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"SPONSORED" AND "CONTEST" MODES OF SOCIAL REPRODUCTION
IN SELECTIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Abstract

Data collected on two community college allied health career programs are analyzed to explore if and how social reproduction occurs when admissions are made on a selective basis. Findings indicate that ethnic group inequalities are reinforced in both programs, but in different ways. In one program, non-whites are discriminated against at the admission stage; but when admitted, white and non-white students receive equivalent "sponsorship" toward completing the degree. In the other program, non-whites are not only less likely to be admitted, but among those admitted, non-whites are more likely to drop-out or be "cooled-out" before completing the "contest." The ideologies of implementation and legitimation drawn upon by key "gate-keepers" in each program appear to correspond to the systems of social reproduction evidenced in the respective program structures.
"SPONSORED" AND "CONTEST" MODES OF SOCIAL REPRODUCTION
IN SELECTIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS

The function of community colleges with respect to social mobility and/or social reproduction has been a frequent topic of discussion and research. This paper reviews and attempts to clarify some of the theoretical issues involved, while drawing upon data collected from applicants, students and gate-keepers in two vocational-technical track community college programs which have selective admission criteria. These programs offer insights into different mechanisms and ideologies for reproducing an unequal social structure.

Theoretical Issues

A major problem in perpetuating socially stratified societies involves the reproduction and legitimation of their existing structured inequalities. While maintaining the status quo constitutes a problem within a given generation, it becomes more problematic inter-generationally. For members of the new cohort to occupy positions in the social structure, some process of selection/allocation as well as instruction/socialization must occur. The problem, thus, includes the issue of how to distribute life chances. However, it also concerns the process of legitimating both a selection/allocation process and a political economic structure, which is characterized by an unequal distribution of wealth, power, and status. Thus, as Bourdieu and Passeron (1977:167) argue, the existence of individual social mobility does not really indicate whether political economies are being reproduced or transformed. Willis (1977:128) makes a similar point in distinguishing between individual mobility and class mobility.

Nevertheless, much of what has constituted inquiry in the field of sociology of education has focused on the extent of individual social mobility. This emphasis on mobility may stem from Schumpeter's view "that the key to understanding social
stratification was social mobility" (Johnson, 1977:93). Furthermore, the individualistic orientation may derive from western liberal ideology and/or from a failure to make "the distinction between the positions in the social structure and the individuals who occupy these positions" (Sorensen, 1975:66). This distinction calls attention to the fact that there is a political economic structure and cultural and ideological context within which individuals and groups are negotiating their lived experiences--experiences which are both enabled and constrained by this structure while at the same time helping to produce and reproduce this structure (see Giddens, 1979).

This is not to argue that individual social mobility is unimportant for the individual nor that the extent of social mobility is not a salient societal characteristic. It is only to clarify that social mobility is a subset of the broader concern of political economic and cultural reproduction and transformation (see Berlak and Berlak, 1981:259).

Although employing the term, "mobility," Turner (1960) attempted to focus our attention on the context rather than on rates of individual mobility. He discussed two conceptually distinct sets of "organizing folk norm(s) which define the accepted mode of upward mobility" (Turner, 1971:72). These organizing folk norms or ideologies, termed contest mobility and sponsored mobility, are considered "ideal types" which "are assumed to be present at least implicitly in people's thinking, guiding their judgments of what is appropriate" (Turner, 1971:72).

\textbf{Contest} mobility is a system in which elite status is the prize in an open contest and is taken by the aspirants own efforts. . . . Under \textbf{sponsored} mobility elite recruits are chosen by the established elites 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 (Turner, 1971:72).

The contest and sponsorship folk-norms or ideologies were seen by Turner (1960) at the time to be ascendant in the United States and England, respectively. One of the features of education systems informed by contest ideologies was a later point of
selection or stratification compared to a sponsorship system; and this feature was emphasized in comparing the United States' comprehensive secondary schools with the then dominant system of selective grammar and secondary modern institutions in England. However, such differences were projected to be diminishing and it was argued that less ascendant folk-norms always competed with the dominant ones.

Despite emphasizing mobility, Turner's (1971:77) discussion illuminates "the kinds of norms and values that serve the indicated purposes of social control in each class and throughout the society." Thus, contest and sponsorship ideologies help provide different forms of the views which Berlak and Berlak (1981:206) suggest are requisite for social reproduction.

Social stability depends in some measure upon widely shared views that some more than others have the right to engage in autonomous, meaningful work and to receive the monetary rewards and/or high status that are attached to such work; that particular forms of work deserve higher status--and greater financial reward; and that particular individuals are qualified to work at these valued occupations because they possess superior capacities and/or talents.

A similar point is made by Clark (1960:101) in stating that "democratic societies need not only to motivate achievement but also to mollify those denied it in order to sustain motivation in the face of disappointment and deflect resentment." Hopper (1971b:305) refers to this as the dilemma of "warming up" and "cooling out" and argues more generally that in "stratified societies . . . in order to 'rule' effectively and efficiently, the elite must strive to maintain at least a minimal semblance of allegiance and cooperation from less powerful groups" (1971a:98).

Hopper (1971a) offers a more comprehensive framework in which Turner's (1960) contest and sponsored mobility systems represent special cases. In addition to the contest and sponsorship ideology distinction, Hopper identifies another related set of
"ideologies of implementation," which concern how and when selection should occur, elitist and equalitarian.

An elitist ideology specifies, for example: that the maximum amount of education for each citizen should depend upon his future ability to contribute to economic productivity; that 'intelligence' and 'educability' are determined primarily by hereditary factors so that some people could not possibly benefit from education above a given minimum; and that those who appear to be bound for elite positions should be separated at an early age from those who appear to be bound for lower positions so that the former gain in their confidence to lead and the latter in their willingness to follow. . . . An egalitarian ideology specifies, for example: that the maximum amount of education is the right of every citizen regardless of his future ability to contribute to economic productivity; that 'intelligence' and 'educability' are determined primarily by environmental factors so that with proper instruction all people could benefit from a maximum of education; and those who appear to be bound for elite positions should work and play as long as possible with those who appear to be bound for lower positions so that the former will not lose touch with the 'common man' and the latter will not become overly subordinate and lacking in initiative (Hopper, 1971a:97).

Hopper also proposes two dimensions of "ideologies of legitimation," which "translate questions concerning the distribution of power into the question concerning the distribution of educational suitability" (1971a:99). The first dimension, represented by the poles of particularism and universalism, pertains to the question: who should be selected. At the particularistic end of this continuum "pupils should be selected primarily on the basis of their diffuse skills and only secondarily on their technical skills" (Hopper, 1971a:99); whereas at the universalistic pole achieved, technical skills are emphasized rather than ascribed, diffuse skills. The second dimension of ideologies
of legitimation, which addresses the question of why they should be selected, is characterized by poles of individualism and collectivism. The former pole sees the answer in terms of individuals' rights, while the latter stresses the society's or the collectivity's "need."

Hopper (1971b) clarifies that these ideologies are relevant to the total selection at various levels of the stratification system, and not just to the role of education in distinguishing elites from non-elites. He emphasizes that these ideologies are relevant to understanding non-mobility as well as mobility.¹ He also posits that although structures (e.g., the educational system) may not correspond exactly to the extant dominant ideologies, different poles of each ideological dimension have different implications for different social classes: lower classes may be "cooled-out," while upper classes are "warmed-up" and vice versa. Thus, "no society can ever resolve its warming-up:cooling-out dilemma with complete success" (Hopper, 1971b:326).

The Community College as a Context

The issue of warming-up and cooling-out provide a clear link to community colleges. For example, in discussing minorities in two-year colleges, Olivas (1979:3) echoes Hopper's quote above: "This dilemma of cooling out versus access may be unresolvable." The concept of "cooling-out" was first applied to two-year colleges by Clark (1960) and derived from "Goffman's concept (1952) of 'cooling out the mark'--con men convincing the sucker that it was his own fault for allowing himself to be deceived" (Erickson, 1975:66). In a continuing application of this concept to the community colleges, it has been argued that (particularly non-white and lower-class) students, who originally enter two-year institutions with aspirations for bachelors degrees, shift their objectives to shorter vocational-technical programs as a result of a subtle process in which they come to accept their "failure" as resulting from their own inadequacies (e.g., Karabel, 1972; Pinkus, 1980; Shea, 1981; Zwerling, 1976). Community colleges
thus appear to open up higher education opportunities, while at the same time taking pressure off the four-year institutions and tracking students away from higher status academic programs to vocational-technical ones. This process is said to reflect class and ethnic bias as much as, if not more than, differences in "ability." Erickson (1975) provides some indication of how "gate-keepers" may function to bias institutional access and degree completion against lower classes and minorities.

The conception of the community college as contributing to social and economic reproduction of structured inequalities is clearly at variance from the view of these institutions as having "open doors" which facilitate mobility, enabling the able from among the poor, minorities and those who were not successful in high school, a relatively inexpensive "second chance" to garner the wealth, power and status that may accrue to highly educated individuals. It is important to stress that such a view is held not only by administrators in selling their institutions' expansion, but also by many of the students who attend community colleges (Weis, 1982).

What kind of effect do community colleges have? Based upon their study of two-year and four-year institutions in the City University of New York, Alba and Lavin (1981) conclude that, when controlling for student's academic background, two-year institutions modestly elevate educational attainment ambitions. They emphasize that the extent of such a deterring effect varied among campuses, with some two-year institutions having a higher average proportion of students achieving a bachelor's degree within five years than some four-year institutions. Tinto (1975) similarly reports that even controlling for differences in student input characteristics, drop out is higher among community college entrants than those who began work at four-year colleges.

More relevant is the question of what effect community colleges have on white versus minority youth. Several studies have documented the greater tendency for blacks and other less powerful and wealthy ethnic groups (compared to whites) to attend two-year rather than four-year institutions (Olivas, 1979; Peng et al., 1977;
Tschechtelin, 1981; Weis, 1982). This is especially the case when full-time students are the focus of study. Thus, it appears that minorities are more likely to attend institutions which tend to limit further educational attainment. This puts another perspective on the rapid increase of black and other minority students in higher education in the last decades (Thomas, 1981; Willie and Cunnigen, 1981). One that is reinforced by Olivas' (1979) finding that, regardless of receipt of financial aid, minority students are more likely to withdraw from community colleges than their white counterparts.

However, research also shows that when both socioeconomic status and academic "ability" are held constant, minorities are more likely than whites to attend four-year institutions (Peng et al., 1977). This reversal is also found when the affect of ethnicity on higher education attendance generally (Thomas, 1981) and on persistence in higher education generally (Cross and Astin, 1981) is considered.

We must be cautious, though, in interpreting such results. For instance, the predictive validity of aptitude or achievement tests for black performance in higher education has been challenged (see Willie and Cunnigen, 1981:189) and Duran (1983:93) concludes that college admission tests predict college grades more accurately for "Anglos" than for Hispanics. "As suggested by Bailey (1978) and others, the use of standardized tests may simply be a support or formal prop for maintaining the status quo" (Morris, 1981). Thus, controlling for "ability" so operationalized may not provide a valid assessment of whether equality of opportunity is being provided, in that ascriptive factors are an influence, if only indirectly.

Controlling for socioeconomic status (SES) raises similar issues. SES in such an analysis is an intervening variable, not a prior cause of both ethnicity and college attendance and persistence. Thus, the zero-order association between ethnicity and college is not to be dismissed as spurious in that the total effect of ethnicity on college remains in the direction of disadvantage for minorities. Minorities are less
likely to be economically advantaged in the current political economic structure and this is translated into educational disadvantage. Moreover, SES and ethnicity are both suspect dimensions with respect to the reproduction of structured inequalities in societies. The point being that the reversal findings (discussed above) point to inequality of educational opportunities among ethnic groups and "social classes," although the latter dimension is more strongly involved. That blacks are less likely to succeed in higher education because they lack the currently accepted cultural capital (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) and/or the financial resources does not explain away the existence and perpetuation of structured inequalities.

Focus of Current Study

While research has focused on mobility and reproduction issues comparing (a) the populations in four-year institutions with those in two-year institutions and (b) the populations in academic and vocational-technical programs in the community college, this study focuses on these issues only in the context of the vocational-technical track of community colleges. This enables an exploration of the nature processes of social reproduction at another level of the educational system. The two-year associate of science degree programs, which prepare individuals for entry into allied health "professions," do not constitute the bottom of the vocational-technical track of the community college. Indeed, given that admission to these vocational-technical programs is made on a selective basis, and that the careers for which these programs provide entry are "respectable" and "reasonably" well paid, the programs may occupy a level in the tracking system near the academic, transfer programs. These programs may, therefore, represent a site in the community colleges in which majority and minority individuals struggle to attain the relatively high rewards associated with becoming an allied health worker (Olivas, 1983: personal communication). In any case, this study's findings may have general relevance for the community college of the future, since
Watkins (1982) reports that the existence of selective admissions is increasing in community college programs.

The focus here is (1) on how minorities fare in gaining access to and in graduating from two selective entry programs in a community college situated in the Houston metropolitan area and (2) on how this situation is accounted for by key gate-keepers, the directors of the programs. Thus, we seek to illuminate the structural effects and ideologies connected with each program. Following Turner (1960) and Hopper (1971a and 1971b) these issues will be discussed in terms of contest and sponsorship modes of social reproduction.

Method

To address the issues outlined above, data were collected from official student record files of all individuals who applied for admission to each of the two allied health programs during the years 1972 through 1977. While such a sampling approach can be subject to problems of rigor (Shea, 1974:15), the files in these two programs appear to have been well maintained and were reasonably complete. (Two other selective allied health programs in this institution were excluded from the study because their records contained less complete data.) For the 227 and 84 applicants to Programs A and B, the only relevant information which was missing were scores on the Developmental Aptitude Test (DAT) for 9% and 29% of the respective program applicant pools. The samples on which data analyses were conducted, therefore, are reduced to 206 and 59 cases, respectively.2

The following variables were developed from information in the files:

a) ADMIT - a dummy variable indicating whether or not the applicant was admitted to the program (1 or 0);

b) AGE - the chronological age in years;
c) DAT - the number of subscales derived from the Developmental Aptitude Test for which a respondent scored at or above the 20th percentile based on national norms (0-6);

d) GRAD - a dummy variable indicating whether or not the applicant completed the program (1 or 0);

e) RACE - a dummy variable (0 or 1) distinguishing between majority (whites) or minority (predominantly blacks with some Hispanics);

f) SEX - a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent was male or female (0 or 1).

Table 1 presents the relevant descriptive statistics for each variable and their intercorrelations.

Table 1 about here

These variables were included in regression analyses to estiamate parameters for the path model illustrated in Figure 1. The path model coefficients were obtained for each program separately by regressing: 1) DAT on AGE, RACE, and SEX; 2) ADMIT on DAT, AGE, RACE; and 3) GRAD on ADMIT, DAT, AGE, RACE, and SEX. Coefficients were considered significant if the F-ratios for the b's and betas had less than a .05 probability of being equal to zero. While the major interest herein was on the effect of RACE (net of DAT), AGE and SEX were included because of their potential relevance to admission and graduation processes.

Data were also collected through semi-structured, individual interviews with directors of both programs conducted after the data obtained from applicants' files were initially analyzed. These individuals, who functioned as admissions officers for and taught key courses in their respective programs, were encouraged to discuss, among other things, the following issues:
1. In what rank order of importance did they consider the kinds of information they had available to make admission or rejection decisions.

2. Were accepted students ever encouraged to drop out and why?

3. What distinguishes the successful student (one who completes the program) from the unsuccessful student.

These tape-recorded interviews were then transcribed and content analyzed to assess the types of ideologies of implementation and legitimation which informed their comments.

Findings

Table 1 indicates that minorities applicants are less likely than their majority counterparts to be accepted into and graduate from both Program A and Program B. The relationships are somewhat stronger in Program B than Program A, with the zero-order correlations between RACE and ADMIT being -.44 and -.64 and between RACE and GRAD being -.34 and -.50 for Program A and Program B, respectively.

The linear regression analysis results presented in Table 2 enable us to scrutinize the functioning of these two programs in more detail with respect to how majority and minority applicants fare in the admission and graduation processes. For example, we can ascertain whether the majority applicants' advantage can be accounted for in terms of differential "ability," i.e., performance on the DAT. We can also see whether the biasing effect against minority applicants occurs only at the point of admission or whether, once admitted, minorities are also more likely to drop out or be "cooled out" before graduation.

Table 2 about here
For Program A one observes that, after controlling for DAT as well as AGE and SEX, RACE still has a negative effect on ADM (beta = -.13). Even among applicants with similar "aptitudes," minorities are less likely to be admitted than their majority peers. This direct effect of RACE on ADMIT is observed despite the fact that the director of Program A ranked race tenth out of eleven characteristics in terms of their importance in such decisions (see Giles, 1981:52). Put another way: admissions decisions seem to be racially and/or class biased even beyond the level of such biasing attributable to the use of DAT scores as the primary criterion for admission. Note the effect of RACE on DAT (beta = -.47) and the effect of DAT on an ADMIT (beta = .64).

Looking at the results for Program A of regressing GRAD on the other variables leads to the conclusion that RACE has no significant, direct effect on GRAD (beta = -.04; F = .48). Thus, once the biasing factor of using DAT scores for admission decisions and the additional disadvantages of being minority for gaining admission (discussed above) have had their impact, minority and majority applicants are equally likely or unlikely to successfully complete the program requirements.

With respect to the distinctions of contest and sponsored modes of social reproduction, Program A seems to be structured as a sponsorship system. Selection and non-selection for sponsorship is done early--at the point of admission--and from that point on success is not directly related to suspect categories such as race. Nevertheless, notice that the early biasing features, represented in the model by DAT and ADMIT, do have a direct effect on GRAD (betas = .17 and .48, respectively).

For Program B a somewhat different structure is apparent (see Figure 1 for an illustration of the structural differences). RACE has a significant, direct effect on ADMIT, controlling for AGE, SEX and DAT (beta = -.34). Thus, to a greater extent than in Program A admission decisions appear to be racially and/or class biased. Minority applicants are less likely than their majority counterparts to be admitted,
even after controlling for the biasing factor of DAT scores. This is despite the fact that race was seen to be the least important of eleven pieces of information on which to make admission decisions. Notice also that RACE has a significant, direct effect on DAT (beta = -.62) and DAT has a significant, direct effect on ADMIT (beta = .48).

Figure 1 about here

Moreover, in Program B, RACE has a direct effect on GRAD, when controlling for the effects of AGE, SEX, DAT, and ADMIT (beta = -.33). That is, minorities who make it through the biasing effects of admission (both DAT and ADMIT factors) are more likely to drop out or be "cooled-out" during the program before completing requirements and graduating. Note also that DAT has no direct effect on GRAD (beta = .06; F = .16), indicating that "aptitude" is irrelevant to graduation once admission decisions narrow the variation in the student population. Thus, Program B exhibits systemic features of both sponsored and contest modes of social reproduction.

As one of the authors discussed with the program directors about the processes of being admitted and pursuing a degree, it became evident that the two programs were being informed by different ideologies of implementation and legitimation.

Ideologies in Program A

Comments made by the director of Program A seemed to derive fairly consistently from a sponsored ideology of implementation; thus, corresponding to the early, sponsorship-like system of selection illustrated (above) in the path analyses. When asked about the relative importance of various information available to make admission decisions, this director replied:

I think probably DAT, number 1, because if they are below our criterion we do not consider them. But if they are low in one area, for example, math,
and everything else is at criterion [greater than or equal to the 20th percentile], then we will go ahead and interview the student and recommend they take a math course. [And then take it (the DAT) again.] So if all the scores are high on DAT, we probably would go on and admit them.

The emphasis at the outset is on applying rigorously a "criterion of supported merit," the DAT scores. If this merit is not evidenced by applicants, they may be encouraged to demonstrate it another way--through college course performance and/or retaking the DAT, but not as a student in the selective program. Toward the end of the interview, when asked if there were any "weaknesses in the formula used to make [admission] decisions," the director did communicate some uncertainty about the predictive validity of the DAT scores: "Only that there is some real question as to how the DAT correlates with the program. It looks as if it does, but we don't know." However, this is the only remark which contrasts with an overall statement that admission decisions distinguish on the basis of given ability. More in line with the director's general view is the following:

Q: Do you feel the courses are in some measure geared down so that the student who began his [program] with a poor background could catch up?

A: They really start right in at the college level. We try to help the student, but we recommend that they pursue his own remedial work [often before being admitted to the program].

Furthermore, this director never makes explicit reference to effort or motivation, even in discussing the nongraduates among those admitted. And although not totally clear, one also gets a glimpse of an elitist (versus egalitarian) ideology of implementation in the director's remarks. This is evidenced in the director's discussion of the DAT (above), but also in the dialogue below concerning the role of finances.

Q: Can you think of how many candidates have been excluded on the basis of financial reasons?
A: They exclude themselves; we don't do it.

Q: You don't do it?

A: Uh-uh. We explain the costs to them and how the program is run. We'll go ahead and schedule them. Then they start and realize . . . many of them will find the financial ability of work and school is just too much. We try to warn them of this in their interviews. We recommend they not work.

Program A's director seems to draw upon an individualist ideology of legitimation. No reference is given to making admission or program success ratings based on the needs of some collectivity. In terms of whether selection should be based upon particularistic, ascribed, diffuse skills or universalistic, achieved technical skills—the second dimension of ideologies of legitimation—it is less clear. For instance, the director suggests that the kinds of ascriptive features which might be taken into account in the interview processes (see Erickson, 1975) are not really relied upon to make admission decisions.

A: If their DAT scores were low, we didn't interview them. If DAT scores are low . . . we don't put too much weight on data other than those scores.

Q: So, if, for instance, their DAT scores were at levels that were acceptable . . . then a low interview score would not exclude them?

A: No, [that's right, it would not exclude them].

I ideologies in Program B

Program B's director's remarks offer a different ideological portrait. For example, the director seems to be informed by a mixture of elements from both ends of both dimensions of ideologies of implementation: contest versus sponsored and egalitarian versus elitist. This director draws on the sponsored ideology in stressing the importance of DAT as an admission criteria.
We had an admissions committee which did look at each one of those criteria. I suspect we felt that the major criteria that we could evaluate objectively was the Differential Aptitude Test. . . . We feel that there is a rather high correlation between percentiles . . . and how one does. And, I think the DAT, we'll say, there's some relevance toward IQ. . . . We have never accepted anyone with less than a 20th percentile.

Nevertheless, the director of Program B indicates that his conception is also based upon elements from the contest ideology-emphasizing motivation-as he discusses the predictive validity of the DAT for minorities. (Recall, however, that when controlling for "ability" minority applicants are even less likely to be admitted in Program B than in Program A.)

The noted pattern is that if I take a Caucasian and he has low scores on the DAT, less than the 20th percentile, I think there's much more of a correlation between his, then, not doing well in our program, then with a minority. I still think the DAT and all the entrance exams are somewhat racist and biased depending on the kind of high school you came from. And so I would say that the DAT scores or ACT or SAT are less meaningful for minorities. And we've seen a number of minorities, that had fairly low scores but were accepted on conditional approval that they do better in coursework here, do really well. And so I think, especially minorities, the motivation sometimes will mask over the lack of development, uh, at the high school level.

This contest-ideology-type concern with motivation or effort is also evidenced with respect to the entire applicant pool. Below Program B's director discusses other information viewed to be important in admission decisions.

I think, obviously, past experience is important . . . If we have them [letters of reference] from a department head and medical director and who says,
"This person was an outstanding technician," I think there is great relevance in the fact that they will then have some motivation to further their education.

Nevertheless, a few moments later he reaffirms some allegiance to the "criterion of supposed merit" central to the sponsored ideology.

I would then say again, though, that if anyone made less than a 20th percentile, that standard measure would then limit them from coming into the program, even if they were given high evaluations by their department head.

Program B's director seems to draw upon an egalitarian ideology (often tied to a contest ideology) in discussing the nature of the program experience. Below the director indicates that he favors a maximum amount of education for all (or at least those admitted) and that he views the differences in accomplishment as more environmentally derived than inherited. One also sees some reference to the "cooling-out" process.

We have no control over the Science Department. And ... the Fall semester we don't see our freshmen group of ... students at all. The Spring semester, starting in January, I teach an intro. class. So in my mind, if they couldn't make it through the core science courses ... math, and health sciences, we really don't want them in intro. ... But once we get them in the intro. that spring semester I measure them myself as an instructor in intro. And I find who the better students are and who the ones are who are having trouble. They haven't for the most part dropped out of the program yet; and, of course, we try to consult and work with them in that, especially in the spring semester, when I have them in intro. ... Well, I think the vast majority of academic problems occur not because of their IQ level but because of their motivation. And, so, we tend to work, if they make greater than 20 percent on verbal reasoning and numerical ability, we feel as if
they have a high enough IQ to get through our program. The problem is motivation. Either they have personal problems or, uh, whatever the problem is.

At another point in the interview, Program B's director seems to support a position, which is characteristic of the elitist ideology, that maximum education should be provided only for those who will be the most "productive." In discussing what it takes to be a successful student, he states:

I think we can all learn to turn a knob, but if we don't know what we're doing to a patient and don't evaluate that patient effectively; and give a five-minute treatment instead of a ten-minute treatment, because we want to drink a little bit of extra coffee; I think that's an attitudinal problem and a communications problem.

The reference in the above quote to "turning a knob" and "attitudinal" and "communication" problems signals Program B's director's position on one of the ideologies of legitimation: particularistic versus universalistic. The emphasis on diffuse skills rather than technical skills, which locates the views at the particularistic pole of this ideological dimension, is also illustrated below as the director continued to clarify what is meant by "motivation."

We feel that it goes back to the same old thing; and that being they're not positive they want to be [allied health professionals]. . . . We need a rather high level of maturity in the program . . . The vast majority of our students don't get into trouble at clinical or at work because of their working knowledge or content knowledge. They get in trouble because of communication skills. . . . That's a problem: as they become younger the maturity, just communication skills alone, getting along with other people and understanding the importance of adapting under stress conditions. And I think as one gets older we tend to mellow a little bit and learn how to
adapt better. So older students tend to do better. . . . I would say that age certainly plays a great role. . . . The typical successful student in my opinion can be an A, B, or C student . . . as long as they have good communication skills. The president of our national organization . . . said a year ago . . . the single most important problem [we] had was communication skills. And that was with physicians and nurses and fellow therapists and patients. . . . And we hope we won't be graduating people who aren't mature enough to give good treatments. And that's why the clinicals make our program. That's why the subjective evaluation of psychomotor traits for instance, . . . you know, and attitudinal traits are so important.

One wonders, however, whether terms such as "maturity," "communication skills" and "attitudinal traits" refer more to cultural distinctions (minority versus majority) rather than to developmental or age-related variations. That differences in ethnic styles of communication and interaction (see Erickson, 1975) may be the issue is evidenced by the facts that AGE has no significant, direct effects on either ADMIT or GRAD, while RACE does on both (see Table 2 and Figure 1).

Finally, the director of Program B seems to be informed primarily by an individualist ideology of legitimation. He does not refer to any collectivity's needs in administering the admission or program completion processes. The possible exception would be his reference (quoted above) to patients suffering from being given a five- rather than a ten-minute treatment because of a therapist's desire for a coffee break. Even this statement, though, is couched in terms of individual patients.

Conclusions

Pincus (1980:356) concludes his critique of "the false promises of the community colleges" by stating
It is important that working class and minority students understand that vocational education in community colleges benefits their employers more than themselves. . . . If community college educators want to help working class and minority students, they should provide them with a historical and political context from which to understand the dismal choices they face. Based on the research reported here, we might add that educators should also illuminate the ways in which ideologies and human action help to sustain or alter that political economic context.

In this paper we have shown how within the community college sector programs involving selective entry, admission decisions are biased against minorities even beyond that which can be attributable to the biasing effects of using standardized "aptitude" test scores as an admission criteria. While this admission bias, in a sense, ends the story for one of the programs studied, in the other, the experience of the program seems to result in minorities dropping-out or being "cooled-out" before graduation at a higher rate than non-minority students with similar aptitude. Program A thus represents a sponsored-type system of social reproduction, while Program B seems to combine features of both sponsored and contest systems.

We have also seen that the key gate-keepers in the respective programs seem to draw on ideologies corresponding to the structure of the program. The director of Program A evinces elements drawn from sponsorship and elitist ideologies of implementation. With regard to ideologies of legitimation, this director seems to hold an individualistic orientation, and seems to include elements from both particularistic and universalistic poles. Program B's director provides an even more eclectic ideological position, just as his program structure represents a mixed type. This director draws on both sponsored and contest as well as both elitist and egalitarian ideologies of implementation. In terms of ideologies of legitimation, he espouses views associated
with universalism, but more so with particularism, while also emphasizing individualistic
criteria concerning why stratifying decisions should be made.

The correspondence between the program's structural effects and at least the
sponsored and contest ideologies of implementation is significant. It indicates how
gate-keepers' ideas may reinforce and be reinforced by the structural effects of a
program. More critically, it begins to indicate how structured inequalities are not only
perpetuated but also legitimated. For instance, it is not known how gate-keepers
represent their decisions and actions to successful or unsuccessful applicants and students.
However, we would not be surprised if Program B's director communicated to applicants
the liberal interpretation of standardized test scores -- that the test was not as valid
for minority students, while at the same time the director's focus on "motivation", for
example, led minority applicants to be excluded to an even greater extent than would
be the case if only test scores were used. Furthermore, it would not be surprising if
the director of Program B incorporated the notion of "communication skills" and
"maturity" in complimenting successful students and in trying to mollify those denied
success.

To the extent that this occurs and to the extent that applicants and students
internalize such ideas, we are witnessing a powerful process. Not only is the structure
operating against minorities, but majority and minority students (and others) may be
learning to accept it unproblematically. Hence, in this specific situation, an unequal
social structure may be sustained and given legitimacy.
End notes

1. Turner (1971:77) also mentioned "immobility" in passing, but Hopper (1971b) highlights the issue more, even including "non-mobility" in the title of his manuscript.

2. The reason for the high level of missing DAT scores is unclear, especially given the import attached to these scores by both program directors; each rated this the most important criterion used in their admission decisions. What is even more surprising is the fact that a higher proportion of rejected applicants (97% and 92%) than accepted applicants (88% and 63%) had DAT scores in their files in Programs A and B, respectively. Part of this discrepant situation can be accounted for by the availability of other measures of academic performance, e.g., ACT scores, high school or college grades, which were sometimes available (see Giles, 1981:55-66). It is also significant to note that minority applicants were less likely than majority applicants to be admitted without DAT scores in their files, although the admission percentages for minority applicants (86.7% and 83.3%) and for majority applicants (100% and 100%) were quite high for Program A and Program B, respectively. (See footnote 3 for implications of including cases which did not have DAT scores.)

3. When the cases excluded from the correlation and regression analyses because of missing DAT score information are included in the analysis the correlations do not change dramatically. The zero-order correlations between RACE and ADMIT become -.42 and -.53 and between RACE and GRAD become -.30 and -.57, when including all 227 and 84 cases for Programs A and B, respectively.

4. This finding differs from that reported in Giles (1981:76) where no significant, direct effect between RACE and ADMIT was observed (beta = -.14; F_ = 1.27). Additional reanalisys of the data for this paper (not presented) indicate that the
differences in findings cannot be accounted for by Giles' (1981) inclusion of additional variables in the regression equation.

5. One might question whether performing at or above the 20th percentile represents a rigorous application of standards of "supposed merit."

6. Results from the path analyses (see Figure 1) show that DAT is the only factor (besides ADMIT) to directly affect GRAD, although the strength of the effect is not large (beta = .17).
TABLE 1: Correlations Among and Descriptive Statistics for Variables in Path Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program A (206 cases)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMIT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program B (59 cases)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMIT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2: Results of Regression Analyses for Program A and Program B (Beta Coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Variables in Regression Equations</th>
<th>Dependent Variables for Respective Program Equations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIT</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respective F ratio is significantly different from zero beyond the .05 level.
**Respective F ratio is significantly different from zero beyond the .01 level.
Figure 1: Path Diagrams for Program A and Program B

Program A

AGE \(-.21\) RACE \(-.18\) SEX \(.73\)

Program B

AGE \(-.34\) RACE \(-.33\) SEX \(.55\)
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