Almeling to show how the *both* the media and science's independent tendencies toward sensationalism and oversimplification affect how the science of obesity is conveyed to the public, contributing to the frame effects Saguy presents in chapter 5. Among the strengths of these chapters is how Saguy balances the complexity of the multiple framings of fatness with a clear mapping of the frames themselves. The tables Saguy uses to lay out the key components of each frame aid this clarity.

Chapter 5 is perhaps the most innovative chapter in the book; in it, Saguy leaves more conventional methodology to report on the findings of three experiments she conducted to measure people's responses to various framings of corpulence as presented in the media. What she found was that, in fact, framings of fatness do shape how we perceive fatness and fat people and that these framings have critical implications for public health as well as size discrimination and antifat bias. Saguy highlights how the results of these experiments speak to how dominant obesity framings do not bring about policies or programs that improve the health of fat people but serve to mask, legitimate, and perpetuate inequality in a neoliberal society that scapegoats fat people for a seemingly endless list of social problems. Saguy concludes by outlining how activists and professionals are fighting to shift the framings of fatness so that we can see beyond the blinders of the dominant framings to ask different questions about size so that we can come up with answers that benefit all of us, rather than stigmatizing and harming all of us, especially those of us who are visibly fat.

What's Wrong with Fat is a well-written, carefully researched book that contributes an essential perspective on body size that will appeal to a wide range of scholars and activists. It is a bellwether in the growth of the interdisciplinary field of fat studies yet firmly grounded in sociological theory and methodology. *What's Wrong with Fat* is an important book, and it is my expectation that Saguy's work will continue to push scholarship on health, weight, and size as well as on gender, race, class, and inequality.

Paying for the Party: How College Maintains Inequality. By Elizabeth A. Armstrong and Laura T. Hamilton. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013. Pp. xviii+326.

Sara Goldrick-Rab
University of Wisconsin—Madison

For over 40 years, America has positioned higher education as a critical social institution aimed at promoting social mobility while investing hundreds of billions of dollars in financial aid and promoting a college-for-all agenda. Yet during that same period, socioeconomic inequality in college attainment has widened considerably. In particular, while access to college has expanded, disparities in who finishes college—and who leaves with insurmountable debt—have become a central concern.

Remarkably little research is devoted to documenting and analyzing the process of education, at the college level, through which inequality is maintained. In contrast to the vast array of studies in K–12 education examining in detail everything from teacher practices to classroom interactions, playgrounds, and family-to-school connections, sociologists studying colleges and universities have largely treated them as economists do—focusing on their inputs and their outputs. Frustration with this narrow approach and a desire to explicate the organizational, historical, political, and cultural details of life in today's higher-education spaces led to the construction of Elizabeth A. Armstrong and Laura T. Hamilton's *Paying for the Party*, one of the most generative books published in the sociology of education in years. This ethnography outlines the ways in which campus cultures focused on indulging upper-middle-class students may adversely affect the chances of college success for less privileged students counting on higher education to propel them into stable, happy lives.

Following 50 undergraduate women for five years, with repeated interviews conducted with (most) of the subjects over time, the authors utilized a team ethnographic approach to studying how women who all began life together in a single freshman dorm ended up years later. The role played by their social-class backgrounds was a key interest, and that analytic lens allowed the researchers to observe substantial variation in the types of students' experiences and in the resulting impacts. They found that at the midwestern university where the research was sited, students navigate college through several pathways, including the "party," "professional," and "mobility" pathways. For upper-middle-class party students (55% of the study's sample) college is a pathway to social reproduction; it is possible for these women to coast through college with little cost to their life ambitions, even if they treat the university as a "playground for the young" (p. 245). In contrast, less privileged students, who depend on the college to provide a route to upward mobility and professionalism, really need administrators and professors to provide an accessible, affordable college education with genuine intellectual engagement and strong workforce connections.

These needs, more often than not, appear to compete. The authors argue that dominant culture at colleges (and particularly universities) indulges preferences for the party pathway, effectively limiting prospects for social mobility for other students. One reason this happens is that the burden of "paying for the party" requires institutional spending on consumptive amenities (e.g., fitness and student centers, big-time sports teams, sororities and fraternities), adding substantially to rising tuition costs that rest on the shoulders of all students. While students who take pathways of emphasizing learning over socializing often receive some financial aid, it is rarely sufficient to offset those added costs, and thus they are left picking up the party tab—often with loans.

This argument is compelling, and one that should be explored in much greater detail in future research. It is common for college administrators to contend that they are allocating resources according to student and parent

demand, but we rarely have empirical evidence to assess that demand. The main limitation of this study is that like any ethnography, the authors are constrained to analyzing a particular place, space, time and set of people. Their powerful arguments are crafted based on a group of women living on a single floor of a residence hall of one midwestern university. Would their conclusions hold had they had the opportunity to study the wishes and desires of the prospective applicants for that university, instead of only those who attended? Do they hold for students who do not live in residence halls, and do they hold for men? Does the setting matter, the type of institution studied, or its location in the country? Legions of graduate students have their work cut out for them.

It would also be useful to deepen the thinking about the implications for higher education finance and accountability. The discussion of these concerns in the book is rather brief, and the policy recommendations relatively quixotic. But the observations it makes arrive at a critical moment, as we face another reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. When legislators consider whether and how to make changes to critical policies such as those governing the distribution of federal financial aid (and all of its loan programs), they should question what today's higher education really looks and feels like. Here, sociologists like Armstrong and Hamilton can play a critical role, helping them to see where the processes of inequality reside. When I testified this year to the U.S. Senate's Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Senator Tom Harkin (D-Iowa) asked me if life on campuses had really changed since he was a first-generation undergraduate years ago. In my response, I referred to *Paying for the Party*, describing the pulling apart of campus life along social class lines. The senator shook his head, surprised, asking, "What is happening here?" The insights this sociological work provides give us clues about where to look. They help to direct policy makers toward a focus on how students are advised, how majors are developed and selected, how teaching is constructed and enacted, and where provision of extracurricular opportunities undermines the academic mission of institutions. I recommend that anyone concerned with finding ways to ensure that higher education is the transformative space we have long hoped for read this text in full.

Top Student, Top School? How Social Class Shapes Where Valedictorians Go to College. By Alexandria Walton Radford. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013. Pp. xii+281. $85.00 (cloth); $27.50 (paper).

Joshua Klugman
Temple University

Children of affluent families are substantially more likely to enroll in prestigious and selective colleges, an inequality that has been growing in recent decades in the United States. Researchers have been disentangling this ef-