017).

4. Interplay Between the Two

In the intricate ballet of college admissions, standardized testing and holistic review might, at first glance, seem like unlikely dance partners. Their inherent philosophies contrast

sharply—one valuing quantitative uniformity and the other championing qualitative diversity. However, in the contemporary admissions process, they find themselves co-existing, sometimes in harmony and occasionally in contention.

While the historical reliance on standardized tests stemmed from their promise of objective standardization, the real-world has often proven messier. For example, research has shown that high-stakes tests like the SAT can sometimes be more indicative of a student's socio-economic status rather than their academic aptitude (Zwick, 2002). This correlation implies that students from affluent backgrounds, who can afford extensive test preparation or multiple testing opportunities, often have an edge.

As universities grew cognizant of these socio-economic biases, the allure of the holistic approach became more pronounced. Institutions like Bowdoin College, which adopted a test-optional policy as early as 1969, have consistently showcased that a student's entire journey, filled with personal challenges, socio-cultural experiences, leadership roles, and community engagements, provides a more nuanced understanding of their potential. By 2020, amid the pandemic, many other institutions temporarily or permanently adopted test-optional policies, further cementing the move toward a holistic perspective.

However, the narrative isn't simply about eschewing test scores. It's about redefining their role in the admissions mosaic. Schools like Wake Forest University, which went test-optional in 2008, have reported an increase in diversity without any compromise on academic quality. Their research showed that other metrics, like high school GPA, were just as predictive, if not more so, of college success as standardized tests (Allman & Slate, 2012). The admissions officers' perspectives are telling. They find themselves grappling with an ever-increasing applicant pool, with many students presenting near-perfect scores. In such scenarios, the differentiation often comes from personal essays, recommendation letters, and extracurricular achievements. There's a growing sentiment that while test scores can offer valuable data points, they shouldn't overshadow the myriad of other factors that define a student's journey.

For students, the landscape is a mix of relief and trepidation. While many appreciate the

decreased emphasis on a single test, they're also acutely aware of the heightened importance of other application components. They often find themselves seeking unique experiences, internships, or community engagements, not just out of genuine interest but also to stand out in a sea of applications.

In conclusion, the evolving dynamics between standardized testing and holistic review mirror the broader shifts in educational philosophy. As the 21st century heralds an era valuing diversity, resilience, and adaptability, it demands an admissions process that can appreciate these multifaceted attributes, weaving them into the rich tapestry of the academic community.

References

- Abedi, J. (2008). Classification system for English language learners: Issues and recommendations. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 27(3), 17-31.
- Allman, K. L., & Slate, J. R. (2012). School discipline in public education: A brief review of current practices. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(1), 1-8.
- Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2015). School readiness and self-regulation: A developmental psychobiological approach. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 711-731.
- Bowen, W. G., Chingos, M. M., & McPherson, M. S. (2009). *Crossing the finish line: Completing college at America's public universities*. Princeton University Press.
- Buckley, J., Letukas, L., & Wildavsky, B. (2017). *Measuring success: Testing, grades, and the future of college admissions*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Crosnoe, R., & Huston, A. C. (2007). Socioeconomic status, schooling, and the developmental trajectories of adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(5), 1097.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 1.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of 'No Child Left Behind'. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 10(3), 245-260.
- Dumais, S. A. (2006). Early childhood cultural capital, parental habitus, and teachers' perceptions. *Poetics*, 34(2), 83-107.
- Duncan, G. J., & Murnane, R. J. (2011). *Whither opportunity?: Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Geiser, S., & Santelices, M. V. (2007). Validity of high-school grades in predicting student success beyond the freshman year: High-school record vs. standardized tests as indicators of four-year college outcomes. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE. 6.07.
- Mislevy, R. J. (2003). Substance and structure in assessment arguments. *Law, Probability and Risk*, 2(4), 237-258.
- Nasir, N. S., & Hand, V. M. (2008). From the court to the classroom: Opportunities for engagement, learning, and identity in basketball and classroom mathematics. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 17(2), 143-179.
- Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2007). *Collateral damage: How high-stakes testing corrupts America's schools*. Harvard Education Press.
- Noguera, P. A. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. Teachers College Press.
- Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. Yale University Press.
- Saatcioglu, A., Moore, S., Sargut, G., & Bajaj, A. (2011). The role of school board social capital in district governance: Effects on financial and academic outcomes. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(1), 1-42.
- Santelices, M. V., & Wilson, M. (2010). Unfair treatment? The case of Freedle, the SAT, and the standardization approach to differential item functioning. *Harvard Educational Review*, 80(1), 106-134.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52(6), 613.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797.
- Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. *Advances in Experimental Social*

Psychology, 34, 379-440.

Thompson, S. J., Johnstone, C. J., & Thurlow, M. L. (2002). Universal design applied to large scale assessments. Synthesis Report 44.

Zwick, R. (2002). *Fair game? The use of standardized admissions tests in higher education*. Falmer Press.