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INTRODUCTION

The present report contains analysis of the data collected through a survey among students from the Psychology Department. The age of the students varies from nineteen to thirty nine year-old, among 34 female students and 14 male students. The questionnaires were answered during a week and a half. The major problem was to be able to reach students through, when they were found they were very collaborative who helped the researchers out to find the other students that became part of the sample. It was just a matter of looking for them that took most of the time because once they were contacted they helped out.

The method of analysis of the collected data through analyzing the data through the mean and as well as the answers of the students directly sometimes. The purpose of this study is to find the causes of the failure problem among students in the Department of Psychology during semester I-2000.
I. ANTECEDENTS

During the ancient times human beings learn through advices and the experience of others. Moreover, in previous times younger people used to go to the elders to look for counseling. These people transmitted their knowledge to other generations through the course of time. At first, it was not necessary to transmit knowledge; since, people did not need a degree to look for a job or to have a better life style; nevertheless, nowadays education is something that is required in all the cultures and all the historic periods.

The culmination of formal education processes is the access to different fields in which people can develop not only the acquired knowledge, but also their abilities. The fulfillment of this goal increases the quality of people life. However, higher education in Latin America is facing a lot of difficulties such as: Low economic supports, lack of appropriate infrastructure, etc. But one of the worse problems is failure, a lot of research have been done in some countries in Latin America related with this matter and they have discovered that there are different causes around this phenomenon.

In Venezuela for example according to UNESCO, Statistics Year Book, 1999 out of 24 students just one finished his/her studies at the University. One of the principal drop out causes is the bad economic situation; since there are a lot of necessities parents are forced to allow their sons to get a job in order to solve the economic situation.
For supporting this drop out or attrition problem in this country there are 659,525 students who had quit their tertiary studies due to poverty. Another cause for dropping out is that students who have registered a subject for a second time, feel ridiculous among the new students and they prefer to stop studying. Pregnancy is another determining cause of attrition, since there is 5.7% of women, who left the university because they became mothers.

In Colombia (1995-1998) based on the research “Deserción Estudiantil en los Programas de Pregrado”, many educational institutions are concerned about this phenomenon not only because it exists, but also because of its magnitude. Since the simple fact that the abandonment of tertiary education exists, the quality of the processes and programs of study used in the educational institutions in Colombia are criticized. A study done by Picon and Woods (1997) indicates as causes of the attrition cycle the following: students drop out because they did not feel comfortable with the groups, because of the economic and personal differences; heavy academic loads of contents, documents, and readings; family problems such as: the lack of communication with parents. Another research done by Sarmiento and Giralds (1989) shows the reasons that provoked the abandonment of the studies in the university programs of the institution during the period 1987-1988, in this research some of the causes found were geographical displacement of the student to move out from one country to another, health problem, economic problems, forced military service and job conflicts. This analysis included the unavoidable attrition, the voluntary attrition, and the attrition due to internal transference.
According to Marcelo Freddi from Buenos Aires University (1998) shows a high rate of attrition during the first semester of any academic year. Since 1998 a research about attrition has been carried at the Buenos Aires University, and the main reasons students drop out are: the lack of vocational counseling to the students, problems that students face in their transition from high school to the university, and the university study programs.

In addition, The South National University in Buenos Aires also did a research about the same phenomenon in 1996, and the results showed a high percentage of attrition in that university (72.10), this result was obtained through out an instrument administered to 1183 students who studied in that university ten years before and dropped out. Another research done in Argentina showed that in the Economic School of the National University of Fourth River the following causes were found; first, the difficulties that the students had related with the subject contents, they were not able to manage the material of study that was required in the subjects; second, the way of study which showed that the students who only studied in groups had a lower level of efficiency that those who studied in groups as well as individually; Third, the students got low grades affecting their whole evaluation because they were not able to manage the materials; and finally a meaningful factor that made students abandon their university studies is that some universities register a great number of students without having an entrance exam. This allows some students to enter the university without having a good level of proficiency in a tertiary education institution.

In Mexico, for a long time the attrition problem has been really serious, even though the classrooms are crowded, the number of students that finish their careers are limited. To this, it is added the fact that most of the time
the teacher do not have a good methodology to help the students to have a successful learning process. Tomas Niclos (1989) stated in his research that some myths suggest that private universities are much better than the public ones, and that the education quality depends on the number of teachers working full time should disappear, because all the universities work under similar academic programs since they are guided by the law of tertiary education; and the education quality does not depend on the number of teachers working full time, but on the quality of teaching methodologies. There are plenty of research that consider the social economic factor to predict if they will continue studying in the university or not. One of these researches is “Reprobación y Deserción Estudiantil en el Itparral” the sampling of this research was formed by 100 students from The Major Electric Engineering of ITP (Instituto Tecnologico de Itparral) from August to December 1992. The result showed that effectively, there exists a close relationship between attrition and failure.

For a long time in the Education System of El Salvador a lot of institutions have faced the attrition and the failure problem, the University of El Salvador has not been the exception. For many years students have not finished their studies as a result of many reasons such as: Economic Problems, health problems and some other reasons. (Hernandez Rivera, 1991). During 1991, students of the Department of Sociology of the School of Arts and Sciences (SAS) of the UES did a research about “What policies and strategies have to be implemented to minimize the attrition cycle and also, to help the students to develop their studies”. The attrition and failure was detected in two processes: Academic and Administrative. The attrition and failure in the Academic process is related with the average of students who failed any
subject. Hernandez Rivera divided the attrition cycle in three different levels based on the semester the subject belong to: Basic level which includes the first three semesters 24.79%; Intermediate level which includes the fourth, fifths, sixth and seventh semesters 11.41% and Advanced level which includes the eighth, ninth and tenth semester 14.63%. He concluded that the teaching learning process is closely related with the result that students get at the end of the semester. On the other hand, the attrition in the administrative process takes place when the students need an academic personal report from the university and it is difficult and time consuming to the students so that they decide to abandon the university.

Most of the students of the sample of this research had to work and study at the same time. In other cases they decided to work instead of studying because they could not have other way to support themselves. In general, he concluded that the students who did both activities were not able to develop the curricular plan as it was designed, and this was one of the most common causes of attrition and failure problem.

In addition, "La Reforma en Marcha, Document III, Lineamiento del Plan Decenal 1995-2005. of the Ministry of Education" (page 5) says that 85% of children who were registered in the Educational System in 1994, just 17% of them will have access to the university studies. Moreover, in 1999 this ministry informed that 118,491 students were registered in the institution of tertiary education; however, the students' population increased only in 865 students according to the last year statistics. Also, Alberto Campos, the National Director of Tertiary Education said that the general attrition varied between 36,000 to 38,000 students in the 2000.
The Statistics and Record Section of the Central Academic Administration (Sección de Estadística y Archivo de la Administración Académica Central de la Universidad de El Salvador) has identified two kinds of attrition, the Controlled and Non-Controlled attrition. The controlled attrition is the one in which the students manifest his or her decision to stop studying. On the other hand, the non-controlled attrition is formed by the students who leave the university without going through any administrative process. According to this section the School of Medicine showed the highest attrition percentage during the academic years of 1990, 1991 and 1992 which presented 44.55%, 26.50 and 27.27 respectively. As determining causes of these phenomenon are the following: First, the economic situation that makes students look for a job (38.20); Second, the grades, there is a 31.66% students that get low grades (that are lower grades than 6.0); Third, other responsibilities (personal, familiar, work etc.) 15.41% and finally, the health problems (14.73%). The same research showed that in the Engineering School of the UES the attrition rate reached 40% of freshmen students and the main reason students dropped out is that they did not have a good academic advisory.

As it can be seen, there is a variety of causes that are related with the students’ failing of courses cycle in different countries of Latin America and the intention of this research is to find the causes that were behind the students decision to abandon their studies as well as the causes of their subject failures in the School of Arts and Sciences in the University of El Salvador, Semester I-2000.
II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As it has been stated in the previous section, nowadays, the students' failure constitutes a problem for educational institutions at any level. So new academic advising program and new teaching methodologies have been put into practice in order to control this phenomenon in different American colleges such as in the University of Missouri at Kansas City (Blane R. A; DcBuhr L; and Martin DC. 1983).

According to Dr. Badia Sierra, Director of the planning office of the University of El Salvador (UES), when interviewed on May 17th, 2001, the UES as a tertiary educational institution also faces this problem. He said that the attrition problem is the result of different causes such as: lack of students' academic preparation, students' emotional problems, students' entrance profile, maturity, lack of teaching materials, teachers' lack of interest in the teaching-learning process. He said that due to all these reasons, a great number of students of the UES quit their studies.

Dr. Badia Sierra, also stated that the average attrition rate from the main campus of the University of EL Salvador, in the years 1995 to 1999 was 14.75%. This rate represents a great investment of the State of El Salvador, since each student that fails courses are the most probably to drop out later on.

According to information obtained from the Academic Administration of the School of Arts and Sciences (SAS), for the years 1995 to 2000 an average of 3195 students register each first semester, and only an average of 447 students
graduate each year. If we compare these figures, it can be stated that only 15% of the registered population graduates from this school each year.

Based on the importance of this phenomenon, this research will try to answer the following general question: What are the academic and non academic factors that influenced students’ failure in the SAS of the UES, main campus, in the first semester of the year 2000.
III. HYPOTHESES

1. The professors' methodology in the teaching-learning process influenced the Department of Psychology failure cycle during semester I-2000.

2. The infrastructure, material, and human resources of the Faculty influenced the Department of Psychology failure cycle during semester I-2000.


4. The student's academic background in the learning process influenced the students' subjects failing during semester I-2000 in the Department of Psychology.
IV. OBJECTIVES

1) Find out if student' failure was influenced by their academic background and class performance.

2) Relate professors’ methodology and interest with the teaching-learning process

3) Determine the relationship among the material, and human resources of the School and students' failure.

4) Determine if there is a difference between women and men in the number of subjects failed in the Department of Psychology in the School of Arts and Sciences.
V. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Academic Probation

In some universities at USA there are Academic Standards and Procedures that students must follow when studying: Students who are not making satisfactory progress toward a degree are placed on academic probation. Academic probation is a strong warning to students that their scholastic performance is less than that expected by the University. Failure to improve after receiving a probation notice can result in academic dismissal from the University. Notices of academic probation are sent to students at the same time grades are available at the end of the semester.

A student seeking the baccalaureate or associate degree is placed on academic probation when any of the following is true:

- The University cumulative GPA is below 2.00.
- The GPA for the most recent semester is below 2.00.
- The cumulative departmental GPA is below 2.00, based on at least 16 credits.

A student on academic probation will be removed from probation when all of the following conditions are true:
- The University cumulative GPA is 2.00 or greater.

- The GPA for the most recently completed semester is 2.00 or greater.

- The cumulative departmental GPA is 2.00 or greater, based on at least 16 credits.

**Appeals of Academic Dismissal**

Appeals of academic dismissal will be heard if students can document that there are unusual or extenuating circumstances surrounding their recent academic performance. They must also be confident that they will be able to remove themselves from probation by the end of one additional semester of attendance. Students wishing to make such an appeal must do so in writing to the Dean of Student Affairs within five calendar days of receipt of the dismissal notice.

**Reinstatement**

A student dismissed for unsatisfactory academic progress may apply for reinstatement through a written request to the Dean of Student Affairs after a period of nonenrollment. A student who is reinstated after academic dismissal will be reinstated on academic probation, and shall be considered as
having enrolled under the catalog and curriculum in effect at the time of reenrollment.

Upon receiving a first notice of academic dismissal, a student must sit out for at least one semester, plus a summer. That is, a student dismissed at the end of a fall semester may not re-enroll until the following fall, and a student dismissed at the end of a spring semester may not re-enroll until the following spring semester.

Upon reinstatement, failure to achieve good academic standing or show substantial academic progress by the end of one semester will result in a second dismissal. Upon receiving a second notice of academic dismissal, a student must sit out two semesters, plus a summer. Upon reinstatement after a second dismissal, failure to achieve good academic standing or show substantial academic progress within one semester will result in permanent academic dismissal.

**Educational Failure Begins At Home**

A study of more than 20,000 teenagers in nine different American communities suggests that the sorry state of student achievement in America is due more to lack of parental interest and peer values than to what takes place within school classrooms.
A recent study found half of all college freshmen in the California state university system needed remedial education in math, and nearly half needed remedial education in English. Researchers from Temple University think that they discovered the reasons for the lack of college preparation and poor achievement test scores by analyzing data on 20,000 high school students in nine very different communities.

They report in "Beyond the Classroom: Why School Reform Has Failed and what Parents Need to Do" that nearly one in three parents is seriously disengaged from their adolescent's life and education. For example,

- About one-sixth of all students report that their parents don't care whether they earn good grades.
- Only about one-fifth of parents consistently attend school programs.
- Nearly one-third of students say their parents have no idea how they are doing in school.

Widespread parental disengagement has left a large proportion of adolescents far more susceptible to the influence of their friends than in past generations. And this influence is taking its toll.

- Fewer than one in five students say their friends think it is important to get good grades in school.
• Less than one-fourth regularly discuss schoolwork with their friends.

• Nearly one-fifth say they do not try as hard as they can in school because they are worried about what their friends might think.

The authors of the study make these suggestions:

• Refocus the national educational debate on changing parents' and students' attitudes and behavior.

• Conduct a serious discussion about the high rate of parental irresponsibility.

• Recognize that the prevailing attitude of "getting by" is in part a direct consequence of an educational system that neither rewards excellence nor punishes failure.

• Support school-sponsored extracurricular programs and extend them to as many students as possible.

They also recommend that recognition be paid to the fact that schooling is the primary activity and purpose of children and adolescents. And that striving to do well there is more important than socializing, organized sports, after-school jobs or any other activity.
The phenomenon of failing subjects is an issue of concern for all educational institutions regardless the rates. It may reach, for the fact that if it exists, it questions the quality of the processes and programs that educational institutions offer, the quality of its teachers and the particular characteristics of every student.

The efficiency of an educational system is measured by its capacity to preserve and retain its students, by permitting them the achievement without any delays of the activities established in the curriculum. In addition, every institution should focus on improving the teaching learning process as well as assisting students as much as possible.

These days, the student's failure and attrition establish a problem for educational institutions at all levels. For that reason, new academic advising programs and new academic teaching methodologies have been carried out in order to control this phenomenon in several institutions of Tertiary Education like The University of Missouri at Kansas City for instance. (Blanc R.A. Dc Buhrl and Martin Dc. 1983.).

A lot can be discussed regarding the failure phenomenon, but a real deep reflection of the concepts that are used concerning this topic are considered necessary as a starting point of this research with the purpose of orienting it adequately, and to obtain the expected results.
Regarding student's subject failure, there is a study done in 1992 by Tinto Vincent en Itparral which shows the subjects of the different schools that overpass the 50% of subject failures are the ones referred to the areas of Chemistry, Mathematics and Statistics.

After having presented a general background about students' attrition in institutions of tertiary education, it is necessary to place the present research in the specific context in which the process is being addressed. Therefore, the definitions that will be used in the study of the attrition phenomenon in the School of Arts and Sciences at the University of El Salvador during semester I-2000 are mentioned next.

For this study, Attrition will be taken as the student’s abandonment of their educational program due to Academic and/or Non-Academic factors, having gone through the administrative process to reserve their right to continue studying later on.

As literature shows, there is a relationship between student's attrition and subject failing; hence, it is necessary to state that failure of subjects is part of this study; thus, it is defined as the student’s lack of success in achieving the average of six, which is the lowest passing grade, in any specific subject at the end of the semester.

Based on the theory studied in regard to causes that provoked students to drop out from different Tertiary Institutions, the researchers have made the following model that will be used in order to study the phenomenon of attrition at the School of Arts and Sciences of the University of El Salvador during semester I-2000.

The model includes two majors categories: Academic factors and Non-Academic factors.
**A. ACADEMIC FACTORS**

These factors have been sub-divided into *Students' area* Professor's area and *Institutional area*.

1. The student's area included students' academic background as well as performance, and student's participation in campus activities such as karate, dancing, and so on. These were the most common factors related to failure according to the theory read. The aim of this area was to find out to what extend the students' academic background, performance, and student's participation in campus activities influenced in students' failing courses.

2. The professor's area included professor's interest in the teaching learning process and the teaching learning methodology used in the subjects that presented the highest number of failures. This particular area was devoted to relate professor's methodology and their interests in the teaching learning process of the students.

3. The last one was the institutional area. This one contains class schedules, curricular changes, administrative processes.
B. NON-ACADEMIC FACTORS

These factors had also been subdivided into two areas as it follows: Student's and Institutional areas.

1. Regarding student's area, it included students' economic situation, health problems, parenthood, career benefits, students sex, and their identification with the institution. The purpose of this area was to determine to what extent all these factors influenced in the students' and then the withdrawal of the university. Furthermore, to identify the relationship between their failure cycle, and the health problems that they might have had.

2. Within the Institutional area were found the infrastructure itself and its resources related to the educational process such as material, financial and human. The main objective of this was to determine the university resources that influenced students to fail.
VI. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study was to find out the Academic and Non Academic factors that influenced students' failure at the School of Arts and Sciences during the first semester of the year 2000.

There was the need to measure and explain the failure cycle phenomenon; for that reason the survey research method was used. This was a sample survey since the nature and the purpose of the study was related with Education and Social Sciences and it was studied only a portion of the population.

The most challenging type of survey is the one that seeks to measure intangibles such as attitudes, opinions and values, or the sociological and psychological constructs, like the reason our students population had for withdrawing from college as well as the implications relative to University entities such as Faculty and Administrators, teaching- learning methodology, students' economic factors, job related reasons, students' preparation for entering college.

The opinions, attitudes, and values are not directly observable but they are inferred from responses given by the subjects to the questionnaires specially designed for this purpose. Since it was a survey of intangibles it was limited by the fact that the data that was collected only indirectly measured the variables the study was concerned about. This limitation depended on how well the observations measured the intangible variables.
The steps involved in this survey research were:

1. Planning: The survey research began with the question that could be answered by means of the survey method. The question of our study was:
   What are the academic and non-academic factors that influenced students' failure of the Department of Psychology of the University of El Salvador, Central Campus in the first semester of the year 2000?
   In order to find out the answer to this question, the research had been divided into two areas: one dealing with the academic factors and the other with the non-academic. The area of the academic factors had been subdivided into: students' factors, teachers' factors, and institutional factors. The area of the non-academic factors consists of: students' factors and the institution resource factors (For more information refer to the theoretical framework).

2. Sampling:
   a. The population of this study was formed by the students who failed one or more subjects and those who withdrew from the Department of Psychology of the University of El Salvador during the semester I-2000.
   b. The sample included students who fulfill the characteristics determined for our study. The subjects were selected according to a simple random sampling with one substitution designed for each Department within the Department of Psychology. (Please, refer to the Sampling Section for more information).
3. Conducting the survey:
   a. First pilot study: once the data gathering questionnaire was ready, the pilot study was run to determine if the designed questionnaire provided the expected data.
   b. Second pilot study: the purpose was to make the questionnaire more accurate with the corrections made to the first pilot study.

4. Data processing

The steps that followed for processing the data were:
   a. Designing the data base using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)
   b. Coding the information.
   c. Entering the data into the data base.
   d. Analyzing and interpreting the data.
   e. Written report
   f. Socializing the results.
VII. SAMPLING

Population

The population of this research was formed by 148 students of the Department of Psychology of the University of El Salvador that failed one or more subjects in semester I-2000.

Sample

The sample was taken in relation to the number of students that failed one or more subjects in Psychology Department. The sample was calculated using the following formulae:

$$n = \frac{Z^2PQN}{E^2(N-1) + Z^2PQ}$$

Where: $n =$ sample; $N =$ population; $Z =$ score; $PQ =$ percentage to be included or excluded; $E =$ standard error.

This formulae was used according to the department mentioned above and its population, which was formed by 148 students and by using this formulae the sample was formed by 47 students. This process consist of picking students at randomly.
VIII. FIELD WORK

First, looking for students schedule to find out where to look for them. Second, approaching students to ask them to look at the sample population list to check if they were part of. Third, asking students to check the list if their friends were part of. This was the process we followed to obtain our sampling population. In fact, the sample was formed in fact by 45 students and the distribution of the questionnaires was as it follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alba Clarbel Quijano</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Cristina Amaya C.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenaida Merlin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana T.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcos Vasques</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Alas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren C.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, this research had the collaboration of three other groups. Zenaida Merlin and Roxana Torres are part of Philosophy group, Marcos Vasquez and Silvia Alas are part of Social Studies group and Loren C. of the Natural Studies group.
IX. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

DESCRIPTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The sampling of the Psychology Department for the present research project was taken from the population who failed courses in the School of Arts and Sciences during semester I-2000. There was a sample population of 47 students who were approached to explain them the purpose of the survey and then they were interviewed using a questionnaire of 82 questions which was administered in order to collect the data required. The questionnaire had 7 parts with open and close questions. On the cover page of the questionnaire there is a part related to the general information with an objective to explain the purpose, name of the interviewer, field work leader name as well as the comments, activity, date, the time that started and ended answering the questionnaire.

The first part of the questionnaire is called Social-Demographic Information which contains 23 questions in total: 14 open and 9 close questions. The second part is called Description of the Teaching Learning Process of the course that students had failed which contains 11 close questions. The third part is called Students’ Academic Performance with 10 close questions. The fourth part is called Identification with Campus Activities with 7 close questions. The fifth part is called Classroom Environment Factors with 7 close questions and 5 close questions. The sixth part is related to the School of Arts and Sciences evaluation of the
administration process, as well as the students’ own appreciation of the university campus with 8 close questions and 4 open questions. And the last and seventh part is related to the course students like the most.

FAILING SUBJECTS DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to psychology I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Techniques of Research I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Social Personality I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Techniques of Research II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapeutic Methods and Diagnosis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Psychophysiological of the behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were asked to mention one course that they had failed. The table above shows all the different courses that were failed which means that Introduction to Psychology I was failed the most (21.3%). In second place are Methods and Techniques of Research I and Individual and Social Personality with 14.9% each. In third place are Methods and Techniques of Research III, Psychotherapeutic Methods and Diagnosis, Fundamentals of Psychophysiological of the Behavior, Pupil's Diagnosis I with (6.4%) each course.
TABLE No 2. “CAUSES STUDENTS SAID WHY THEY HAD FAILED SUBJECTS”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest, motivation, and dedication</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors’ Methodology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of the subjects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48.9 % of these students said that they failed courses because of their lack of interest and dedication. The answer to question had 9 students who said that they failed a course because the professor’s methodology was not appropriate. Another cause for students failure is the difficulty of the courses, there was 21.3% who affirmed so.

STUDENTS EVALUATION OF THE TEACHING-LEARNING METHODOLOGY USED IN THE SUBJECTS STUDENTS SAID THEY HAD FAILED.

The evaluation of the teaching learning methodology includes the following variables professors’ subject mastery, motivation to students’ participation and the kind of resources used by the professor to develop the classes especially in the courses that students mentioned they had failed.

According to the sample population and the mean show above the mean is 2.52. Which means that they evaluated it as regular.
The construct *Methodology 71* is referred to the professor’s methodology especially in a subject that students felt mostly satisfied with. In this category the evaluation had considered the same elements as the teaching learning methodology mentioned before which has a mean of 1.57 which means that the methodology was appreciated between excellent and very good.

**STUDENTS´ ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE.**

The information concentrated in the *Students´ academic performance* area was concerned to the students' habits of studying individually and in groups, as well as students' participation in classes, the hand in of assignments and the attendance to classes punctually, and also the use of the library resources. Analyzing these data is observed that most of the students' evaluate themselves with a lack of good habits of studying with a mean of 2.26. This means that they evaluate themselves as regular students.

**EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY**

The evaluation of the Department of Psychology obtained through the students' answers had a mean of 4.52 consequently the whole group of the students evaluated the services of the administration offices as deficient work. It can be concluded that the Psychology Department students are not satisfied with the services received mentioned before.
CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT FACTORS

The classroom environment factors area was evaluated in the questionnaire on part V where students were asked to give out their opinions concerning the ventilation and light of the classrooms, the cleaning of classrooms and bathrooms, condition of desks as well as bathrooms availability. As a result there is a mean of 4.5 which means that students from the Psychology Department are not comfortable with the physic conditions of the infrastructure, so they considered that it should be improved.

TABLE No 3. "STUDENTS SELF EVALUATION OF THEIR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ academic performance</th>
<th>No of students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent – Very good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good – Good</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good – Regular</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

METHODOLOGY

The relationship between the professors’ methodology evaluation of the course students have failed in semester I- 2000 and the students’ performance shows that the students evaluated the professors’ methodology from good to regular. And they also considered themselves: 11 of them from excellent to very good students. 31 students evaluated themselves from very good to good and the last 5 students from good to regular. Therefore, there
is a deficient methodology as well as in their interest and dedication, although, they considered themselves from a high self-esteem point of view because they believe on themselves maybe as able to obtain better results and grades.

TABLE No 4. “HOW STUDENTS FOUND THEIR STUDIES”.

All of the sample students had failed as minimal one course, and as it can be noticed from the table above 35 students had family support which represents a 74.5% and also there are 10 students who supported themselves through a job, as well as 1 student who had an scholarship and just one with a non-identified source. Therefore, these students didn't take advantages of their family support or didn't appreciate it because they had failed courses if they would do so they wouldn't have failed. The other ten of them were working and of course they do not have sufficient time to study enough to pass the course which is understandable, consequently they had failed courses.
CONCLUSIONS

The professors’ methodology in the teaching Learning Process influenced the Department of Psychology subject failing phenomenon during semester I 2000.

Students’ evaluation of the professors’ methodology has a mean of 2.52 which means that the methodology and interest is regular and it needs to be improved to obtain better students’ results or reduce the percentages.

There is a big group of students, nine of them who considered that professors’ methodology and the complexity of the courses need a serious improvement since they evaluated it as regular.

The students’ academic background in the learning process influenced the subject failing phenomenon during semester I 2000 in the Department of Psychology. The data collected from the survey show that there is a lack of interest and dedication producing a low performance of the students with a consequence of failing courses.
The rest of students had developed a dispersed information because they mentioned different causes for failing courses, among those causes are schedule interference, schedule problems between work and studies

More women than men failed courses in the Department of Psychology during semester I 2000. The sample population in the data collected shows a 72.35% of women population who had failed courses and a 27.65% of men in the same situation. Which develops a higher percent of women than men.

Based on the data obtained through the questionnaire and the statistical charts it was found that:

1. Students' failure is produced mainly by 3 causes:

   A. Students lack of interest and dedication. B. Teachers' methodology in the teaching learning process. C. The difficulty of the courses.

2. There is a dispersed information about other causes such as conflict with schedules at work and studies, and so on.

3. There are more women than men failure phenomenon in School of Arts and Sciences during the semester I, 2000.

4. It is necessary to open seminars, workshops, and other activities needed for the professors' methodology of these students affirmed that UCA is the second best university after UES.
5. There are 9 students who manifested they would move to UCA because they considered professors' academic preparation, and infrastructure much better than UES even though 3 of them affirmed that UCA is the best second best university after UES. There are other 3 students who will move to different universities because they think that at UES it takes too long to get graduated.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations should be taken into consideration:

1. Professors’ methodology should be in continuous evaluation with students’ evaluation for it is necessary to perform research as this one. It is necessary to develop seminars to help professors to improve the methodology used in the teaching learning process as well as workshops to help one to another because there are good professors according to the students’ responses in that way students failure phenomenon would be reduced.

2. There should be an open program for continuous advisory or counseling especially to those students involved in failing courses.

3. There is a need of a better regulation system in high school to prepare students academically to have a more successful development at the tertiary education.
TESTING HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis number 1, the professors’ methodology in the teaching-learning process influenced the Department of Psychology failure cycle during semester I-2000 is not valid because the gathered information shows that is not just the methodology a problem that causes students’ failing of subjects but other three reason as it was mentioned before, as it follows: Students’ lack of interest and dedication as well as the difficulty of the courses. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis number 2, the infrastructure, material, and human resources of the faculty influenced the Department of Psychology failure cycle during semester i-2000 students manifested they are not satisfied with the class environment factors but the information collected does not prove that hundred percent of the students pointed out that it is a major cause for them to fail the subjects. However, there are nine students who manifested that if they have to they will move to UCA because different reasons, for instance: UCA has a much better class environment, better professors’ academic preparation, the graduation process is more convenient in terms of time as well as the complexity of the courses, and so on. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis number three, women failed more subjects than men in the Department of Psychology during semester I-2000 is not valid because it was
not analyzed the population of both sexes; therefore the null hypothesis is valid.

Hypothesis number four, the students’ academic background in the learning process influenced the students’ subjects failing during semester I-2000 in the Department of Psychology is not valid because there was not investigated at all. Although, it can be inferred that one of the causes that influenced the students’ subject failing is the lack of good habits from the students.
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