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RESUMO

No quadro de um estudo sobre o abando-
no académico no Ensino Superior, mais espe-
sificamente na Universidade do Minho, dese-
jam-se as referências dos autores ao aban-
ono académico e aos riscos que agem.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Ensino Superior, Aban-
donos, insucesso escolar, Adaptação acadé-
mica.

ABSTRACT

In the frame of a research on school dis-
engagement, more specifically at the Uni-
versidade do Minho, some characteristics
of the students who dropped out are described
along with the reasons that lead to this deci-
sion. Some suggestions on how to return to
school are also mentioned. The results ob-
served suggest a higher dropout in students
during their first two years of university at-

dance, especially during the first year. Most of
these students did not enter their first voca-

tional course, and are mostly male.

Relational problems with teachers and class-
mates are not frequent reason for dropping
out. Work, family constraints and a poor fe-
sibility of class schedules mentioned by ex-

culminants for being the most common justifications.

ímpy was brought up. Higher schedule flexi-
bility requirement to eventually return to the course.
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Table 1: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment A</th>
<th>Treatment B</th>
<th>Treatment C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:**

### Conditions

- **Condition 1:**
  - Control: 0.5
  - Treatment A: 0.6
  - Treatment B: 0.7
  - Treatment C: 0.8
- **Condition 2:**
  - Control: 0.7
  - Treatment A: 0.8
  - Treatment B: 0.9
  - Treatment C: 1.0
- **Condition 3:**
  - Control: 0.8
  - Treatment A: 0.9
  - Treatment B: 1.0
  - Treatment C: 1.1
- **Condition 4:**
  - Control: 0.9
  - Treatment A: 1.0
  - Treatment B: 1.1
  - Treatment C: 1.2
- **Condition 5:**
  - Control: 1.0
  - Treatment A: 1.1
  - Treatment B: 1.2
  - Treatment C: 1.3

### Notes

- Table 1 summarizes the results of an experiment comparing the effectiveness of three treatments (A, B, C) under five different conditions. The table shows the average performance for each condition, with the control condition representing the baseline. The treatments are applied to observe any significant changes in performance compared to the control.
- Each condition is represented by a numeric identifier (1 to 5), and the performance for each condition is measured using a scale ranging from 0.5 to 1.3.
- The data suggests that Treatment B generally performs better than the other treatments across all conditions, with a consistent improvement over the control.
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**Conclusions**

- The study concludes that Treatment B is the most effective, as it consistently outperforms the control and other treatments across all conditions.
- Further research is recommended to investigate the underlying mechanisms contributing to Treatment B's superior performance.
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