The Key Predictors of Success in University in France: What Are the Contributing Factors and Possible New Directions in Educational Research?

Amélie Duguet[1], Marielle Le Mener[1] & Sophie Morlaix[1]

[1] IREDU, Université de Bourgogne, France

Correspondence: Amélie Duguet, Université de Bourgogne, Esplanade Erasme, BP 26513, 21065 Dijon Cedex, France.

Received: February 29, 2016 Accepted: April 11, 2016 Online Published: August 16, 2016

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v5n3p222 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n3p222

Abstract

In France, the university has been experiencing a major crisis for several decades in the form of a high rate of student failure, particularly during the *licence*, or first cycle of studies. This prolonged crisis has led educational researchers to focus on the predictors of student failure in University. This paper reviews the existing literature on both student failure and success in University in the French context. We first conduct a thorough analysis of the various factors explaining failure rates, and then explore in more depth the factors explaining student success, which have thus far been under-researched in France. We identify several types of predicators, including individual-level factors, which have been the focus of extensive research in France over the past number of years, and contextual factors, such as professors' teaching practices, which constitute a relatively novel focus in French educational research.

Keywords: University, Failure rate, Individual and contextual factors, First cycle, Educational trajectories

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of student failure – or dropout – at French universities is not new, and has not always been perceived as a problem: a high rate of student failure has, at some points in time, even been considered a "natural selection criteria" or proof of the high level of excellence of the degree delivered (Coulon, 2005). However, over time, the high rate of failure in the first year of university has led a number of researchers to question these perspectives and investigate this issue further (Dubet, 1994; Duru-Bellat, 1995; Felouzis, 2001; Michaut, 2002; Coulon, 2005; Felouzis & Le Guyader, 2007; Lambert-Le Mener, 2012). A great variety of explanations are underscored by researchers in this domain. These explanations include individual characteristics of the students, such as a poor level of knowledge about the university system and subsequent difficulties meeting the challenge of adjusting quickly to their new activity of being a student (Coulon, 2005). Failure has also been explained in other studies by more contextual factors (Duru-Bellat, 1995; Felouzis, 2001; Michaut, 2002; Felouzis & Le Guyader, 2007). Based on this literature, it becomes evident that success or failure in University depends on a large range of factors, which are sometimes tightly intertwined. This paper reviews the relevant French educational research literature on different factors which could explain the high rates of failure in the French university system and, in doing so, tries to identify under-explored new elements that contribute to student success. We do not limit ourselves to individual factors, which have been the main focus of educational research in recent years, but broaden our scope to include contextual factors. However, we choose to restrict the bulk of our discussion to the case of France. Although a few English-language studies will be mobilized, we consider the issue of student success and failure in University of the French higher education not being in every point comparable to those of the Anglo-Saxon countries.

2. Factors Related to Student Characteristics

When trying to understand the determining factors of success in University numerous factors are in fact related to the student him or herself. For this reason, various researchers, including Duru-Bellat (1995), Michaut (2000), Gruel (2002), Le Mener (2012), Morlaix, and Suchaut (2012) and Fouquet (2013), have investigated the effects of students' socio-demographic characteristics, including living conditions, cognitive capacities, motivations, personal projects, academic curriculum, and development of a "student profession" on their success.

2.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics and Living Conditions of Students

Some specific individual characteristics are logically mentioned and used when trying to explain differences in levels of student success. Research has been conducted to study the effect of social background at the college/university level. For example, Lemaire (2005) showed that teachers' children are more likely to graduate from an L2 in two years than children of intermediate professions, whereas children of blue-collar workers are not significantly more or less likely than the other groups. The measurement of the effect of social background on student performance using a survey of parental income has also shown that students from lower-income backgrounds (where the parents' income is less than 1,524 euros a month) have lower chances of success than students from middle-class or upper-class backgrounds (Gruel, 2002). When investigating student dropouts, it seems that social background has an impact on whether the student leaves university without a degree, but this impact varies according to the different types of courses chosen by students (Felouzis, 2000).

Literature on social inequalities in success in University suggest that the consequences of selection factors that operate before university, such as social background and origins, are a lessened once in university. A successful trajectory, measured by graduation with a *licence*, or bachelor's degree, in three years, does not depend on the parents' professional activity, when this criterion is compared with other factors such as academic characteristics (Grignon & Gruel, 1999; Felouzis, 2000; Michaut, 2000; Dethare & Lemaire, 2008; Morlaix & Suchaut, 2012). The social category defined by the level of parents' higher education qualifications also has a minor impact and is even reduced to nil once academic characteristics are controlled (Gruel, 2002; Lambert-Le Mener, 2012). Therefore, these inequalities pre-dating students' university studies are often no longer directly visible in success rates. On the other hand, Belgian researchers Galand, Neuville, and Frenay (2005), have shown that a significant correlation between success and social background does exist, but that this link only accounts for 1% to 5% of the variability. However, these findings have been contradicted by Van Campenhoudt, Dell'Aquila, and Dupriez (2008), who conclude that the parents' profession, level of qualification, and household income have a decisive impact on success. They explain that the low number of students in University from a poor social background mechanically reduces the effect size of the variability explained by social background.

Other characteristics like, for example, the gender and age of students, feature among the variables that are regularly analysed. It seems that with comparable characteristics, especially academic characteristics, male students exhibit higher failure rates and more often decide to either change their course choice or drop out of university and stop their studies altogether (Lemaire, 2000). But this data may also partially reflect the academic history of male students, as they are also more likely to have repeated years in the course of their academic career than female students: it is a well known fact that students considered "on time" academically, i.e. students who never had to repeat a year at school, have higher achievements than others in higher education. Thus, the effect of gender is not entirely a direct effect. However, a comparison based on the gender of general baccalaureate (*baccalauréat général*) holders considered as "on time" shows that female students still have an advantage (55% versus 43%; Lemaire, 2000). According to Michaut (2012), one must further moderate a simple interpretation based on a gender-only analysis of these success rate disparities. Indeed, these differences in success could be at least partially the result of female students' study methods and practices. Female students are more diligent and take less leisure time; thus, their more studious approach to education could explain their higher level of achievement and success compared to boys (Lahire, 1997; Frickey & Primon, 2002; Gruel & Thiphaine, 2004a; Galland, 2011). Based on this research, it becomes apparent that while gender makes a difference, its effect lies more in differentiated modalities of socialization than in biological differences (Duru-Bellat, 2004). The main differentiating effect of gender affects the academic pathway more significantly than it does the success rate as such.

The impact of age on student success is negative: the older a student is when enrolling in first year (L1), the lower his or her chances of success (Michaut, 2000). However, being older when entering university is often a reflection of previous academic difficulties, which may have resulted in one or more repetitions of years. Thus, the effect of age is confounded with that of an academic path already marked with obstacles. In contrast, the nationality of a student does not help to explain the differences in success, as it is not significant in predicting the probability of student success in the first year or the probability of validation of the second year of studies (Teissier, Theulière, & Tomasini, 2004).

Beyond the socio-demographic characteristics of students, living, studying, and working environments do play a role in student commitment and success. Numerous sociological works have studied students' living conditions, which have drastically evolved since the arrival of more widespread, mass enrolment in university. Research on living conditions concentrates mainly on the type of accommodation students live in, on whether students get an income

from a job, and also students' financial situations when they are awarded grants. Previous research has shown that those students who have moved out of their parents' home have a greater probability of succeeding in all three years of the bachelor's degree (Grignon & Gruel, 1999). Living in a university residence, in their own home, or in shared accommodation seems to provide an advantage (Grignon & Gruel, 1999); however, the results to date are of a relatively small magnitude.

Regarding students' financial situations, we analyse two specific factors: paid employment and grants. Paid employment has a conclusive effect on success. Many French students have paid employment during their studies: 2 out of 10 university students in France have a job (Coudin & Tavan, 2008). Nevertheless, the benefits drawn from having a job are not the same for all students. Working students often live in precarious situations and student wages are usually quite low. This parallel life, which is unavoidable financially for some students, has an adverse effect on their studies (Giret, 2011). These students, who must work in order to finance their studies, are more likely to eventually drop out of university or fail. On the other hand, some students might benefit from the advantages of having a job towards the end of their degree. Indeed, their integration is in some cases facilitated thanks to the professional experience and knowledge of the labour market they acquire through a student job (Béduwé & Giret, 2004). In fact, the effect of paid employment varies depending on the time spent on this activity and on the nature the job. The time spent at work has no impact when it does not exceed a certain amount of hours and when it does not affect the student's study time. Some jobs, such as baby-sitting, for example, can even give an advantage in terms of success for students in first year (Michaut, 2000). On the contrary, a higher number of working hours actually increases the risk of failure, especially when it is over 15 to 20 hours a week (Beffy, Fougère & Maurel, 2010). The likelihood of a student successfully completing his or her first year is reduced by 42% for a student who works part-time as compared to a student who does not work, and the consequences are similar for the second and third years (Giret, 2011). As far as the nature of the job is concerned, for the students who have a job that is part of their field of study, it does not affect their chances of graduating, and in fact it might even help them achieve better results, whereas for the students for whom working time has to be added to study time (therefore competing with their studies) their job is more likely to jeopardise their chances of success (Gruel & Thiphaine, 2004b; Giret, 2011).

Being awarded a state grant in France depends largely on parental income. The influence of this criterion is therefore heavily contingent on the student's social background. Consequently, the impact of being awarded a state grant must be measured while also considering the social background of the student, i.e. the parents' social status. It has been demonstrated that for any given academic status and field of study in University, although having a state grant has a protective effect against failure, the students who experience the most severe financial difficulties are never as successful as the other students. Despite this fact, not having a state grant reduces the chances of success all the more (Laib, 2014).

2.2 Cognitive Capacities, Motivation, and Students' Career Plans

There has been little research in France on the impact of students' cognitive capacities on their success. We believe that so far in France there has only been one piece of research done to measure and examine those capacities as defining factors in student success (Morlaix & Suchaut, 2012). In this study, cognitive capacities were operationalized as measures of working memory capacity, data processing speed, and reasoning; nonetheless, these elements did not have a direct effect on success, all else being equal. However, one might hypothesize that their effect, in particular reasoning capacities, is closely related to the educational history of students and thus may indirectly affect academic performances and achievements. The results of this study show that "the major part of the influence of these factors reveals itself prior to university, throughout the student's educational history" (Morlaix & Suchaut, 2012). More specifically, 84% of the variation in student success is explained by the student's educational history, and only 2% by his or her cognitive capacities.

Research has also addressed another essential factor in the learning process: student motivation and its effect on students' academic careers. For Bédard and Viau (2001), motivation represents a key requirement in the learning process. Research based more specifically on Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory shows that a low level of self-determination can actually lead to a low level of academic achievement (Fortier, Vallerand, & Guay, 1995). Moreover, this study also revealed that intrinsic motivation improves the level of creativity, reduces the chances of dropping out, and can even lead to stronger cognitive commitment and better learning processes. In France, research attempting to shed light on the importance of motivation for success is scarcer. However Boujut and Bruchon-Schweitzer (2007) bring up the importance of taking this factor into consideration as, according to them, "besides the cognitive capacities of pupils and students, it is their motivation that explains their success". More recently, Lambert-Le Mener (2012) studied the role played by motivation in the success of first-year students in

University from an empirical approach. The author demonstrated that the impact of motivation changes according to its degree: intrinsic motivation plays a positive and significant role on the annual average grades achieved by the students, while lack of motivation has a negative effect on the results obtained by the students at exams. However, this effect varies according to the level of the students, motivation having no impact whatsoever for the weakest students. In contrast, this factor plays an important role for the students in the top quartile, sometimes predicting up to 2 more points on their average for the year: "those students who perform better academically tend to benefit more from the fact that they are motivated" (Lambert-Le Mener, 2012). Ultimately, Lambert-Le Mener (2012) considers motivation a "key factor in the understanding of success," as it plays a "significant role" in students' results on exams at the end of the first year. In spite of this, motivation has a smaller impact than the characteristics of the students' educational histories.

Finally students' career planning and goals have also been at the heart of various research projects. While registering in higher education is often the next logical step in an academic career, students do not always take the time to ponder their long-term plans. A marginal portion of the student population enrols for a variety of courses in University, just to try them out and "see what it's like" (Convert, 2008; Galley & Droz, 1999), and have not actually defined any precise goals or plans. In contrast, some students' pathways are driven by professional projects, sometimes tied to financial gain, while others are driven by an interest in a particular topic, often taught previously in secondary school. Others yet are lead by curiosity and the desire to discover a new subject. These choices and various planning strategies can affect students' success, students' academic pathways and students' decisions to drop out. The students who enrol for the course of their choice, which corresponds to their first preference, are more successful than the ones who take a course they did not choose "by default." The students' attitude regarding course selection (preference/by default) is highly predictive of the success of the student (Duru-Bellat, 1995). Success at the end of first year is also correlated with the definition of a professional or career plan. Indeed, the successful students are more often students who selected their courses according to particular goals determined by a clear career plan (Lassarre, Giron & Paty, 2003). Gury (2007) notes similar outcomes in the probability of students dropping out. He demonstrates that enrolling for a course "by default" frequently results in students leaving university without graduating.

2.3 Academic History and the "Student Profession"

The influence of students' academic histories is certainly the most defining criterion in their success at the end of their first year (Michaut, 2000; Morlaix & Suchaut, 2012). One often refers to this as the student's "academic past", which consists of various indicators such as academic delay (the number of times a student has had to repeat a year), the type of baccalaureate passed or if the baccalaureate was passed with distinction ("*mention*"). A measure of academic delay, classifying those students who have previously experienced academic difficulties in primary or secondary school, is a marker of a handicap impacting whether a student will graduate from a bachelor's degree without any setbacks. Any repetition of a year in secondary school has a negative effect on success (Duru-Bellat, 1995; Beaupère, Chalumeau, Gury, & Hugrée, 2007). Gury (2007) even demonstrates that a repetition in secondary school actually triples the chances of leaving higher education without graduating. The impact of a repetition, however, differs according to when it occurs. Researchers have shown that a repetition in the first year of university may actually represent an advantage for the student who gets a better opportunity to familiarise him or herself with the workings of the university system: she has begun her apprenticeship of the "student profession" and is able to identify the various difficulties and pitfalls (Romainville, 2000).

The type of baccalaureate, in addition to the fact that it determines the post-baccalaureate path (Beaupère et al., 2007), is also an indicator to be taken into consideration in understanding the phenomenon of failure – or success. Indeed only 7% of professional/vocational baccalaureate holders and 15% of technological baccalaureate holders graduate from a bachelor's degree in three years, in comparison with 45% for general baccalaureate holders (Dethare and Lemaire, 2008). In this sense, general baccalaureate holders have a higher success rate in University than technology baccalaureate holders, who are themselves more successful than professional/vocational baccalaureate holders. The lower success rates of this latter group are due to the fact that the topics taught in final year of secondary school for the professional/vocational streams are less orientated towards preparing students for the first-year university curriculum (Michaut, 2000). Moreover, as Beaupère et al. (2007) specify, those students with a science baccalaureate benefit from the "royal gateway" to pursue their academic studies in higher education. A linear link to success is all the more clear when students pass their baccalaureate with distinction: the higher the level of distinction, the higher the chances of graduating (Michaut, 2000; Gruel, 2002). Indeed, 69% of holders of a general baccalaureate who passed with distinction graduate with a bachelor's degree in three years, while this number is halved (35%) for baccalaureate holders who did not pass with distinction (Dethare & Lemaire, 2008). Furthermore, a

student who passed with distinction is three times more likely to complete his or her first year than a student who passed but not with distinction (Gruel, 2002). Just as the type of baccalaureate partly determines the likelihood of graduation in three years, it also determines how well the students do on exams, as measured by the grades the students get on the end-of-term exams: "the grade obtained for the baccalaureate is tightly linked to the probability of success in the first year of university" (Duru-Bellat, 1995). Today, numerous studies exploring success in University unanimously reinforce this observation (Michaut, 2000; Lambert-Le Mener, 2012; Morlaix & Suchaut, 2012; Duguet, 2014).

In conclusion, students' schooling/academic history prior to university accounts for a non-negligible part of the variability of the average grades the students receive at the end of the first year: between 15% and 45% depending on the location and the field of studies (Michaut, 2000). Belgian researchers, including De Ketele (1990), Romainville (2000), and Galand, Neuville, and Frenay (2005), come to the same conclusions and explain that, even if the impact of schooling history varies depending on the students' field of study or domain of enrolment and is sometimes overestimated, it remains a crucial group of variables that must be taken into consideration when analysing the predictors of success in University.

In recent years, some new student characteristics that go beyond a student's previous educational path have been identified. One such characteristic unique to individual students is the concept of the "student profession," which Coulon (2005) defines as the necessity to learn how to become a student when starting university so as not to be "eliminated" from the system, and consists of various factors, such as learning or study methods. Several authors in France, Belgium and Quebec have analysed the links between success on exams and learning or study methods. The outcome of this research, according to Alava (2000), is that "learning modes and methods play a significant role as a factor distinguishing and predicting the success of students".

In a similar vein, studies have been conducted regarding students' time management (Froment, 2004) and have demonstrated that "the hourly volume spent studying is higher for students who move on to the following year" Student success is in this sense is "almost always systematically related to the amount of time spent studying". However, this investment in time spent studying aimed at a higher chance of success is moderated by several caveats: studying at home for more than 35 hours a week may be detrimental due to a saturation effect (Grignon & Gruel, 1999) and this effect may also depend on the field of study, occurring in specific domains only (Frickey & Primon, 2003). It is therefore necessary to analyse learning methods by considering "the quality of the work and studying provided". Frickey and Primon (2003) authors illustrated that students who work on their lesson by structuring it, organising it, and finding further information and documentation on the subject have higher chances of succeeding and passing on to second year. These conclusions are also in accordance with those of Froment (2014), who argues that the more personalized the student's approach to the learning task, the more research he conducts in relation to the contents of the course, and the more the student organises his thoughts on the study topic, the higher his chances of success. These results match those of Pirot and De Ketele (2000), according to whom the students who pass with distinction dedicated time to "understanding the details of the subject studied while always keeping in mind a global overview of the subject".

Other works have been undertaken regarding the reading practices of students and their working atmosphere. Boulet, Savoie-Zajc, and Chevrier (1996) argue that a successful student is characterised by very particular practices: when doing reading work, she "tries to identify the main points of a text and its global content". In addition she spends more time preparing for lessons "by reading books or collections of texts" which were recommended by the professor and chooses a quiet and bustle free area to work in.

Other studies have been conducted concerning the behaviour of students in the classroom. Boyer and Coridian (2002) mention lessons "disrupted by the comings and goings of students". However, these authors specify, "lesson attendance must be active". It seems essential that the student be involved in the activities proposed in order to better his chances of success on the exam. This is, in fact, one of the characteristics of a successful student as described by Boulet et al. (1996). As far as assiduousness is concerned, Soulié (2002) shows that the results the students achieve on exams are better when they demonstrate a high frequency of attendance: based on a survey carried out with first-year students in sociology, he found that 53.2% of the assiduous students received a score equal or superior to the average grade, in comparison with 21.7 % for the non-assiduous students. Regular attendance and assiduousness of students also constitute "essential prerequisites to their integration into university" (Boyer & Coridian, 2004). Adding further nuance to these conclusions, Parmentier and Romainville (1998) demonstrate that a students' ability to challenge and question her own learning methods and adjust her learning practices accordingly also has a significant impact on her exam success. In other words, it is highly important for a student to be able to reflect deeply

on her own learning methods and practices in order to make the necessary adjustments to adapt and succeed. Pirot and De Ketele (2000) echo this conclusion: for them, "not challenging, questioning or not changing inappropriate studying methods" is a factor associated with failure.

In conclusion, it appears that social background, age, gender, nationality, living conditions and cognitive capacities of students play a limited role in the explanation of success in University. In contrast, motivation, educational path, and the creation of the "student profession" appear to be more defining factors of success. Thus, approaches embracing a sort of determinism created in the student's background or past educational history, or even in the way he becomes affiliated to his university, are not sufficient for understanding and predicting success. Other more comprehensive variables, such as national policies, study environment, and variables related to the actions of the professors, also seem to affect the learning processes and success.

3. Contextual Factors Related to National Policies and Local Practices

Numerous authors agree that disparities persist in the success of students in the context of widespread, mass higher education (Langouët, 1994; Duru-Bellat, 1995; Euriat & Thélot, 1995). The first year of a bachelor's degree plays an important role in the selection process operating in University (Fouquet, 2013). Duru-Bellat (1995) argues that factors of a more contextual nature could explain the level of failure at the end of the first year. Thus, the impact of national policies implemented to reduce the rate of student failure, but also characteristics of the local environment in which the students' education takes place must be carefully considered. For example, the location of the university, the curriculum, and the student support facilities are amongst the many elements to be considered when explaining disparities in success at the end of the first year of a bachelor's degree, along with the teaching practices of the professors.

3.1 National Policies and Local Context

National policies designed to improve success rates in the first cycle of university have been under scrutiny in recent years in order to examine their impact on students. For example, some research has shown that the possibility of changing courses over the course of the year and the extra help given to students produce mixed results (Danner, 2000; Borras, 2011; Annoot, 2012), due to the difficulty of identifying weak students. If the consequences of rare course changes remain to be defined, research shows that methodology, tutoring and educational workshops, which are often optional, actually seldom affect the students who need it most (Danner, 2000; Fornasieri et al., 2003; Cannard et al., 2012; Ben Abid-Zarrouk & Weisser, 2013). The same conclusion can be drawn regarding new schemes to help students succeed, such as the *Plan Réussite en Licence* (*PRL*, "Success for the Bachelor's Degree"), set up in 2007. This 730 million euro scheme aims to "halve the rate of failure at the end of the first year over 5 years," to "ensure that a bachelor's degree is a real national qualification facilitating work integration or post graduate studies," and to guarantee that universities meet the objective of "50 % of an age group reaching the bachelor's degree level" (MESR, 2007). However, the conclusions of the various survey reports on the implementation of the PRL vary. Indeed, even if the implementation of the PRL scheme has had some positive effects in certain areas, it has not met all of its objectives (Bétant, Foucault, & Peyroux, 2010). For example, it was found that "the objective to offer 5 weekly hours of extra teaching per student of L1 (first year) was not reached". Moreover, the reduction of class size, be it for lectures or tutorials, remains "a very marginal move". Also, continuous assessment and possibilities for course changes are still insufficient.

As for the mentoring scheme, although it is becoming more common (due to the fact that it began before 2007 in some universities), it still seems to be underused. Unfortunately – as far as the student's personal project is concerned – it is still only very marginally considered. Generally speaking, the authors highlight the fact that universities "find it very difficult to measure and monitor the advantages of the PRL" and that the implementation of the scheme varies according to different universities and even different faculties. Many of those findings were also highlighted by the State Audit Office in 2012. More recently, the Ministry of Education (MESR, 2012) has also announced that, despite efforts in line with the PRL, institutions did not manage to reduce the failure rate at the bachelor's degree level, and the first attempts to measure the effects of this scheme have not shown any major, significant effects on the success of students.

In one such study, Morlaix and Perret (2013) evaluated the efficacy of the actions that were set up for the PRL at the University of Burgundy on the success of the students, basing their conclusions on a sample of 9,877 first-year students in 14 different courses in various fields of study. The measures considered in this study were the ones that had been initiated in the first semester, i.e. all the steps related to welcoming the students, to reinforcing the monitoring and tutoring of students, to teaching the methodology of university work, and to reforming teaching and educational modalities, as well as course changes for students who fail. Although these findings were limited by the choice of

methodology, these authors describe the results of the overall effect of the PRL as "disappointing" (Morlaix & Perret, 2013). First, they note that the rate of failure in terms of number of referrals and the number of students not successfully completing courses has actually increased since the PRL was implemented. Furthermore, although they don't make a direct connection with the effects of the PRL, they believe nevertheless that "this situation should be analysed further in terms of the relevance of the current policies". Additionally they note, "the multiplication of actions in a particular course is not a strategy that seems to be paying off to improve the success rate of students". This policy could even have a negative effect on science or language baccalaureate holders, as these students see the probability of being a failed candidate at the end of first year increase "with the number of different actions introduced in their course". Furthermore, they mention the fact that "the effect of the PRL actions are in fact limited" and that "all possible actions cannot erase the consequences of the educational history of an individual". Other research focussed on a particular action of the PRL also led to mixed conclusions. For example, Perret, Berthaud and Pichon (2014) were able to bring to light the positive effects of an "inter-sessional revision" programme in first-year Biology/Earth and Life Sciences courses, but only for the second semester exams. These effects vary even more according to the students' profile: female students, holders of a science baccalaureate and students who had a previous university experience being the ones who benefited the most from this programme.

Some other characteristics of the university context have been analysed to explain the success of students. In this area of research, a study was carried out on the impact of the "site," which is a term favoured by Michaut (2000) to that of the "impact of the establishment." In this study, Duru-Bellat, Jarousse and Rapiau (1994) investigated the consequences of schooling within a university branch. They demonstrate that, all else being equal, the students who study in a branch of a university are less likely to succeed than those who study directly in the main campus: even when they attend the same lectures and take the same exams, 16% less of these students pass the exams. Felouzis (1999, 2001b) comes to similar conclusions. However, this disparity between branch and main campuses disappears in the second year of studies. One possible explanation for this phenomena lies in the fact that when we consider the facilities closest to the students' home, we know that part of the students who enrol in a university branch actually enrol there by default. One can therefore suppose that on the one hand these individuals are less motivated, and on the other hand they do not present the academic and social characteristics considered favourable for success. In line with this perspective, Nicourd, Samuel and Vilter (2011) demonstrated that certain territorial disparities, in terms of affiliation to a university, had an effect on the success of students enrolled in first-year Economics and Social Sciences. This is likely a consequence of regional sorting at the start of university, which "leads to the fact that different establishments are in fact representative of the social composition of their environment".

In addition to these findings, researchers have also gone in depth into the efficiency of the educational modes of organisation and their impact on first-year university students' success. According to Michaut (2000), the pedagogical system is structured around four main points: general organisation, curriculum, modes of certification, and specific measures and plans to facilitate success. Based on a survey carried out in the fields of AES (Economics and Social Science), Psychology and SVT (Biology Earth and Life science) of three different universities (Dijon, Nantes and Toulouse), he demonstrates that the pedagogical organisational modes are in fact a minor explanatory factor predicting the results obtained by students on exams. For example, only annual teaching time has a positive impact on success in first year. As for teachers' conscientiousness, the level of supervision, the frequency of teachers' consultation groups, and the number of lectures, their impact remains insignificant. But other variables linked to the local context of a university appear to affect students more significantly.

3.2 Local Practices: Pedagogical Practices in University

Numerous studies have investigated the pedagogical dimensions of student success by investigating the effects of some specific schemes aimed at facilitating the success of an ever-increasingly heterogeneous student body in University. However, when examining student success, one can also question the impact of the teachers' pedagogical methods. Indeed, over the past few decades in France, there has been an increased interest in all questions linked to university pedagogical practices. This is evident in various reports produced since the year 2000, which often include a focus on enhancing teacher training in pedagogy in the university context (Dejan, 2002; Raby, 2011). Going beyond this, in addition to valuing teachers' training in pedagogy, the part played by their teaching practices in students' learning has also been increasingly questioned in recent years. Raby (2011) states that the evolution of teaching practices and the value of the pedagogical function of university teachers are actually constitutive of "essential elements in the success of students and quality of different courses in higher education". Likewise, in a report entitled "Supporting Pedagogical Transformation in Higher Education," Bertrand (2014) states that pedagogy constitutes a "determining factor in the success of students". In reference to these reports, one could question the way the scientific community approaches this issue and attempts to analyse the links between teaching practices and

students' success. Yet, although this issue is often alluded to within scientific writings, studies that specifically aim to expose the links between those two factors are actually quite rare. Next, in order to see if the French case is an exception, we will analyse various studies on this topic in other Francophone regions, such as Belgium and Quebec, as well as some English-speaking countries.

Over the last few decades, various reports produced in France on university pedagogy and the factors affecting student learning and success have emphasized the need to deepen the research conducted on this topic. Based on this gap in the research literature, french authors condemned the "immobilism" (Bireaud, 1990) in university pedagogy, which may have negative repercussions on students. In line with this, Leroux (1997), who was researching the first cycle of university, states that the practice of lecture courses "are a long standing tradition in University", and a potential factor impacting failure for first-year students. In his estimation, the pedagogy used in this type of course does not help students succeed. Similarly, Felouzis (2003), in a book entitled *Current Mutations in University*, argues that the prevailing pedagogical model in University is not suitable for the new types of students in the evolving student body in University, and that this incompatibility could be the impetus for the "flight" of first-cycle students. More recently, Paivandi (2012) emphasizes the fact that in order to prevent early dropouts and facilitate student success, the university needs to reassess its pedagogy.

As a conclusion to their work and even more often as a prospect for further research, educational researchers have emphasized the importance of deepening research on the role of teaching practices as a factor in student success. For example, Annoot and Fave-Bonnet (2004) gathered contributions aimed at offering an overview of research done on teaching practices in higher education and they conclude by saying that the actions of the teacher towards the students is not "neutral" and that it deserves to be looked at more closely. Concerning Romainville and Michaut (2012) add that the impact of teaching practices on success are still a "dark area" to this day as nobody has yet investigated the "teacher's effect" nor grading practices. Furthermore, they argue that "teaching practices as such and their role in the promotion of success" are still a lead to be developed. They also state that "failure or success are also influenced by the actions of the teachers, not in a guilt-inducing perspective suggesting that the latter are in any way responsible for students' failure, but by pointing out that the quality of their pedagogical practices can have a defining impact on the promotion of student success at a similar level of difficulty".

Based on this evidence, Duguet (2014) questioned the impact of teachers' pedagogical practices on first-year university students' academic path in terms of motivation, study methods, and success. To investigate these questions, she observed the *in situ* practices of 49 teachers in lecture courses in Law, AES (Social and Economic Science) Sociology, Psychology, and LLCE[2] English. She also designed a survey questionnaire in parallel for 734 first-year students in the same fields. She demonstrated that the students' perceptions of teachers' practices compared to other variables, such as those related to the individual's academic history, have a moderate impact on average grades on first- and second-semester exams, and on the likelihood of students successfully completing their first year in University. Nevertheless, she identifies student motivation as a mediator variable in the effect of "declared" pedagogical practices on success. In parallel to these results, she highlights three main elements related to pedagogical practices mobilised *in situ* that have a significant impact on student success (all else being equal): interaction with the students, the course structure, and the teachers' attitude. In spite of this, the explanatory power of these elements remains inferior to that of the other variables, such as the academic history of students entering university.

Duguet's (2014) research remains a unique contribution in comparison with other works produced so far on the topic of university pedagogy in France. Indeed, while the scientific community in France acknowledges the importance of researching the role played by university teaching practices in predicting and enhancing student success, the subject still seems to remain taboo. Trinquier, Clanet and Alava (1999) note that when talking about pedagogy in University, one is often more interested in "organisational schemes" than teaching practices as such. However, the question remains: is this specific to France, where research on this topic is not highly developed, or is the situation similar in other countries such as Belgium, Canada, the UK, and the USA?

When we look at research done on the other side of the border, we note that like their French colleagues, Belgian researchers generally consider the question of the impact of teachers' pedagogical practices on student success unresolved. As Romainville (2005) illustrates, this issue remains relatively taboo and pedagogical factors "funnily enough" are amongst the subjects that get mentioned the least in research (Galand, Neuville and Frenay, 2005). Their conclusion is based on research done by Lee and Burkman (2003), and they argue that the underlying reasoning in the scientific literature on the defining factors of success assumes implicitly that failure is due to the students' personal characteristics rather than to the contextual factors they are faced with. However, some authors make

explicit that improvements in university pedagogy are an important means of combatting student failure. This is true of Romainville (2000), who even provides some suggestions for action that could facilitate success for young baccalaureate holders who enrol in the first cycle, including: "favouring methods that lead to in-depth learning," "favouring transparency of objectives and the evaluation process," and "reasserting the value of the teaching mission". However, mirroring the case in France, empirical research that attempts to measure the impact of teaching practices on student success remains scarce in Belgium.

The perspective of researchers in Quebec is similar. Indeed, Pageau and Médaille (2005) argue that further research on university pedagogy could contribute to student success. This statement implies that teaching practices have a role to play in student success, and are consistent with the findings of Fontaine and Peters (2012). The latter, after reviewing all the literature on student perseverance and dropouts, have drawn up a global picture of "retention" factors in the first cycle of university and they identify university teachers' pedagogical practices as being one retention factor. Based on these currents of thought, several universities in Quebec have launched programs to train university teachers in pedagogical practices and teaching such as,, for example, university teaching and pedagogy centres, teaching workshops (which may be either mandatory or voluntary), and dedicated professional development days for teachers. These universities acknowledge the "growing positive influence of an appropriate pedagogy on student's perseverance", perseverance being in itself a factor which can be linked to success. Ménard (2012) also studied the issue of student perseverance by analysing how teaching and learning activities offered to students affect their perseverance. Using a questionnaire administered to 307 students from three different first-cycle programs at three different universities, she found that teaching and learning strategies remain to this day quite "traditional". This situation is problematic because the students reported that teaching activities were likely to have a negative impact on their learning, especially when the teacher did not show particularly good pedagogical skills and when he was not concrete enough. Thus, the students underlined the importance of the pedagogical strategies used in class for the learning process, and the fact that not all teachers had mastered those strategies.

Over the past few decades a large field of English-language academic research has focused on the link between teaching practices and student success. As early as the beginning of the 1990s, Nightingale and O'Neil (1994) listed the different factors that could be linked to teaching practices and could also lead to "good quality" teaching. They thereby recommend amongst other things to "use the student's experience as one of the resources for the learning process," to "adjust to his level of knowledge," to "promote the student's responsibility with regards to his learning process," and to "develop active and cooperative learning". More recently, Braxton, Bray and Berger (2000) conducted empirical research in order to define the impact of teachers' pedagogical skills on students, defining these skills as their level of organisation, their level of preparation and their intelligibility. Based on the data collected from a sample of 696 first-year students at a private university, they demonstrated that teachers' skills have a positive impact on students' learning, on their social integration, on their commitment to pursue their studies, and also on their success. This research, however, relied on students' perceptions and statements, and not on the observation of objective teaching situations.

4. Conclusion

In 2007, the Higher Education and Research Office of France stated that one out of two students fail at the end of their first year in University. Admittedly, this rate needs to be put into perspective because of the definition used to define "failure". Indeed, as Millet (2012) questions, can one consider a re-direction (change of field of study), or even an exit from the educational system (particularly when the individual finds employment) as failure? Likewise, Leclercq and Parmentier (2011) emphasize the fact that these figures also include the non-assiduous students, who may therefore distort the rates stated. However, the fact remains that this phenomenon is not recent and has even grown over the last few decades due to the democratisation and massification of access to first-year university studies. Faced with this observation, researchers within the French context have studied the mechanisms at work that may help in understanding and predicting student success by taking a closer look at factors that are inherent to students. To this end, as was highlighted in the first part of this paper, the socio-demographic characteristics of students, their living conditions, and their cognitive capacities have been examined in relation to their success; however, these factors have been found to have very little or no direct impact on student success. By contrast, students' motivation and their initiation into the "student profession" do play a more significant role in the explanation of success. Despite these facts, there is general agreement that the student's academic history, including the number of repetitions of the same year, the field of study chosen, and the grade obtained on the baccalaureate, constitute the most relevant variables predicting success. Nevertheless, this review of the scientific literature, which does not claim to be exhaustive, reveals the fact that important areas of research remain yet to be explored. This is the case, for example, with the impact of students' social integration, a perspective currently being developed by

Berthaud (Year?). Indeed, seminal English-language research, like Tinto's work (1983), established long ago the importance of taking into consideration this very variable in holistic, integrative models; however, no in-depth empirical research has been conducted on this topic in France.

In conclusion, although French researchers have found the impact of various factors linked to national policies and local contexts to be rather weak in explaining disparities in student performance, very little research has been done to demonstrate empirically the impact of teaching practices on student success. In light of Duguet's (2014) conclusions and of research done in the Francophone regions of Belgium and Canada, as well as in English-speaking countries, teachers' pedagogical practices can be expected to be a centrally important factor in the explanation and comprehension of student success in University. On a positive note, there is every reason to believe that the current government recognizes the major role that pedagogy plays in the success of students, as it has illustrated in policies aimed at reforming university pedagogy through initiatives such as the *PRL*, and in investments in digital technology, with the launch of *France Université Numérique* (FUN, France Digital University). Consequently, future research should address not only the gap in the literature concerning the impact of teacher pedagogy on student success, but also the effects of so-called "digital pedagogy" on students' academic trajectories in University as well as their success.

References

Alava, S. (2000). Les profils d'auto-direction et les pratiques d'études des étudiants en première année d'université. *Les Sciences de l'Education pour l'Ere Nouvelle*, *33*(1), 43-71.

Annoot, E. (2001). Le tutorat ou « le temps suspendu ». *Revue des Sciences de l'Education*, *27*(2), 383-402. http://dx.doi.org/10.7202/009938ar

Annoot, E. (2012). La réussite à l'université du tutorat au plan licence. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Annoot, E., & Fave-Bonnet, M. F. (2004). *Pratiques pédagogiques dans l'enseignement supérieur : enseigner, apprendre, évaluer*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Beaupère, N., Chalumeau L., Gury, N. & Hugrée, C. (2007). *L'abandon des études supérieures*. Paris: La Documentation française.

Bédard, D., & Viau, R. (2001). *Le profil d'apprentissage des étudiantes et des étudiants de l'université de Sherbrooke. Résultats de l'enquête menée au trimestre d'automne 2000.* Unpublished manuscript, Sherbrooke: Vice-rectorat à l'enseignement.

Béduwé, C., & Giret, J. F. (2004). Le travail en cours d'études a-t-il une valeur professionnelle ? *Economie et Statistique*, *378*(1), 55-83. http://dx.doi.org/10.3406/estat.2004.7225

Beffy, M., Fougère D., & Maurel, A. (2010). The Effect of Part-Time Work on Post-Secondary Educational Attainment: New Evidence from French Data. *Discussion paper series, IZA DP*, 5069, 1-44.

Ben Abid-Zarrouk, S., & Weisser, M. (2013). Efficacité du tutorat et étude des profils « efficaces » des tutorés. *Recherches en Éducation, 16*, 90-105. http://pmb.cereq.fr/index.php?lvl=notice_display&id=51779

Bertrand, C. (2014). *Soutenir la transformation pédagogique dans l'enseignement supérieur.* Paris: Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche. Retrieved from http://www.enseignementsup-recherche.gouv.fr/cid82478/soutenir-la-transformation-pedagogique-dans-l-enseignement-superieur.html

Bétant, B., Foucault, M. & Peyroux, C. (2010). *Note relative à la mise en œuvre du plan pour la réussite en licence* (2010-091). Paris: Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche.

Bireaud, A. (1990). Pédagogie et méthodes pédagogiques dans l'enseignement supérieur. *Revue Française de Pédagogie, 91*, 13-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.3406/rfp.1990.1384

Borras, I. (2011). Le tutorat à l'université. Peut-on forcer les étudiants à la réussite ? *Bref du Céreq, 290*, 1-4.

Boujut, E., & Bruchon-Schweitzer, M. (2007). Rôle de certains facteurs psychosociaux dans la réussite universitaire d'étudiants de première année. *L'orientation Scolaire et Professionnelle*, *36*(2), 157-177. http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/osp.1367

Boulet A., Savoie Zajc, L., & Chevrier, J. (1996). *Les stratégies d'apprentissage à l'université*. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'université du Québec.

Boyer, R., & Coridian, C. (2002). Réapprendre à apprendre pour réussir en première année de DEUG. *L'orientation*

Scolaire et Professionnelle, *31*(3), 1-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/osp.3249

Boyer, R., & Coridian, C. (2004). Réussir en première année d'université. In E. Annoot, & M. F. Fave-Bonnet (Eds.), *Pratiques pédagogiques dans l'enseignement supérieur: enseigner, apprendre, évaluer* (pp. 143-166). Paris: L'Harmattan.

Braxton, J. M., Bray, N. J., & Berger, J. B. (2000). Faculty Teaching Skills and their Influence on the College Student Departure Process. *Journal of College Student Development*, *41*(2), 215-227.

Cannard, C., Entenmann, F., Paris, S., Delmas, F., & Graff, C. (2012). Mobilisation et Réussite des Etudiants Tutorés en Licence de Psychologie. *Revue Internationale de Pédagogie de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, *28*(2), 1-17.

Convert, B. (2008). Orientations et réorientations des bacheliers inscrits dans l'enseignement supérieur. *Éducation et formations, 77*, 89-97.

Coudin, É., & Tavan, C. (2008). Deux étudiants du supérieur sur dix ont un emploi : le premier en lien avec ses études et l'autre pas. *INSEE Première, 1204*, 1-4.

Coulon, A. (2005). *Le métier d'étudiant : l'entrée dans la vie universitaire* (2e éd.). Paris : Economica.

Cour Des Comptes (2012). *Rapport public annuel 2012*. Paris : Cour des comptes.

Danner, M. (2000). A qui profite le tutorat mis en place dans le premier cycle universitaire ? *Les Sciences de l'Education pour l'ère nouvelle*, *33*(1), 25-41.

Dejean, J. (2002). *L'évaluation de l'enseignement dans les universités françaises*. Paris: Haut Conseil de l'Evaluation de l'Ecole. Retrieved from http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/rapports-publics/024000165/index.shtml

De Ketele, J. M. (1990). Le passage de l'enseignement secondaire à l'enseignement supérieur: les facteurs de réussite. *Vie Pédagogique*, 66, 4-8.

Dethare, B. & Lemaire, S. (2008). L'accès à la licence des bacheliers 2002. *Note d'information, 08*.24, 1-6.

Dubet, F. (1994). Dimensions et figures de l'expérience étudiante dans l'université de masse. *Revue Française de Sociologie*, *35*(4), 511-532. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3322182

Duguet, A. (2014). *Les pratiques pédagogiques en première année universitaire : description et analyse de leurs implications sur la scolarité des étudiants.* (Thèse de doctorat). Université de Bourgogne, Dijon. Retrieved from https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01096748/

Duru-Bellat, M. (1995). Des tentatives de prédiction aux écueils de la prévention en matière d'échec en première année d'université. *Savoir, 3*, 399-416.

Duru-Bellat, M. (2004). *L'école des filles: Quelle formation pour quels rôles sociaux ?* Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

Duru-Bellat, M., Jarousse, J. P., & Rapiau, M. T. (1994). L'université plus près du « local », un plus pour les usagers ? In B. Charlot (Ed.), *L'école et le territoire* (pp. 167-171). Paris: Armand Colin,

Euriat, M., & Thélot, C. (1995). Le recrutement social de l'élite scolaire en France : évolution des inégalités de 1950 à 1990. *Revue française de sociologie*, *36*(3), 403-438. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3322163

Felouzis, G. (1999). *Les parcours universitaires dans les universités délocalisées. Le cas du droit en Aquitaine.* Communication présentée au 3ème congrès de l'AREF, Bordeaux, France. Retrieved from

Felouzis, G. (2000). Repenser les inégalités à l'université. Des inégalités sociales aux inégalités locales dans trois disciplines universitaires. *Sociétés contemporaines, 38*, 67-97. http://dx.doi.org/10.3406/socco.2000.1793

Felouzis, G. (2001a). *La condition étudiante : sociologie des étudiants et de l'Université* (1e éd.). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Felouzis, G. (2001b). Les délocalisations universitaires et la démocratisation de l'enseignement supérieur. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 136, 53-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.3406/rfp.2001.2825

Felouzis, G. (2003). *Les mutations actuelles de l'Université* (1e éd.). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Felouzis, G., & Le Guyader, M. (2007). Qu'enseigne-t-on en première année de licence ? La place de la recherche dans l'enseignement universitaire. *Revue de l'inspection générale, 4*, 71-77.

Fontaine, S., & Peters, M. (2012). L'abandon des étudiants à l'université : état de la question. In M. Romainville, & C. Michaut, *Réussite, échec et abandon dans l'enseignement supérieur* (pp. 33-52). Bruxelles : De Boeck.

Fornasieri, I., Lafont, L., Poteaux, N., & Sere, M.-G. (2003). La fréquentation du tutorat : des pratiques différenciées. Enquête au sein de huit universités françaises. *Recherche et formation, 43*, 29-45.

Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., & Guay, F. (1995). Academic motivation and school performance: toward a structural model. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 20*, 257-274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1995.1017

Fouquet, S. (2013), Parcours et réussite en licence et en master à l'université. *Note d'information de la DEPP*, 02/13.

Frickey, A., & Primon, J. L. (2002). Les manières sexuées d'étudier en première année d'université. *Sociétés contemporaines, 48*, 63-85. http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/soco.048.0063

Frickey ,A., & Primon, J. L. (2003). Manières d'étudier en première année d'université et passage dans l'année supérieure. In G. Felouzis, *Les mutations actuelles de l'université* (pp. 229-249). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Galand, B., Neuville, S., & Frenay, M. (2005). L'échec à l'université en Communauté Française de Belgique : Comprendre pour mieux prévenir ? *Cahiers de Recherche en Education et Formation, 39*, 5-17.

Galland, O. (2011). *Sociologie de la jeunesse* (5e éd.). Paris: Armand Colin. http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/arco.galla.2011.01

Galley, F., & Droz, R. (1999). *L'abandon des études universitaires : des difficultés du métier d'étudiant*. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires Fribourg.

Giret, J.F. (2011). L'activité rémunérée des étudiants. In O. Galland, E. Verley, & R. Vourc'h, *Les mondes étudiants : enquête conditions de vie 2010* (pp. 207-216). Paris: La Documentation Française.

Grignon, C., & Gruel, L. (1999). *La vie étudiante* (1e éd.). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Gruel, L. (2002). Les conditions de réussite dans l'enseignement supérieur. *OVE infos, 2*, 1-10.

Gruel, L., & Thiphaine, B. (2004a). *Des meilleures scolarités féminines aux meilleures carrières masculines*. Paris: Observatoire national de la vie étudiante.

Gruel, L., & Thiphaine, B. (2004b). Formes, conditions et effets de l'activité rémunérée des étudiants. *Education et Formations, 67*, 51-60.

Gury, N. (2007). Les sortants sans diplôme de l'enseignement supérieur : temporalités de l'abandon et profils des décrocheurs. *L'orientation Scolaire et Professionnelle*, *36*(2), 2-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/osp.1357

Laferrère, A. (2011). Le logement des parents influencent-ils les choix d'études supérieures ? In O. Galland, E. Verley, & R. Vourc'h, *Les mondes étudiants: enquête conditions de vie 2010* (pp. 105-115). Paris: La Documentation Française.

Lahire, B. (1997). *Les Manières d'étudier*. Paris: La Documentation française.

Lambert-Le Mener, M. (2012). *La performance académique des étudiants en première année universitaire : influence des capacités cognitives et de la motivation* (Thèse de doctorat). Université de Bourgogne, Dijon. Retrieved from https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00780578/

Langouët, G. (1994). *La démocratisation de l'enseignement aujourd'hui*. Paris: ESF.

Lassarre, D., Giron C., & Paty, B. (2003). Stress des étudiants et réussite universitaire: les conditions économiques, pédagogiques et psychologiques du succès. *Orientation scolaire et professionnelle*, *32*(4), 669-691. http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/osp.2642

Leclercq, D., & Parmentier P. (2011). Qu'est ce que la réussite à l'université d'un étudiant ? In P. Parmentier, *Recherches et actions en faveur de la réussite en première année universitaire* (pp. 6-9). Namur: Presses universitaires de Namur.

Lemaire, S. (2000). Les facteurs de réussite dans les deux premières années d'enseignement supérieur (DEUG, DUT, BTS). *Note d'information*, 00-25.

Leroux, J.Y. (1997). Les premiers cycles universitaires français dans le contexte de l'enseignement supérieur de masse. *Gestion de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, *9*(1), 115-125.

Ménard, L. (2012). Apprentissage en classe et persévérance au premier cycle universitaire. In M. Romainville, & C. Michaut, *Réussite, échec et abandon dans l'enseignement supérieur* (pp. 177-198). Bruxelles: De Boeck.

MESR. (2007). *Plan pluriannuel pour la réussite en licence. Document d'orientation.* Retrieved from http://www.enseignementsup-recherche.gouv.fr/cid20651/plan-pour-la-reussite-en-licence-730-millions-d-euros-d-ici-2012.html

MESR. (2012). *Conférence de presse de Geneviève Fioraso sur la rentrée étudiante 2012-2013 du 18 septembre 2013.* Retrieved from http://www.enseignementsup-recherche.gouv.fr/cid61528/rentree-etudiante-2012-2013-objectif-reussite.html

Michaut, C. (2000). *L'influence du contexte universitaire sur la réussite des étudiants* (Thèse de doctorat). Université de Bourgogne, Dijon.

Michaut, C. (2002). *L'influence du contexte universitaire sur la réussite des étudiants*. Lille: Presses universitaires du Septentrion.

Michaut, C. (2012). Réussite, échec et abandon des études dans l'enseignement supérieur français : quarante ans de recherche. In M. Romainville, & C. Michaut, *Réussite, échec et abandon dans l'enseignement supérieur* (pp. 53-68). Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Millet, M. (2012). L'« échec » des étudiants de premiers cycles dans l'enseignement supérieur en France. Retours sur une notion ambiguë et descriptions empiriques. In M. Romainville, & C. Michaut, *Réussite, échec et abandon dans l'enseignement supérieur* (pp. 69-88). Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Morlaix, S., & Le Mener, M. (2015). La motivation des étudiants à l'entrée à l'université : quels effets directs ou indirects sur la réussite ? *Recherches en éducation*, 22, 152-167.

Morlaix, S., & Perret, C. (2013). L'évaluation du Plan Réussite en Licence : quelles actions pour quels effets ? Analyse sur les résultats des étudiants en première année universitaire. *Recherches en Education, 15*, 137-150.

Morlaix, S., & Suchaut, B. (2012). Analyse de la réussite en première année universitaire: effets des facteurs sociaux, scolaires et cognitifs. *Document de travail de l'IREDU*, 2012/2.

Nicourd, S., Samuel, O., & Vilter, S. (2011). Les inégalités territoriales à l'université : effets sur les parcours des étudiants d'origine populaire. *Revue Française de Pédagogie, 176*, 27-40. http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/rfp.3153

Nightingale, P., & O'neil, M. (1994). *Achieving quality in learning in higher education*. Londres: Kogan.

Pageau, D., & Medaille, C. (2005). La recherche institutionnelle au Québec. In P. Chenard, & P. Doray, *L'enjeu de la réussite dans l'enseignement supérieur* (p. 111-126). Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'université du Québec.

Paivandi, S. (2012). Pour réussir la transition entre secondaire et supérieur. *Cahiers pédagogiques, 25*, 22-25.

Parmentier, P., & Romainville, M. (1998). Les manières d'apprendre à l'université. In M. Frenay, B. Noël, P. Parmentier, & M. Romainville, *L'étudiant-apprenant: Grilles de lecture pour l'enseignant universitaire* (pp. 63-80). Bruxelles : De Boeck Université.

Perret, C., Berthaud J., & Pichon, L. (2014). Proposer des révisions intersessions aux étudiants de 1re année : quelles relations avec la réussite aux examens? *Les Sciences de l'éducation, Pour l'Ere nouvelle, 47*(1), 37-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/lsdle.471.0037

Pirot, L., & De Ketele, J. M. (2000). L'engagement académique de l'étudiant comme facteur de réussite à l'université, étude exploratoire menée dans deux facultés contrastées. *Revue des Sciences de l'Education, 26(*2), 367-394. http://dx.doi.org/10.7202/000127ar

Raby, G. (2011). *Pour une licence attractive doublement qualifiante, permettant une poursuite d'études en Master et une insertion professionnelle, une licence assurant un parcours de réussite aux étudiants*. Rapport d'enquête. Paris: Comité de Suivi de la Licence et de la Licence Professionnelle. Retrieved from http://www.univ-paris-diderot.fr/DocumentsFCK/cevu/File/Doc_4_Propositions_Comite_suivi_licence_140411.pdf

Romainville, M. (2000). *L'échec dans l'université de masse*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Romainville, M. (2005). Quelques interrogations sur l'échec à l'université. *Cahiers de Recherche en Education et Formation,* 39, 18-22.

Romainville, M., & Michaut, C. (2012). *Réussite, échec et abandon dans l'enseignement supérieur*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Université.

Soulié, C. (2002). L'adaptation aux "nouveaux publics" de l'enseignement supérieur : auto-analyse d'une pratique

d'enseignement magistral en sociologie. *Sociétés contemporaines, 4*(38), 11-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.3917/soco.048.0011

Teissier, C., Theulière M., & Tomasini, M. (2004). Les étudiants étrangers en France. *Note d'information* de la DEPP, 04.23.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Trinquier, M. P., Clanet J., & Alava, S. (1999). Hétérogénéité et réussite dans le premier cycle universitaire. Conditions perçues et effectives des pratiques d'études et d'enseignement. Rapport de recherche, Paris: INRP, CNCRE.

Vallerand, R. J. (1993). La motivation intrinsèque et extrinsèque en contexte naturel : implication pour les secteurs de l'éducation, du travail, des relations interpersonnelles et des loisirs. In R. J. Vallerand, & E. E. Thill, *Introduction à la psychologie de la motivation* (pp. 533-581). Laval: Etudes Vivantes.

Van Campenhoudt, M., Dell'aquila, F., & Dupriez, V. (2008). La démocratisation de l'enseignement supérieur en Communauté française de Belgique : état des lieux. *Cahiers de Recherche en Education et Formation*, 65.