

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v13i25.1258>

Artículos científicos

El fenómeno de la reprobación en la educación superior

Reprobation Analysis by Subject in Higher Education by Following a School Trajectory

O fenômeno do fracasso no ensino superior

Fausto Medina Esparza

Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, México

fmedina59@uabc.edu.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6577-3643>

Jorge Eduardo Martínez Iñíguez

Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, México

jorge.martinez43@uabc.edu.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8833-5600>

Resumen

En la licenciatura en Ciencias de la Educación (LCE) de la Universidad Autónoma de Baja California se identificaron promedios altos de reprobación en hombres y mujeres del periodo 2014-1 al periodo 2018-2. En consecuencia, se determinó como objetivo entender este fenómeno desde una aproximación metodológica cuantitativa: por una parte, mediante la aplicación de una encuesta, y por otra, mediante el análisis de unidades de aprendizaje (UA) obligatorias y optativas de seis periodos escolares (2019-1, 2019-2, 2020-1, 2020-2, 2021-1 y 2021-2) para identificar los porcentajes de reprobación en cuatro áreas de formación. En los resultados destaca que los alumnos no suelen reprobado por actividades académicas, por situaciones laborales, de salud o familiares. Ahora bien, de las UA más reprobadas, cuatro son obligatorias: Psicología y educación, Investigación educativa, Metodología de la educación y Procesos grupales; y dos optativas: Modelos alternativos de la educación y Problemas educativos en Baja California. Asimismo, se identificó que en el periodo 2021-2 se registraron los mayores porcentajes de reprobación de las UA analizadas



y se estima que la reprobación de dichas UA pudo deberse al desempeño y al estado de ánimo de los estudiantes.

Palabras clave: cursos universitarios, enseñanza superior, grado de repetición.

Abstract

In the Bachelor of Education Sciences (LCE) of the Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, high failure averages were identified in men and women from the 2014-1 period to the 2018-2 period. Consequently, the objective was determined to understand this phenomenon from a quantitative methodological approach: on the one hand, through the application of a survey, and on the other, through the analysis of the compulsory and optional learning units (LUs) of six school periods (2019-1, 2019-2, 2020-1, 2020-2, 2021-1 and 2021-2) to identify the percentages of failure in four training areas. The results highlight that students do not usually fail due to academic activities, work, health or family situations. Now, of the most failed LUs, four are compulsory: Psychology and Education, Educational Research, Educational Methodology, and Group Processes; and two electives: Alternative Models of Education, and Educational Problems in Baja California. Likewise, it was identified that in the period 2021-2 the highest percentages of failure of the analyzed LUs were recorded and it is estimated that the failure of said LUs could be due to the performance and mood of the students.

Keywords: university courses, higher education, repetition grade.

Resumo

No Bacharelado em Ciências da Educação (LCE) da Universidade Autônoma da Baixa Califórnia, foram identificadas altas médias de reprovação em homens e mulheres do período de 2014-1 ao período de 2018-2. Conseqüentemente, determinou-se o objetivo de compreender esse fenômeno a partir de uma abordagem metodológica quantitativa: por um lado, por meio da aplicação de uma pesquisa, e por outro, por meio da análise das unidades de aprendizagem (AU) obrigatórias e opcionais de seis períodos letivos. (2019). -1, 2019-2, 2020-1, 2020-2, 2021-1 e 2021-2) para identificar as porcentagens de reprovação em quatro áreas de treinamento. Os resultados destacam que os alunos não costumam reprovar devido a atividades acadêmicas, trabalho, saúde ou situações familiares. Agora, das UA mais reprovadas, quatro são obrigatórias: Psicologia e educação, Investigação educacional,



Metodología educativa e Processos de grupo; e duas eletivas: Modelos alternativos de educação e Problemas educacionais na Baixa Califórnia. Da mesma forma, identificou-se que no período 2021-2 foram registrados os maiores percentuais de reprovação das AUs analisadas e estima-se que a reprovação das referidas AUs possa ser devido ao desempenho e humor dos alunos.

Palavras-chave: cursos universitários, ensino superior, série de repetição.

Fecha Recepción: Enero 2022

Fecha Aceptación: Julio 2022

Introduction

Failure influences lag and dropout (Romo, 2011). Disapproval is equated with mistake. It is a negative concept reflected in grades where, usually, 5 or 59 represent not having covered the minimum requirements of a subject or course. In addition, failure implies failure to perform tasks, indiscipline and absence (Valdez, 1989, cited in Ruiz, Romano and Valenzuela, 2006; Ponce, 2006).

Failure is not caused by a particular cause or factor. In higher education, it can originate from various situations. In this work, four categories related to failure have been classified based on the contributions of Nava, Rodríguez and Zambrano (2007), Rascón, Mendoza and Fernández (2011), Riego (2013), Hernández, Martínez, Carrillo, Romualdo and Hernández (2013), Amado, García, Brito, Sánchez and Sagaste (2014) and Saucedo, Herrera, Díaz, Bautista and Salinas (2014).

- Teaching work. This category concentrates the way of teaching and the attitudes of teachers as factors of disapproval.
- Student performance. In this category, the following factors are the difficulty in understanding the contents, the little time dedicated to studies, the absences and the lack of study habits.
- The state of mind. In this category, the factors are lack of interest in learning, lack of adaptation to the school context, low motivation and lack of control of emotions.
- The social context. In this category are factors that are beyond the control of the students: work schedule (which can change or be extended), marriage (which can present challenges for child care), money (which, due to its scarcity, limit the purchase of school supplies, transportation and food), illnesses (which can reduce the student's concentration), family relationships (which can cause worry and distraction), among others.



In the School Statute of the Autonomous University of Baja California (H. University Council, December 3, 2018), article 65, it is established that students are qualified quantitatively through a scale that goes from 0 to 100, where the value 60 is the minimum passing grade. However, there are learning units (UA) that cannot be evaluated quantitatively, in this case "Accredited" (A) is recorded as approval and "Not accredited" (NA) as failure. to students who have the right to take an ordinary or extraordinary exam, but those students who do not present it are recorded as "Did not present" (NP) and those who did not have the right are recorded with the acronym SD (H. Consejo Universitario, 3 de December 2018).

Thus, obtaining a grade of 59 or less, not accrediting a AU, not having the right or not presenting an ordinary or extraordinary exam is synonymous with failure. The students enrolled in the Bachelor of Science in Education (LCE) at the Autonomous University of Baja California (UABC) from the 2014-1 school year to the 2018-2 school year were 6,675, 1,907 men and 4,868 women. The percentages of failure in these periods, obtained from the UABC academic staff portal, made it possible to identify that in the school modality (classes from Monday to Thursday) women on average (49.7) fail more than men (49.0). While in the blended mode (classes Friday and Saturday) men (41.9) fail more than women (41.3). It is also realized that, on average, more are failed in the school modality (49.2) than in the blended modality (41.3). In addition, an increase in the percentage of failure was identified in the school modality. From the 2014-1 period it began with 34%, in 2016-2 it reached its maximum with 57% and in 2018-2 a 56% failure rate was recorded. In the blended modality, in the period 2014-1, 27.0% of failure was registered, in 2017-2 it was the maximum percentage with 54.0% and in 2018-2 it reached 47.0%. The data (means and percentages of failure) indicate that, on average, men fail more (1.3) than women, and that they fail more in the school modality (7.9) than in the blended learning.

However, these data do not contribute to understanding failure, since they are general and there is no idea of the factors that led to it. So, an organization is needed that not only allows disapproval to be quantified, but also to understand it. One way of organizing the percentages of failure is through the school trajectory followed by the students, which is represented on the curricular map, in this case the LCE. This trajectory is distributed in three stages (UABC, 2012): 1) basic (common core), 2) disciplinary and 3) terminal. According to the contributions of Terigi (2007), a linear progress with a generalized sequence is established. In the basic stage, 10 compulsory UA are concentrated

and up to three optional UA can be taken. The disciplinary stage contains 23 compulsory UA and a maximum of five electives can be taken. The terminal stage brings together five compulsory UA and up to seven optional UA can be taken.

The compulsory UA of the basic stage are: 1) Socioeconomic structure of Mexico, 2) Development of skills in digital documentation and information, 3) Oral and written communication, 4) Development of critical thinking, 5) Introduction to scientific thinking, 6) Descriptive statistics, 7) Human development, 8) Administration, 9) Ethics and social responsibility and 10) Introduction to social sciences.

The compulsory UA of the disciplinary stage are: 1) Psychology and education, 2) Normative framework of education, 3) Economics and politics of education, 4) Communication and technologies of education, 5) Philosophical foundations of education, 6) Basic teaching processes, 7) Educational planning, 8) Administrative strategies in education, 9) National educational system, 10) Educational evaluation, 11) Contemporary philosophical foundations of education, 12) Academic organization, 13) Human resource management, 14) Learning evaluation instruments, 15) Research methodology, 16) Constructivist currents in education, (17) Teaching practice and professionalization, 18) Curriculum theory, 19) Group learning processes, 20) Management and administration of educational institutions, 21) Educational research, 22) Design of teaching and learning programs and 23) Quality evaluation systems.

The compulsory UA of the final stage are: 1) Curriculum design, 2) Group teaching and learning strategies, 3) Transdisciplinary intervention projects, 4) Curriculum evaluation and 5) Teacher education and training. The classification of the AUs by stage of training allowed ordering the registration of failure percentages with the information provided by the Department of School Control of the Faculty of Human Sciences (FCH).

Next, in the method, the process of quantitative approximation of failure is described from the perspective of the students and through the percentages of the UA that correspond to the periods 2019-1, 2019-2, 2020-1, 2020 -2, 2021-1 and 2021-2.

Method

The type of study used in this work was descriptive (Behar, 2008); It was interesting to identify elements and characteristics of failure in higher education, as well as the categorization of factors that favor failure at said educational level. The methodological approach was quantitative because it focused on observable and measurable aspects. (Latorre, Del Rincón y Arnal, 1997).

Participants

There was the participation of 79 LCE students in the third, fourth and sixth semesters who were studying four UA: 1) National educational system (school modality), 2) Educational research, 3) Economics and education policy and 4) System national educational (blended modality).

Instrument

A survey was developed that contains three initial questions that inquire about the number of AUs failed by the participants, the compulsory AUs and the optional AUs that are most failed. In addition, the survey is made up of three scales: Academic activities (11 statements), Factors that encourage failure (11 statements, and Economic and family support (six statements). The three scales have three response options: Always, Sometimes, and Never. The survey was piloted with a group of students to verify the clarity of the statements before applying them to the sample, and the survey was reviewed by two full-time professors from the FCH to validate its content.

Data collection and analysis procedure

The surveys were applied from October 8 to 12, 2019 in the rooms that are located in the FCH, Campus Mexicali. Students were previously asked for their participation and the purpose of applying the survey was explained to them. They were told how to answer it and, in addition, they were recommended to raise their hands so that, in case of doubts about the questionnaire, the applicant would come to them. The minimum time to complete the questionnaire was around eight minutes and the maximum time was approximately 14 minutes. In general, there were no interruptions or distractions during the application of the surveys in the four groups.

The data was analyzed with SPSS Statistics version 20 software. The frequencies and percentages of the statements that made up each of the three scales that make up the survey were obtained.

The approximation of the failure from the percentages was carried out by registering the examination minutes of each AU for the periods 2019-1, 2019-2, 2020-1, 2020-2, 2021-1 and 2021-2 in tables in Word format. Failed students (men and women) were identified. Various percentages were obtained: by UA, by shift (morning, evening and blended), by semester (third to eighth), by stage of training (disciplinary and terminal) and by period. The percentages were obtained using a rule of three. Due to the multiplicity of data, it was decided to concentrate the general percentages of each UA per period with respect to the number of enrollment (men and women, and the sum of both) per shift, as well as the number of failed men and women per shift. Finally, the percentages of both enrollment and those failed by UA in each period were obtained.

Results

This section mentions the answers obtained by the students regarding the following items: failure by UA, academic activities, factors that promote failure and economic and family support. In addition, the percentages of failure of the UA are presented by professional training area (Pedagogy, Training and curricular development, Administration and educational management and Educational Research) of the school periods 2019-1, 2019-2, 2020-1, 2020-2, 2021-1 and 2021-2. Likewise, the failure percentages of some optional UA that were identified are included.

Reprobation from the perspective of the students

79 students participated. Their ages were recorded in five ranges: in the first, from 18 to 23, 64 students (81.0%) were concentrated; in the second, from 24 to 29, seven students were grouped (8.9%); in the third, from 30 to 35, five students met (6.3%); in the fourth, from 36 to 41, two students were registered (2.5%), and in the fifth, from 48 to 53, one student was registered (1.3%). The gender distribution registered 61 women (77.2%) and 18 men (22.8%). The distribution by UA: National educational system (22.8%), Educational research (26.6%), Economics and education policy (29.1%) and National

educational system (blended modality) (21.5%). The distribution by semester is as follows: third semester (29.1%), fourth semester (44.3%) and sixth semester (26.6%).

The responses of the participants on failure of UA in general allow us to infer that 59.5% of them did not fail any subject, 27.8% failed one or two subjects, 8.9% failed three or four subjects and 3.8% failed five or more subjects.

On the other hand, the compulsory UA that are most failed are: Descriptive statistics (53.2%), Psychology and education (21.3%), Contemporary philosophical foundations (5.1%), Educational research (3.8%). Introduction to scientific thought (3.8%), National educational system (3.8%), Research methodology (3.8%), Administration (1.3%) and Group processes (1.3%); the remaining 2.6% of the participants did not mention any AU.

The elective UAs that are most failed are: Alternative models of education (13.9%), Emotional intelligence (10.1%), Online subjects (6.3%), Audiovisual media (3.8%), Comparative education (3.8%), Educational problems in Baja California (2.5%) and Gender violence (1.4%), while 58.2% of the participants did not mention another optional subject. Finally, men (63.3%) fail more than women (29.1%), and 7.6% did not answer the question. The percentages that are grouped in tables 1, 2 and 3 are approximate and do not all add up to 100%.

Table 1. Academic activities

Núm.	Afirmación	<i>N</i>	Nunca	A veces	Siempre
1	Entrego mis tareas en tiempo y forma tiempo	79	1.3 %	45.6 %	53.2 %
2	Dedico tiempo extraordinario al estudio	79	10.1 %	75.9 %	13.9 %
3	Organizo a diario mis actividades	79	10.1 %	49.4 %	40.5 %
4	Soy dedicado	79	2.5 %	53.2 %	44.3 %
5	Investigo por mi cuenta	79	3.8 %	39.2 %	57.0 %
6	Falta de hábitos de estudio	77	67.5 %	26.0 %	6.5 %
7	Asisto puntualmente a mis clases	79	3.8 %	29.1 %	67.1 %
8	Asisto a asesoría con mi profesor	79	29.1 %	49.4 %	21.5 %
9	Mantengo buena relación con mis profesores	79	5.1 %	25.3 %	69.6 %
10	Cuando tengo dudas acudo con mi	79	12.7 %	34.2 %	53.2 %

	profesor				
11	Mi carrera ha cumplido mis expectativas	78	14.1 %	28.2 %	57.7 %

Source: self made

The results of table 1 suggest that the majority of students have study habits (67.5%), sometimes spend more time studying (79.9%) and usually consider themselves as dedicated people (53.2%). Finally, they relate properly with their teachers (69.9%), attend classes on time (67.1%), investigate on personal initiative (57.0%) and resolve doubts with their teachers. (53.2 %).

Table 2. Factors that favor failure

Núm	Afirmación	N	Nunca	A veces	Siempre
1	He reprobado por inasistencias a clase	79	75.9 %	11.4 %	12.7 %
2	He reprobado por problemas con algún profesor	79	83.5 %	6.3 %	10.1 %
3	He reprobado por la dificultad de la materia	79	60.8 %	21.5 %	17.7 %
4	He reprobado por no recibir apoyo económico de mi familia	79	82.3 %	13.9 %	3.8 %
5	Reprobación debido al trabajo	78	91.0 %	6.4 %	2.6 %
6	Reprobación por problemas de violencia	79	93.7 %	3.8 %	2.5 %
7	Reprobación por falta de motivación personal	79	73.4 %	22.8 %	3.8 %
8	Reprobación por ruptura amorosa	78	97.4 %	2.6 %	0.0 %
9	Reprobación por cuidado de hijos	75	94.6 %	4.0 %	1.4 %
10	Reprobación por embarazo	76	81.6 %	17.1 %	1.3 %
11	Reprobación por problemas de salud	78	91.0 %	5.1 %	3.9 %

Source: self made

The responses of the participants grouped in Table 2 refer that, for the most part, they have never failed due to a love breakup (97.4%), due to taking care of their children (94.6%), due to problems of violence (93.7%), due to work (91.0%) and due to health problems (91.0%). On the contrary, they sometimes fail due to lack of personal motivation (22.8%) and because of how difficult a subject is (21.5%). Finally, they fail because of how difficult a subject is (17.7%) and because they do not attend classes (12.7 %).



Table 3. Financial and family support

Núm.	Afirmación	N	Nunca	A veces	Siempre
1	Recibo apoyo económico por parte de mi familia	78	34.6 %	27.0 %	38.4 %
2	Problemas en la escuela por motivo del trabajo	79	59.5 %	32.9 %	7.6 %
3	Problemas asistir a clases por horario laboral	79	67.1 %	24.1 %	8.9 %
4	Problemas por estudiar extra por el trabajo	79	57.0 %	34.2 %	8.9 %
5	Sustento económico, pieza fundamental para el desempeño escolar	79	40.5 %	40.5 %	19.0 %
6	El trabajo afecta mi rendimiento escolar	78	64.1 %	28.2 %	7.7 %

Source: self made

The responses of the participants, gathered in table 3, allow us to assume that their work does not cause them problems to attend classes (67.1%), does not affect their school performance (64.1%), does not cause other problems (59.5%) and does not prevents them from studying longer (57.0%). Sometimes, they consider that their economic resources are essential to maintain good school performance (40.5%) and receive financial support from their family (38.4 %).

Failure in training area

The results are grouped into four tables (4, 5, 6 and 7) divided by professional training area: Pedagogical, Curricular planning and development, Educational administration and management, and Educational research. Each table mentions the AU, the semester, the percentage of accumulated failure in the periods 2019-1, 2019-2, 2020-1, 2020-2, 2021-1 and 2021-2 and the period with the highest percentage is indicated. of disapproval of each UA.

Table 4. Pedagogical training area

	UA	Semestre	Reprobación	Periodo de mayor %	
1	Psicología y educación	Tercero	15.2 %	2020-1	47.4 %
2	Comunicación y tecnologías en educación	Tercero	20.2 %	2021-2	38.3 %
3	Fundamentos filosóficos de la educación	Tercero	12.9 %	2021-1	21.4 %
4	Procesos básicos de enseñanza	Tercero	12.7 %	2021-1	21.7 %
5	Fundamentos filosóficos contemporáneos de la educación	Cuarto	9.3 %	2021-1	19.1 %
6	Instrumentos de evaluación del aprendizaje	Quinto	14.4 %	2021-2	30.1 %
7	Corrientes constructivistas en educación	Quinto	9.4 %	2021-2	21.4 %
8	Práctica y profesionalización docente	Quinto	11.2 %	2021-2	25.0 %
9	Procesos grupales de aprendizaje	Sexto	12.8 %	2021-2	22.5 %
10	Diseño de programas de enseñanza y aprendizaje	Sexto	12.5 %	2021-2	31.4 %
11	Estrategias grupales de enseñanza y aprendizaje	Séptimo	18.7 %	2019-1	28.8 %
12	Formación y capacitación docente	Octavo	6.6 %	2019-2	13.3 %

Source: self made

Table 4 shows that the AUs with the highest failure rate in the six periods analyzed are Communication and technologies in education (20.2%) and Group teaching and learning strategies (18.7%). While the UA with the lowest percentage of failure is Training and teacher training (6.6%) in the eighth semester. Regarding the periods with the highest percentage of failure, it was identified that the 2021-2 period registered the highest percentages of five AUs and the highest percentages of three AUs were concentrated in the 2021-1 period. Finally, in the period 2020-1 Psychology and education registered 47.4% failure, the highest of all the AUs in this training area.

Table 5. Training area Curriculum planning and development

	UA	Semestre	Reprobación	Periodo de mayor %	
1	Marco normativo de la educación	Tercero	11.2 %	2021-2	22.2 %
2	Economía y política de la educación	Tercero	15.1 %	2021-2	25.5 %
3	Planeación educativa	Cuarto	9.7 %	2021-2	32.4 %
4	Evaluación educativa	Cuarto	14.6 %	2021-2	28.5 %
5	Organización académica	Quinto	7.2 %	2021-2	18.4 %
6	Teoría curricular	Sexto	8.3 %	2021-2	21.7 %
7	Diseño curricular	Séptimo	12.9 %	2020-2	28.0 %
8	Evaluación curricular	Octavo	7.0 %	2021-1	16.0 %

Source: self made

In table 5, it was identified that Economics and politics of education (15.1%) and Curriculum design (12.9%) obtained the highest percentages of this training area, while Curriculum evaluation, eighth semester, has the lowest percentage of failure (7.0%). On the other hand, the period 2021-2 registered the highest percentages of six AUs, for example, Planning (32.4%) and Educational Evaluation (28.5%).

Table 6. Training area Educational administration and management

	UA	Semestre	Reprobación	Periodo de mayor %	
1	Estrategias administrativas en educación	Cuarto	7.4 %	2020-2	15.2 %
2	Sistema educativo nacional	Cuarto	19.9 %	2019-1	33.3 %
3	Administración de recursos humanos	Quinto	6.6 %	2021-2	15.8 %
4	Gestión y administración de instituciones educativas	Sexto	9.0 %	2021-1	19.4 %
5	Sistemas de evaluación de la calidad	Sexto	9.9 %	2021-1	36.6 %

Source: self made

In table 6, the National Education System concentrated the highest failure rate (19.9%) and Human Resources Administration, from the fifth semester, the lowest (6.6%). The period 2021-2 has the record of two highest percentages, one of them is the highest of all the AUs in this area: Quality evaluation systems (36.6%).

Tabla 7. Training area Educational research

	UA	Semestre	Reprobación	Periodo de mayor %	
1	Metodología de la investigación	Quinto	12.4 %	2021-2	30.1 %
2	Investigación educativa	Sexto	26.0 %	2021-2	32.6 %
3	Proyectos de intervención transdisciplinaria	Séptimo	12.7 %	2020-1	24.1 %

Source: self made

In table 7, Educational Research has the highest percentage (26.0%) of the area that bears the same name. Here the period 2021-2 registered the highest percentage of two AUs: Educational Research (32.6%) and Research Methodology (30.1%).

Table 8. optional AU

	Unidad de Aprendizaje	Reprobación	Periodo de mayor %	
1	Desarrollo de competencias profesionales	7.8 %	2019-2	16.3 %
2	Diseño instruccional de nuevas tecnologías	18.1 %	2019-2	33.3 %
3	Educación comparada	12.3 %	2021-2	26.0 %
4	Mercadotecnia para instituciones educativas	9.9 %	2019-2	16.7 %
5	Modelos alternativos en educación	30.8 %	2020-2	35.5 %
6	Perspectivas contemporáneas de las ciencias de la educación	22.1 %	2020-2	32.9 %
7	Problemas educativos en Baja California	40.1 %	2019-2	62.5 %
8	Producción de medios educativos	10.7 %	2021-2	25.0 %
9	Seminario de asuntos contemporáneos en educación	28.7 %	2019-2	44.0 %
10	Teoría y práctica de la educación a distancia	26.5 %	2019-2	43.8 %
11	Evaluación y Formulación de Proyectos	31.6 %	2020-1	38.5 %
12	Metodología de la enseñanza de las ciencias	29.7 %	2021-1	46.7 %

Source: self made

Finally, in table 8, the optional UA with the highest percentage of failure in six periods is Educational problems in Baja California (40.1%), and Development of professional skills has the lowest percentage (7.8%). The 2019-2 period registered the

highest percentages of half of the optional AUs analyzed. Three UA stand out with high failure rates: Educational problems in Baja California (62.5%), Science teaching methodology (46.7%) and Seminar on contemporary issues in education (44.0%).

Discussion

The data organized in the results section on failure is retrieved with a comprehensive rather than quantitative intention. In this sense, this phenomenon is understood from the point of view of LCE students and the percentages of failure by training area.

The failure of the UA, from the perspective of the students, is not due to the lack of study habits, homework or entering classes late. Nor is it due to extracurricular situations such as personal relationships, health or work. Even the job does not limit class attendance or school performance. In this sense, dedication to study, organization of activities and regular attendance at classes are actions that reduce the probability of failing any UA. Consequently, the failure of UA can be derived to a lesser extent by not receiving advice from teachers and by the difficulty of the academic content that is taught. However, from the percentages by area of training, in various compulsory AUs, failure percentages ranging between 32% and 47% have been recorded, such as Psychology and education, Quality evaluation systems, Educational research and Educational planning. In addition, optional AUs with failure rates between 32% and 62% were detected, such as Educational Problems in Baja California, Science Teaching Methodology, Seminar on Contemporary Issues in Education, Theory and Practice of Distance Education, among others.

Then, factors must be presented that generate the failure of the AUs mentioned in the previous paragraph that the students do not recognize as those concentrated in the categories: teaching work, student performance, state of mind and social context (Amado et al., 2014; Hernández et al., 2013; Nava et al., 2007; Rascón et al., 2011; Riego, 2013; Saucedo et al., 2014). In this scenario, it is necessary to delve into the factors responsible for failure beyond the student's perception and the record of failure percentages by UA.

A situation to highlight regarding the perspective of the students participating in this study is that the failure of the AU is not generated by absences or by lack of delivery of tasks, but in the qualification records where the teachers record the final grades of the semester, in addition to the numerical record of 59 or less that means failure, SD and NP are noted as failure records. The SD is granted when a student did not meet the minimum

attendance (20%) to be entitled to an ordinary exam or an extraordinary exam (60%). While the NP is granted when the student, having the right to take an ordinary or extraordinary exam, does not appear to answer. In this sense, failing due to SD or NP is synonymous with absence. In this sense, it is convenient to identify the records of failure due to SD and NP in those AUs that record percentages of failure above 20% to understand the failure due to absences.

Conclusions

It concludes with the registration of AUs that coincide as the most failed based on the opinion of the students, of the six AUs identified in the periods 2016-2 and 2017-1 and in the percentages of failure of the periods of 2019-1 to 2021-2. Table 9 shows six AUs with the percentage of students who indicated them as the most failed; with the percentage identified in the periods 2016-2 and 2017-1; with the percentage accumulated between the periods from 2019-1 to 2021-1, and with the period where each registered its highest percentage. It is worth mentioning that a D has been placed to indicate that the AU belongs to the disciplinary stage and an O to indicate that the AU is optional.

Table 9. Coincidences on UA with greater disapproval

Núm.	Unidad de aprendizaje	Alumnos	2016-2 y 2017-1	6 periodos	Periodo	%
1	Psicología y educación (D)	21.5 %	22.7 %	15.2 %	2021-1	47.4
2	Investigación educativa (D)	3.8 %	20.7 %	26.0 %	2021-2	32.6
3	Metodología de la investigación (D)	3.8 %	19.8 %	12.4 %	2021-2	30.1
4	Procesos grupales de aprendizaje (D)	1.3 %	16.2 %	12.8 %	2021-2	22.5
5	Modelos alternativos de la educación (O)	13.9 %	30.7 %	30.8 %	2020-2	35.5
6	Problemas educativos en Baja California (O)	2.5 %	26.4 %	40.1 %	2019-2	62.5

Source: self made

The students who failed one or more of the six AU concentrated in table 9 may have experienced some of the factors indicated in the specialized literature on failure or by those mentioned in this work from the opinion of the students. Thus, from the four categories that concentrate a series of factors that can lead to failure: 1) teaching work, 2) student performance, 3) mood and 4) social context, and based on the three categories of the survey applied to the participants: 1) Academic activities, 2) Factors that favor failure and 3) Economic and family support; through all these, we said, factors were identified that could lead to the disapproval of the six mentioned AUs.

The failure could originate from the student's performance as he did not know how to face the difficulty presented by the UA (21.5%) and for not attending classes regularly (12.7%). Also due to the state of mind due to lack of personal motivation (22.8%). In this sense, the following factors are discarded: teaching work (the way of teaching and attitudes towards the group) and the social context (work, child care, health situations, among others).

In addition, the increase in the percentages of failure in the period 2021-2 is emphasized, because of the 28 AUs, 15 of them registered the highest percentages of failure. Six from the Pedagogical training area: 1) Learning evaluation instruments, 2) Constructivist currents in education, 3) Teaching practice and professionalization, 4) Group learning processes, 5) Design of teaching and learning programs and 6) Communication and technologies in education. Six from the training area Curriculum planning and development: 1) Regulatory framework of education, 2) Economics and education policy, 3) Educational planning, 4) Educational evaluation, 5) Academic organization and 6) Curriculum theory. One from the Educational Administration and Management training area: Human Resources Administration, and two from the Educational Research area: 1) Research Methodology and 2) Educational Research.

Finally, the understanding of the failure in the LCE that has been reached in this work can support the educational counselor and the tutors of the FCH, since the failure by stage of training is described, the UA with the highest percentage of failure, as well as the periods and possible factors responsible for causing students to fail. In this sense, educational guidance and tutoring can provide follow-up because they are transversal services that accompany the school career of students at UABC and FCH.

Future lines of research

The results of this work lead to research on three lines related to school failure as an object of study: 1) the student's school discipline, 2) the functioning of the tutoring and 3) the teaching work. The students, in their particular point of view, can reject that they fail UA due to absences, but the failure data for SD and NP can show the opposite. In addition, it is understood that students, for various reasons, do not commit themselves in a homogeneous way to their professional training. In the case of LCE students, there are students who enter this career as their second choice or due to pressure from parents or relatives, which leads to a lack of interest in learning, which is reflected not only in absences and lack of delivery of tasks, but also in low participation and delivery of late papers or with various inaccuracies, even, in some cases, they even have copies or plagiarism of information.

Tutoring is an educational service that contributes to the reduction of failure, however, in the LCE there are no records of studies that demonstrate its impact on said reduction. Tutors are known to work from the office in person or online intermittently throughout the semester. The moment of more tutor-tutor interaction occurs on the registration dates for the semester, which thus turns tutoring into an administrative means that does not impact the reduction of failure.

The teaching work is related to failure in the teaching of academic content, in the evaluation criteria and in the learning environment in the classroom. Teaching content with a lack of precision and clarity generates doubts that among students are usually or are tried to clarify. Assessing student work without feedback on failures can be just as confusing or more so than not checking the assignments they submit. Providing personal explanations that move away from the central topic being taught generates doubts and inaccuracies. Fostering a sense of friendship with students relaxes discipline and if the atmosphere is strict, they learn with intimidation and disinterest.

In short, having studies on failure and its relationship with the student's school discipline, the functioning of tutoring and with the teaching work will give more clues to achieve an accurate diagnosis that allows designing feasible and relevant strategies to contribute to the reduction of the phenomenon. failure in higher education.

References

- Amado, M. G., García, A., Brito, R., Sánchez, B. y Sagaste, C. (2014). Causas de reprobación en ingeniería desde la perspectiva del académico y administradores. *Ciencia y Tecnología*, 14, 233-250.
- Behar, D. S. (2008). *Metodología de la investigación*. Perú: Ediciones Shalom.
- H. Consejo Universitario. (3 de diciembre de 2018). Estatuto Escolar de la Universidad Autónoma de Baja California. *Gaceta UABC*. http://sriagr.al.uabc.mx/externos/abogadogeneral/Reglamentos/Estatutos/03_Estatuto_EscolarUABC_ReformasDic032018.pdf.
- Hernández, L. I., Martínez, A., Carrillo, D., Romualdo, Z. y Hernández, C. (2013). Factores asociados a la reprobación estudiantil en la Universidad de la Sierra Sur, Oaxaca. *Temas de Ciencia y Tecnología*, 17(51), 25-33.
- Latorre, A., Del Rincón y Arnal, J. (1997). *Bases metodológicas de la investigación educativa*. España, Barcelona: GR92.
- Nava, G., Rodríguez, P. y Zambrano, R. (2007). Factores de reprobación en los alumnos del Centro Universitario de Ciencias de la Salud de la Universidad de Guadalajara. *Revista de Educación y Desarrollo*, 4(7), 17-25.
- Ponce, V. (2006). Reprobación y fracaso en secundaria. Hacia una nueva reforma integral. *Revista de Educación y Desarrollo*, 2, 59-70.
- Rascón, L. T., Mendoza, M. y Fernández, M. (2011). Factores que inciden en la reprobación en los alumnos de los primeros semestres de las licenciaturas a cargo del Departamento de Contabilidad de la Universidad Sonora. Ponencia presentada en el III Foro Institucional de Tutorías. Hermosillo, octubre de 2011.
- Romo, A. (2011). *La tutoría: una estrategia innovadora en el marco de los programas de atención a estudiantes*. Ciudad de México, México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.
- Saucedo, M., Herrera, S., Díaz, J., Bautista, S. y Salinas, H. (2014). Indicadores de reprobación: Facultad de Ciencias Educativas (UNACAR). *RIDE Revista Iberoamericana para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Educativo*, 5(9), 96-106.
- Riego, M. A. (2013). Factores académicos que explican la reprobación en cálculo diferencial. *Conciencia Tecnológica*, (46), 29-35.

- Ruiz, N. Y., Romano, C. y Valenzuela, G. A. (2006). Causas de la reprobación vinculadas a las características de los estudiantes de la Licenciatura de la Facultad de Filosofía de la BUAP. *Graffylia*, 3(6), 150-155.
- Terigi, F. (2007). *Los desafíos que plantean las trayectorias escolares*. Fundación Santillana. III Foro Latinoamericano de Educación.
- Universidad Autónoma de Baja California [UABC]. (2012). *Proyecto de modificación del Programa de Licenciatura en Ciencias de la Educación*. México: Universidad Autónoma de Baja California.

Rol de Contribución	Autor (es)
Conceptualización	Fausto Medina Esparza
Metodología	Fausto Medina Esparza
Software	No aplica
Validación	Fausto Medina esparza “igual” Jorge Eduardo Martínez Iñiguez “igual”
Análisis Formal	Fausto Medina Esparza
Investigación	Fausto Medina Esparza
Recursos	Fausto Medina Esparza
Curación de datos	Fausto Medina Esparza
Escritura - Preparación del borrador original	Fausto Medina Esparza “igual” Jorge Eduardo Martínez Iñiguez “que apoya”
Escritura - Revisión y edición	Fausto Medina Esparza “principal” Jorge Eduardo Martínez Iñiguez “que apoya”
Visualización	Jorge Eduardo Martínez Iñiguez
Supervisión	Fausto Medina Esparza
Administración de Proyectos	Fausto Medina Esparza
Adquisición de fondos	Fausto Medina Esparza