International Journal of Education, Management, and Technology

e-ISSN : 3026-5444
p-ISSN : 3026-4200

Index : Harvard, Boston, Sydney University, Dimensions, Lens, Scilit, Semantic, Google, etc

https://doi.org/10.58578/IJEMT.v1i1.1956

THE SELECTION OF WHETHER TO ENTER THE UNIVERSITY OR THE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY IS A DECISION THAT DISPLAYS ONE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD KNOWLEDGE

Supala
University of Muhammadiyah Bandung, Indonesia
supala@umbandung.ac.id

Article Info:

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Sep 23, 2023	Oct 10, 2023	Oct 13, 2023	Oct 23, 2023

Abstract

For the past fifty years, the dynamics of guidance have been at the centre of social, political and educational concerns. Many researchers have conceptualized the determinants at work in the development of orientation choices: Bourdieu and Passeron adopt a sociological point of view with their model of social reproduction, while others develop this process of orientation from a more psychological angle, notably with the notion. We wish to contribute to the effort to build knowledge by developing an explanatory model of career choices at the time of entry into higher education. This study involves 265 participants, including 147 students enrolled in the first year of IUT GEA and 118 students enrolled in the first year of an AES degree at the university. There are sociobiographical differences between our two populations. Not surprisingly, our population comes from a higher socio-professional background. For both AES and GEA, the father's level of education is mostly equal to or higher than the baccalaureate with percentages of 56.5% and 66.9% respectively ($\chi 2(2) = 4.25$, $p = .04$). This is also the case for the mother's level of education, with percentages of 57.4% and 67.6% respectively ($\chi 2(2) = 12.68$, $p = .01$). These results also show us that the level of education of both fathers and mothers is, in each case, higher for GEA

IJEMT Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

students The results of this research allow us to affirm that the choices of orientation in the IUT GEA or at the university section AES at the time of entry into higher education are determined by the interrelation of socio-biographical and psychological differences. In particular, this study reveals important distinctions between these two categories of students in their forms of relationship to knowledge, differences that explain their choices of orientation. These choices underpin the projection of the individual into his or her future professional and social integration. However, the position he hopes to occupy in the training landscape, and in particular his sector, suggests a number of future social and professional positions that will be "possible" or "unattainable.

Keywords: Guidance dynamics, Educational concerns, Sociobiographical differences, IUT GEA and AES degree students

INTRODUCTION

For the past fifty years, the dynamics of guidance have been at the centre of social, political and educational concerns. Many researchers have conceptualized the determinants at work in the development of orientation choices: Bourdieu and Passeron adopt a sociological point of view with their model of social reproduction, while others develop this process of orientation from a more psychological angle, notably with the notion. We wish to contribute to the effort to build knowledge by developing an explanatory model of career choices at the time of entry into higher education (Lempert, 2019).

Over the past fifty years, we have observed what Romainville describes as a "student surge", a university that has grown from 214,000 students in the early 1960s to nearly one and a half million today. This incessant increase in the number of students is the result of policies initiated in the 1990s, including the stated desire to ensure that 80% of an age group obtains the baccalaureate. Logically, these baccalaureate holders continue their studies in higher education. Thus, overall in 2012, 78% of baccalaureate holders enrolled in four main paths: universities (32%), technicians' sections Higher education institutions (STS) (18.6%), university institutes of technology (IUT) (7.3%), preparatory classes for the grandes écoles (CPGE) (6.6%) (DEPP-RERS, 2013).

As we can see, these new baccalaureate holders are very unevenly distributed, in particular because of a predefined number of places open in IUTs, STS and CPGEs. We

are particularly interested in the choice made by two student populations, those enrolled in tertiary IUT, with a GEA specialization in business and administration management, and students in AES (economic and social administration) enrolled at university. These two populations have the merit of being comparable in several respects. These courses offer a program with similar content on various points but do not "recruit" according to the same modalities. The IUT is a selective and professional course that delivers the DUT at the end of two years of study. On the other hand, university is a non-selective course that allows students to continue their studies on the LMD principle (bachelor's, master's, doctorate). At the start of the 2010-2011 academic year, 1,437,104 students enrolled in university. Of these, 20,244 have joined the IUT GEA, and 39,750 students have enrolled in the university in AES (Charbuty & Abdulazeez, 2021).

The objectives set by each also differ. The DUT (University Diploma of Technology) theoretically allows for rapid professional integration, while university allows the pursuit of long studies. However, two out of three DUT graduates continue their studies. In addition, in AES, from the first year, multiple repetitions, reorientations and dropouts are noted. These paradoxes have led us to ask ourselves the following questions: what are the reasons that push baccalaureate holders to choose university or IUT? If this is the only duration of studies, how can we explain what drives two-thirds of DUT graduates to continue their studies?

Today, more than ever, and since the massification of higher education, guidance is at the centre of all debates. School guidance refers to "the set of psychological, psychosocial and social processes that make it possible for people to young people in school are assigned to certain training courses rather than others". This clarification shows the importance of the sector in the dynamics of guidance. This is why, in our work, we study the processes at play in higher education guidance by highlighting the specificities of vocational courses (IUT) and traditional university courses.

The term "sector" gives rise to the term "selection". The subjects then make choices of orientation that will lead them to consider a certain number of courses. As Guichard (1999) points out, guidance after the baccalaureate is a unique case in relation to the practices in force in secondary education. Indeed, this is the only time when the orientation procedures no longer depend on proposals made by the class councils but on the decisions of selection boards of host institutions or on the free choice of each

individual. So how do you make your career choices? General, technological and vocational baccalaureate holders do not go into the same courses, and cannot enrol in them with the same ease depending on the case.

Social origin also remains a determining factor in training choices. Only fifteen per cent of AES students come from the socio-professional category (CSP) executive and higher intellectual professions (this is the university discipline that receives the fewest students from this CSP), while 22.8% come from tertiary IUT. These elements, which can be described as sociological aspects of the choice of orientation, do not in any way explain the differences observed and do not inform us about the basis of the choice of orientation. Interesting answers are provided by a so-called "vocationist" approach to guidance. For the proponents of the latter, the project would have a mobilizing aspect likely to explain the choices of training.

For these vocational models, the choice is made through the elaboration of a project and the rational definition of the means necessary for its realization. While it is true that disciplinary choices cannot be dissociated from professional projects, it would be a mistake to think that the two are completely overlapping. Indeed, on the one hand, numerous studies (Caille, Lemaire, & Vrolant, 2002; Lemaire, 2004, 2007) show that, on average, all courses combined, interest in the content of studies is the reason most often given by all new baccalaureate holders for the choice of their training (56.5%). "The attraction for job opportunities and the professional project come next, but the relative importance given to these two motivations is significantly different depending on the chosen field. Those who join an IUT favour the "profitability" of their training on the labour market (51.7%). On the other hand, those who go to university give the greatest importance to their professional project: one in two university entrants declares that they have enrolled in their course for this reason".

On the other hand, the professional project is no longer the guarantor of academic success, even if it seems commonly accepted that the transition from secondary to higher education is facilitated by the student's personal project, which then becomes a factor of motivation and therefore of success (Abdel-Basset et al., 2020).In the difficult context of the university, it would make it possible to draw from within oneself the motivation to hold on to the difficulty linked to the very organization of the institution.

However, many authors question this injunction to project in order to succeed, arguing that guidance is often made more by constraint (orientation by default due to poor academic results) or in the continuity of a previous success than by taste or disciplinary interest. These results should also be put into perspective with empirical studies that show the absence of a causal link between project, motivation. Having a clearly defined professional project is not necessarily a guarantee to make a choice of study that suits the student and in which he or she will succeed.

Finally, an overly specific professional project can often lead to academic failure, insofar as the knowledge offered seems too far removed from a practical application and know-how that can be directly transferred to a work situation. In this sense, we can speak of an "injunction to the project". that is both "paradoxical", because the choice is often made by constraint, but also "unfounded", because the student's focus on a professional project sometimes does so missing out on a "positive" relationship with academic knowledge. The existence of a professional project does not guarantee an intellectual interest in the content of the courses themselves and is not likely to ensure the relationship to knowledge that is implicitly expected and valued by the courses. the project is virtual, the choice of orientation is a decision-making process, based more on intellectual interest in the content of the training, the feeling of ability, and the characteristics of the course of study. However, this does not mean that the orientation processes can be regarded as conduct without motives (FitzGerald et al., 2020).

These approaches, which link the choice of orientation and the professional project, are increasingly discussed by models of the relationship to knowledge, which emphasize the paradoxes of the injunction to the project. The relationship to knowledge takes into account the forms of mobilization of the student in an institution (in this case, the university or the IUT) where the issue is that of knowledge. It refers to a "relationship to the world as a set of situations and relationships in which an embodied, active, temporal subject endowed with an affectivity is engaged".

In this way, we consider not only the set of objective determinants that come into play at the time of choice (such as the subject's social and family contexts), but also the way in which the subject appropriates them. Over the past twenty-five years, this notion of the relationship to knowledge has become a major concern for all those interested in educational issues. If, for some, it's a "new paradigm" that appears to be revolutionary, For

others, it is a promising concept because it allows us to go beyond certain debates and thus open up new perspectives. However, many agree that it is a notion whose "contours seem rather poorly delineated, while its heuristic power is not very questionable".

To speak of a 'social relationship to knowledge' thus makes it possible to designate 'the different and antagonistic position of social classes in the production process and not an individual difference in innate or acquired aptitude'. However, it is not possible to limit oneself to 'an analysis in terms of social positions', but also to take into account 'the history of the subject, that of its construction and its transformations'" (Laterrasse & Brossais, 2006, p. 382). This is why it is a question of studying the situations in which the elements of this relationship to knowledge are implemented, seeking to understand the meaning that students give, as subjects, to their activities: what they retain from them, what they value or reject, what underlies their greater or lesser mobilization. The question of meaning is the keystone of this approach (Frantzeskaki et al., 2019).

Charlot reports on three conceptualizations of the notion of relationship to knowledge. An identity-based relationship to knowledge (why learn?): "learning makes sense with reference to the subject's history, his expectations, his points of reference, his conceptions of life, his relationships with others, the image he has of himself and the image he wants to give to others". It corresponds to the life you want to lead, the job you want to do. An epistemic relationship to knowledge (what is learning?): this relationship refers to the very nature of the act of learning and the fact of knowing. "The epistemic relation is defined in reference to the very nature of the activity that the subject puts under the terms learning, namely: to learn, is to have what type of activity?").

A social relationship to knowledge: "there is not the identity of the subject on the one hand and his social being on the other," the two are inseparable, the relationship to knowledge is inseparably social and singular. By condensing the identity, epistemic, and social dimensions of the relationship to knowledge, Charlot accounts for the conditions under which knowledge is appropriated by a singular subject. Rochex also emphasizes that there is a real challenge in contact with learning. Learning activities always have an objective and a subjective side, which are inseparable and irreducible. In order for the subject to appropriate knowledge, he or she must deploy a cognitive activity that is always inscribed in "singular biographical constructions, in subjective and intersubjective dynamics: they thus always carry out, in the subjective history of the learner, a movement

other than that of their social efficiency, without losing any of their objective content". Any relationship to knowledge therefore refers to the subject's history, his expectations, his conception of life or the image he has of himself. This corresponds to "the way in which knowledge takes on meaning by reference to models, expectations, identifying landmarks, the life one wants to lead, the job one wants to do. The relationship of meaning between the individual and knowledge is rooted in the subject's history in the making, and this, for the most part, without the subject's knowledge". In secondary education, knowledge is decontextualized and fragmented. At university, young students experience a period of institutional and intellectual "affiliation". Five constantly interacting dimensions indicate the potential difficulties that students may encounter in the appropriation of knowledge and that are likely to come into play in their choice of training (Shrestha et al., 2019).

The first dimension refers to the meaning of statements or concepts. If the student privileges the pragmatic dimension of meaning and is unable to access decontextualized thought content, he remains in a "pointillist and quantitative vision of knowledge". On the other hand, the perception of a coherence of knowledge between them allows the student to access problematization.

The second dimension refers to the representation of knowledge. The teacher's practice consists in promoting perspective, debate and problematization. But many young students are waiting for knowledge that will make use of their future professional practice. For them, knowledge only makes sense when it is clearly linked to a professional practice. On the other hand, some students may claim that a discipline is worthy of interest even if it does not seem directly useful to them. The third dimension refers to the didactic contract, that is, the relationship that determines what each partner, the teacher and the student, will be responsible for managing. Ideally, therefore, there should be a reciprocal commitment that sets out the expectations of each other, and thus legitimizing behaviour. These expectations can sometimes be perceived as opaque (Parnell, 2011).

The fourth dimension refers to the relationship between identity and knowledge. The relationship to knowledge can become dependent on the subject's convictions or ambitions, which can imply logics of self-affirmation, opposition, avoidance or withdrawal. The last dimension refers to the affective relationship to knowledge. Some students perceive knowledge only in its affective dimension and make this the condition of learning. The relationship to knowledge can thus be experienced by the student through an affective

relationship with the teacher. From this perspective, the relationship to knowledge is relevant for understanding the representations and motivations at work in this orientation dynamic, but also the specificities of the relationship of these young baccalaureate holders to knowledge which, in our opinion, are decisive in their decision-making. We use the notion of the relationship to knowledge to explain students' choices of orientation at university. It is indeed a mediating concept that has the advantage of linking the subject and knowledge and therefore of taking into account the subjective characteristics as well as the constraints inherent in the appropriation of knowledge. These include not only the factors of student orientation traditionally studied by sociologists, but also the necessities related to the production and exercise of knowledge (disciplinary divisions, requirements related to the transmission and production of scientific knowledge). Conducting our study in terms of the relationship to knowledge therefore allows us to take into account several parameters that contribute to the subjects' disciplinary choices. In order to explain the choices of orientation, we will be particularly interested in the reasons for the choice, the expectations with regard to the discipline and the representation of the university. We therefore hypothesize that the choice of orientation at the time of entry into an IUT GEA or a university in the AES section depends on the interrelationship of sociobiographical and subjective variables. More specifically, we believe that academic characteristics (such as the type of baccalaureate and the mention obtained), the characteristics of the courses, the types of relationship to knowledge and the relationship to the institution influence the choices of orientation(Lăzăroiu et al., 2020).

METHODS

This study involves 265 participants, including 147 students enrolled in the first year of IUT GEA and 118 students enrolled in the first year of an AES degree at the university. There are sociobiographical differences between our two populations. Not surprisingly, our population comes from a higher socio-professional background. For both AES and GEA, the father's level of education is mostly equal to or higher than the baccalaureate with percentages of 56.5% and 66.9% respectively ($\chi2(2) = 4.25$, $p = .04$). This is also the case for the mother's level of education, with percentages of 57.4% and 67.6% respectively ($\chi2(2) = 12.68$, $p = .01$). These results also show us that the level of education of both fathers and mothers is, in each case, higher for GEA students.

The most important differences between our two populations relate to tertiary science and technology (STT), economic and social (ES) and scientific (S) bachelor's degrees. Indeed, the ES baccalaureate is largely represented in AES (70.7%), and the other series are more anecdotal, whereas in GEA it can be observed that the ES baccalaureate, even if it is the most represented, is followed by the STT and S baccalaureates. The latter, which is also the most prestigious, was obtained by 21% of the population of GEA, i.e. 3 times more than in AES ($\chi2(2) = 36.18$, $p = .00$). With regard to the baccalaureate grade, there is an over-representation of the "fair" grade in AES compared to GEA, but overall AES and GEA get similar grades (for "fair" or "fairly good" grades, the cumulative figure is 84.9% for AES and 85.8% for GEA). The difference is in the mentions 'good' or 'very good', with a higher percentage in GEA (14.3% vs. 12.4% of AES students $\chi2(2) = 7.82$, $p = .05$). Here too, the logic is respected since entry into the GEA is based on an application and favours the best.

Data were collected by questionnaire. It should be remembered that the study presented here aims to identify the reasons for the choice of orientation at the entrance to the university and the IUT. More specifically, we were interested in the reasons for the choice of training, the expectations of the sector and the modalities of the relationship to learning. The operationalization of these dimensions is the result either of the work carried out by Rey and his co-authors, or of research carried out as part of a study conducted by us among first-time university students enrolled in different courses. This eight-page questionnaire includes five main sections: the socio-professional category of the parents, the studies of the subject, the determinants of their choice of orientation, their projects and their relationship to knowledge. Sociobiographical and psychological variables were studied using a series of items for which the response is given on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." For example, for the following item "What are the factors that led you to choose your course?", the rating of the responses ranged from 1 "strongly disagree" to 4 "strongly agree". Thus, we consider that if the average of the group is between 1 and 2.99, the students disagree with the item, while if the average is between 3 and 4, the students agree with the item. Analyses of variance were performed to determine significant differences between our two groups. The work from which this study is extracted was carried out in three successive collection phases, the objective of this longitudinal study being to identify a possible evolution of the relationship to knowledge over time. Here we will present only some of the results of time 1. The questionnaire was

administered at the end of the course, after agreement with the teachers. The duration of the exam was approximately 15 minutes.

RESULTS

The presentation of the results aims to show that orientation choices can be explained according to various dimensions of the relationship to knowledge. More precisely, we believe that it is because students have certain forms of relationship to knowledge that they make different choices of orientation, "conforming" to their relationship to knowledge. We therefore assume major differences between our two populations on these different factors (Alhakim & Tan, 2022).

We will propose the results in two stages. First, the first part will report on the items with which our two populations jointly agree or disagree. The significant differences between the two groups show differences in their degree of adherence or rejection of the item. In a second step, we will present the results that differ significantly between our two populations and that show a disagreement of adherence to the item. All students reject a number of factors that could explain their choice of training. Thus, they did not choose their training because it allowed them to avoid other types of training, to work after graduation or, on the contrary, because it allowed them to postpone the moment of professional integration. Nor did they wish to break with the disciplines that had been taught until then. Finally, the choice of training is also not linked to the factors associated with the training itself (socio-economic advantages, social status, the value of the diploma, the professions to which the training gives access). Students generally have a rather negative representation of the knowledge taught in higher education. They don't wait for knowledge for the sake of it and don't like to learn theories. On the contrary, they want the course to take into account the reality of their future profession. They are looking for certain knowledge, which provides answers, the teacher having to explain everything(Hollenberg et al., 2019).

The valued didactic contract evokes the image of a teacher who makes the knowledge imparted concrete, but the knowledge that students encounter is rather the bearer of characteristics that make students difficult. Thus, the teacher does not express himself clearly enough about his expectations, especially for the exam, and he dispenses knowledge that is too abstract. However, it doesn't seem to overcomplicate things

unnecessarily and doesn't use problematic language. The attitude developed with regard to knowledge itself is rather ambivalent. Thus, students feel that they can learn or understand a course even if they don't like the teacher or feel at odds with him. They don't feel uncomfortable, and that doesn't mean they let him know or turn on each other.

Finally, expectations of the institution are quite low. Students do not consider that their place of study will allow them to better understand themselves, to provoke a mind game, or to acquire working methods. But that doesn't mean they think they'll be able to make it easy. Nor do they envisage that the university will be an opportunity for them to meet friends or to build a future professional network. On the whole, it can be said that students have a rather negative view of where they study and how they work. Are there nevertheless any 'positive' elements put forward to explain the choice of training? If so, which ones? The second part of the results will allow us to see what really differentiates our two populations.

The differences between IUT students and those enrolled in university are played out in terms of the reasons given for choosing a career path. Only GEA students provide positive reasons for their choice. They say that they have chosen their field to continue their studies with the security of having a diploma valued on the job market (the DUT) and because the latter will offer them professional opportunities and also the opportunity to continue their studies afterwards. For AES students, the only reason they agree is because of the multiplicity of subjects taught.

The two categories of students also differ in terms of the representation of the knowledge provided in higher education. Not surprisingly, GEA students want to learn techniques and how to use tools, which is one of the specificities of the field they have chosen. AES students, on the other hand, report that they are confronted with knowledge that is abstract in relation to professional practice. They approach knowledge with the desire to understand everything, while at the same time cutting it up. They need to concretize this knowledge in order to better understand it.

The expectations placed on teachers are therefore in line with the logic deployed here: GEA students expect their teachers to shed light on their future professional practice, in particular in the form of advice. They invest emotionally in the latter, which has an impact on their learning: they participate in class if they like the teacher or the class. They also report that they sometimes have difficulty motivating themselves to go to class, even

though they say they are controlled over their attendance. Finally, the institution is seen as a place to prepare the foundations for the exercise of their future profession. They believe that their training opens up a wide range of professional opportunities in a field of the future. Our two populations differ in this respect, which is the basis for the separation between the two formations studied here. One (IUT GEA) provides concrete, applicable knowledge, while the other provides more abstract, less certain knowledge (AES stream). The next part will discuss these results.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we looked at the reasons for the choice of orientation of students at AES University and IUT GEA. Our first results confirm that the choice of IUT GEA is determined by a higher quality academic path than that of their counterparts at the university in the AES section. IUT students have a more positive perception of their academic value compared to university students. This can lead to some "self-selection" and influence the type of baccalaureate prepared (hence the differences in series observed between IUT and university students) and the higher education envisaged. A pupil with a good level who is preparing for a general baccalaureate has a different view of his or her career options and is more likely to engage in selective courses, especially if they have a baccalaureate, as is the case for a certain number of IUT students (Lakkireddy et al., 2020).

Moreover, the choice of IUT GEA is determined by a more favoured socio-professional background than that of their counterparts at the university section AES. This is a good illustration of the extent to which children from intermediate and higher professions have invested in IUTs (Erlich, 1998). This also confirms the concept of "strategy" according to which, in order to maintain their privileged status, the most advantaged groups adopt "qualitative" strategies, considering specific sectors that are not invested by their less well-placed counterparts. Thus, they invest in sectors deemed more profitable from which less advantaged groups will be excluded (Arum, Gamoran, & Shavit, 2007). There is talk of a "gentrification" of higher education courses, with social recruitment of the most prestigious courses and short courses.

Secondly, the reasons given by the two categories of students for their choice of training in (IUT GEA versus university in the AES section), or for the specificities related to the choice of course (IUT versus university) also reveal significant differences. IUT

GEA students chose their course of study for its supervision, with the early intention of continuing their studies at the very moment of choice. In addition, they have a utilitarian vision of the diploma prepared, in terms of professional opportunities and as a rewarding and secure springboard for further studies. Also, the IUT course is not chosen because it is short, but because it is "professionalizing". This seems to give a sense of security (regarding future professional integration) to students who wish to study for a long time from the outset.

The reasons given by students for choosing the nJT therefore seem paradoxical in relation to the initial objectives of an IUT. However, these reasons are in line with reality, a massive continuation of studies by DUT graduates. Here, therefore, the orientation process seems to be based on a "choice of pathway". In the (generalist) university sector, we can speak of "academic" orientation with very few professional expectations. On the other hand, in the IUT stream (which is specific and prepares for particular professions), we speak of "vocational" guidance with strongly applied expectations. We therefore have a choice of orientation made between sectors of unequal value.

Thirdly, we were able to highlight significant differences between our two categories of students, in different dimensions constituting their relationship to knowledge. First , we questioned their representation of knowledge. IUT GEA students have a significantly utilitarian relationship to learning. The choice of course is directly linked to an expectation of applied knowledge, in terms of techniques and tools that they wish to acquire. Again, this corresponds to the pedagogical objectives of the IUT, which offers tutored projects, internships and the concrete acquisition of many techniques.

Thus, while for students at the AES University knowledge is worthy of interest for its own sake, even if it does not seem directly useful to them, for IUT students, knowledge only makes sense if it is clearly linked to a professional practice. This study illustrates the differences in the relationship to knowledge at stake in the choice of orientation. At the time of their entry into higher education, IUT GEA students differ from those who AES students on the "representation of knowledge" (Rey et al., 2005). For GEAs, studies are seen as an instrument for professional integration. As a result, they have a very utilitarian vision of knowledge, they do not consider it for themselves. Knowledge only seems to make sense when it is linked to a professional practice. They are waiting for a presentation of knowledge that makes more use of their future professional practice, which is referred to

as a "target practice". On the other hand, for the ESAs, knowledge is worthwhile for its own sake, even if it does not appear to be directly useful to them (Kuziemski & Misuraca, 2020).

This result is confirmed when we consider the students' relationship to the institution. They consider the IUT as a place of learning that will allow them, through the acquisition of applied knowledge, to learn the basics for the exercise of their future profession. If AES university students (and this, in accordance with the pedagogical objectives of their training) are not in a "professionalized" affiliation to the institution, this is clearly the case for IUT students. In addition, IUT GEA students differ from AES students in terms of the "meaning of concepts" (Rey et al., 2005). The GEAs clearly privilege the pragmatic dimension of meaning, and are unable to access decontextualized content of thought and thus adopt a "pointillist vision" of knowledge. It is even referred to as "parcellization" (Rey et al., 2005). They do not accept the temporary suspension of meaning and consider statements in isolation. On the other hand, ESAs seem to perceive a coherence of knowledge between them and thus access "problematization" and "meaning".

We were also interested in the meaning of knowledge for students. IUT students have a pointillist vision of knowledge. In other words, they take a very linear and academic approach to knowledge. If AES university students manage to access problematization and accept provisional sus- pensions of meaning, IUT students cannot access decontextualized thought content. This utilitarian and scholastic relationship to learning is found through the didactic contract. IUT students' expectations in terms of "useful" knowledge seem to be consistent with the teachings received. They do receive practical advice for the exercise of their future profession. Conversely, students in the AES stream do not expect this applied dimension from their university teachers. Finally, IUT GEA students adopt a different "didactic contract" (Rey et al., 2005) than AES students. In the case of GEAs, teachers and students appear to be engaged in a reciprocal contract where expectations are clearly applied (Rey et al., 2005). This corresponds perfectly to the pedagogical objectives of a professional course such as the IUT. AES students, in accordance with academic objectives, do not expect this applied dimension of knowledge.

In addition, we also observed the students' attitude to knowledge, and our results show an "affective" relationship between IUT students and the teacher. In particular, these students are looking for real supervision, which corresponds to the IUT's form of teaching.

If for AES university students proximity to teachers is not a necessary condition for learning, this is the case for IUT students. nJT GEA students also differ from AES students in terms of their attitude to knowledge. GEAs perceive knowledge only in its affective dimension and make this the condition of learning. The relation to knowledge is referred by the student to the subjectivity of the teacher: "he experiences it as a relation to the teacher, which is susceptible to emotional or political treatment". In other words, the relationship to knowledge is experienced through the relationship to the teacher in an affective way.

Finally, when they enter higher education, IUT GEA students adopt a different relationship to the institution than AES students. When students enter higher education, they must adopt a new culture: they go through a period of "affiliation" (Coulon, 1997), both institutional and intellectual. By choosing an IUT, GEAs are committed to a course close to secondary school, in terms of supervision and proximity to teaching and administrative staff. In this, institutional affiliation is relatively easy for them. In addition, they also choose vocational training and thus commit themselves, with full knowledge of the facts, to an affiliation that can be described as professional. The intellectual affiliation thus seems to be in line with their expectations. For the AES, institutional and intellectual affiliation, in accordance with university pedagogical objectives, cannot be professionalized(Fraenkel et al., 2022).

It should be noted that, on the other hand, for the ESAs, the fact of entering university leads them to confront new and complex institutional rules. In this, institutional affiliation can be more difficult, especially for those who have earned an STT bachelor's degree. In the same way, the relationship to knowledge is disrupted by the breadth of the intellectual fields addressed but also by the need for a more synthetic way of thinking. Their intellectual affiliation is therefore more complex (Sutton et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION

The results of this research allow us to affirm that the choices of orientation in the IUT GEA or at the university section AES at the time of entry into higher education are determined by the interrelation of socio-biographical and psychological differences. In particular, this study reveals important distinctions between these two categories of students in their forms of relationship to knowledge, differences that explain their choices

of orientation. These choices underpin the projection of the individual into his or her future professional and social integration. However, the position he hopes to occupy in the training landscape, and in particular his sector, suggests a number of future social and professional positions that will be "possible" or "unattainable". If the choice of a generalist university course gives very little prospect of future professional integration (in AES, internships and professionalization appear at the master's level), the choice of a professionalized course goes on the contrary "define" from the outset a set of possible occupations corresponding to "certain probable positions in the hierarchy of social positions". For example, when IUT students are asked in their first year about the job they want to do, they answer in terms of social positions: "business manager", "executive in a large company", etc. On the other hand, AES students provide very little information on this issue. Students in the IUT stream want to pursue long studies while having the security of having a diploma that is valued on the job market. So, they have expectations in terms of skills "to have" that they can't find in the general university stream. The choice of the IUT is made with the intention, from now on, of continuing the studies at the end of the DUT, to achieve social and professional integration in accordance with life projects.

REFERENCES

Abdel-Basset, M., Manogaran, G., Gamal, A., & Chang, V. (2020). A Novel Intelligent Medical Decision Support Model Based on Soft Computing and IoT. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, *7*(5), 4160–4170. https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2019.2931647

Alhakim, A., & Tan, K. (2022). *IMPROVING LEGAL UNDERSTANDING VIA EDUCATION OF LEGAL ENTITIES ON THE ESSENTIAL WORKING AGREEMENT IN BATAM CITY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT*. *2*(1), 652–664.

Charbuty, B., & Abdulazeez, A. (2021). Classification Based on Decision Tree Algorithm for Machine Learning. *Journal of Applied Science and Technology Trends*, *2*(01), 20–28. https://doi.org/10.38094/jastt20165

FitzGerald, J. D., Dalbeth, N., Mikuls, T., Brignardello-Petersen, R., Guyatt, G., Abeles, A. M., Gelber, A. C., Harrold, L. R., Khanna, D., King, C., Levy, G., Libbey, C., Mount, D., Pillinger, M. H., Rosenthal, A., Singh, J. A., Sims, J. E., Smith, B. J., Wenger, N. S., … Neogi, T. (2020). 2020 American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Management of Gout. *Arthritis Care and Research*, *72*(6), 744–760. https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.24180

Fraenkel, L., Bathon, J. M., England, B. R., Clair, E. W. S., Carandang, K., Deane, K. D., Genovese, M., Huston, K. K., Kerr, G., Kremer, J., Nakamura, M. C., Russell, L. A., & Jasvinder, A. (2022). American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Treatment of Rheumatoid Arthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*, *73*(Jul;73(7):924-939), 924–939. https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.24596.2021

Frantzeskaki, N., McPhearson, T., Collier, M. J., Kendal, D., Bulkeley, H., Dumitru, A., Walsh, C., Noble, K., Van Wyk, E., Ordóñez, C., Oke, C., & Pintér, L. (2019). Nature-based solutions for urban climate change adaptation: Linking science, policy, and practice communities for evidence-based decision-making. *BioScience*, *69*(6), 455–466. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biz042

Hollenberg, S. M., Warner Stevenson, L., Ahmad, T., Amin, V. J., Bozkurt, B., Butler, J., Davis, L. L., Drazner, M. H., Kirkpatrick, J. N., Peterson, P. N., Reed, B. N., Roy, C. L., & Storrow, A. B. (2019). 2019 ACC Expert Consensus Decision Pathway on Risk Assessment, Management, and Clinical Trajectory of Patients Hospitalized With Heart Failure: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Solution Set Oversight Committee. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, *74*(15), 1966–2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2019.08.001

Kuziemski, M., & Misuraca, G. (2020). *Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19 . The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect , the company ' s public news and information website . Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories , such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source . These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active . AI governance in the public sector : Three tales from the frontiers of automated decision-making in democratic settings*. *January*.

Lakkireddy, D. R., Chung, M. K., Patton, K. K., Gluckman, T. J., Turagam, M., Cheung, J., Patel, P., Sotomonte, J., Lampert, R., Han, J. K., Rajagopalan, B., Eckhardt, L., Joglar, J., Sandau, K., Olshansky, B., Wan, E., Noseworthy, P. A., Leal, M., Kaufman, E., … Russo, A. M. (2020). Guidance for Cardiac Electrophysiology during the COVID-19 Pandemic from the Heart Rhythm Society COVID-19 Task Force; Electrophysiology Section of the American College of Cardiology; And the Electrocardiography and Arrhythmias Committee of the Council on Clinical Cardiology, American Heart Association. *Circulation*, *141*(21), E823–E831. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.047063

Lăzăroiu, G., Neguriţă, O., Grecu, I., Grecu, G., & Mitran, P. C. (2020). Consumers' Decision-Making Process on Social Commerce Platforms: Online Trust, Perceived Risk, and Purchase Intentions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(May), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00890

Lempert, R. J. (2019). Robust Decision mkaing (RDM). In *Decision Making under Deep Uncertainty*.

Parnell, G. S. . D. P. H. D. (2011). *Decision Making in Systems Engineering and Managmeent - Parnell*. 546.

Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257

Sutton, R. T., Pincock, D., Baumgart, D. C., Sadowski, D. C., Fedorak, R. N., & Kroeker, K. I. (2020). An overview of clinical decision support systems: benefits, risks, and strategies for success. *Npj Digital Medicine*, *3*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0221-y