

The “help” of the family grant program: representations of income transfer to their beneficiaries

Viviane Marinho da Costa
Luciana Maria Cerqueira Castro²
Shirley Donizete Prado³
Silvia Ângela Gugelmin³

¹ Graduate Program in Food, Nutrition and Health. Institute of Nutrition, University of the State of Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

² Department of Social Nutrition. Institute of Nutrition. University of the State of Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

³ Graduate Program in Food, Nutrition and Health. Department of Social Nutrition. Institute of Nutrition. University of the State of Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

Correspondence
Viviane Marinho da Costa
E-mail: viviane _ mcosta@yahoo.com.br

Abstract

The Family Grant Program (PBF) is currently the Brazilian social policy to fight hunger of greater magnitude and scope. Aimed at families in poverty and extreme poverty, it associates the transfer of financial benefits with access to basic social rights through conditionality. Three main axes and interrelated actions should make this program: income transfer, access to public health and education, and access to employment and income through complementary programs. However, it is clear that income transfer plays a central role in PBF. This study aimed to identify the representations of PBF beneficiaries about the financial benefits received and, therefore, discuss the relation between these individuals and the program. We conducted 23 interviews and analyzed them through the hermeneutic-dialectic approach. The interviews summarized the representations of beneficiaries with the category *help*. The main points we highlight on this categorization are: a lack of benefit considering the needs of the family; disregard of this benefit as a right, ie, understanding that it is some kind of grant; and the feeling of disaffiliation from the labor market, which generates feelings of worthlessness and social inertia.

Keywords: Government Programs. Health Promotion. Human Rights. Family Grant Program. Income Transfer Programs.

Introduction

The Bolsa Família Program (BFP) is part of the Brazilian social policy of transferring income to fight hunger of greater magnitude and scope. Aimed at eradicating absolute poverty, the program serves millions of Brazilian families selected from Unified Registry of Government Social Programs (CadÚnico).

Implemented on the first year of President Lula's administration and introduced by Provisional Measure nº 132, October 20th, 2003, the PBF is presented as the highest emergency part of the policy for eradicating hunger and poverty in Brazil. It introduces the direct transfer of income as a measure of relief to the immediate needs of families in vulnerable situations (poverty and extreme poverty), associating the transfer of financial benefit with access to basic social rights (health, education and welfare) through conditionalities.

While many questioned the program's ability to achieve its ambitions, research on the PBF have demonstrated its potential for modification of the acute poverty in Brazilian society. The 4th National Monitoring Report on the Millennium Goals¹ informs lowering the rates of extreme poverty from 12% in 2003 to 4.8% in 2008. These data give strength to the PBF on a national level, in the movement to eradicate extreme poverty.

To join the PBF, families must meet the criteria for program eligibility (which are centrally summarized on the family income *per capita*) and be enrolled in CadÚnico. In this register are inserted all the families who have an income of up to half the minimum wage *per capita*, since CadÚnico is used to select audiences of various social policies. With the entry of the family in the program, it receives the magnetic card from Caixa Economica Federal, the agency responsible for the transfer of the benefit from the Union directly to the beneficiary.

The focus, the central part of the program design, has its basis in the concept of positive discrimination. Thus, the program chooses its audience according to their immediate needs for survival. Income is the criterion used to measure the degree of the need and is the primary identifier of families that can enroll in the program.

In the chart below, we can see the types and amounts of benefits granted in 2012.

Chart 1. PBF eligibility criteria and benefits. 2012.

Elegibility Criteria		Basic Benefit	Occurrence of children / Adolescents 0- 15 years, Expecting and Nursing moms (maximum 3 benefits)	Occurrence of adolescents aged 16 and 17 (maximum 2 benefits)	Benefit variation according to income
Family situation	Per capita monthly income				
Poverty	From R\$70,01 to R\$140,00	---	R\$32,00	R\$38,00	R\$32,00 to R\$172,00
Extreme poverty	Up to R\$70,00	R\$70,00	R\$32,00	R\$38,00	R\$70,00 to R\$242,00

Source: BRASIL, Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social e Combate à Fome, 2012.

The PBF provides that the main beneficiary of the family will preferably be the woman, empowering her and recognizing her ability to identify the needs of the family. According to a study by IBASE,² women owners report that after receiving the PBF benefit they “feel more financially independent”, in addition to stating that it “increased their power of decision regarding the family’s money.”

According to the Ministry of Social Development and Hunger Combat (MDS), the PBF is guided on the articulation of three dimensions essential to overcoming hunger and poverty: a) promotion of immediate poverty relief, through direct income transfer to the family; b) strengthening the exercise of basic social rights in the areas of Health and Education, through the fulfillment of conditionalities, which helps families who are able to break the cycle of intergenerational poverty; c) coordination of complementary programs that aim at the development of families, so that the PBF beneficiaries can overcome the situation of vulnerability and poverty.

Also according to the MDS, the complementary programs aim to further enhance the effects of conditional income transfers in reducing inequality, “promoting a qualitative leap that leads families from a situation of poverty reduction, to another of sustained overcoming any kind of vulnerability”.³

Seeking new perspectives to the understanding of the PBF, we aimed, in this study, to approach representatives of families assisted by the program on the financial benefit received and discuss the relationship between these individuals and the program that assists them.

Methodology

This article is derived from the master's dissertation of the first author, titled *The Bolsa Família Program and health conditionalities: perceptions of beneficiaries in the municipality of Rio de Janeiro*, a study which aimed to identify representations on this income transfer program and about health conditionalities attached to it.

Semistructured interviews were used. The option of using this type of interview was not random and converges with the approach of this research, of exploratory character. This type of interview allows us an approach and knowledge of the subject, without limiting new discoveries.⁴

We favor the view of the beneficiaries on this program, understanding these individuals as protagonists of this policy, which may raise issues relevant to the understanding of the social reality brought with the PBF. They are the ones who experience, every day, the direct changes, impacts and repercussions that this policy has in their lives. We then consider this sample as a peculiar point in our study, revealing the view of certain individuals that is often disregarded.

The fieldwork was conducted in the Health Program Area 5.3, in the city of Rio de Janeiro. The choice of this site was based on a look at the practices carried out in monitoring the conditionalities of the program in the city of Rio de Janeiro. While visiting the Annes Dias Institute of Nutrition (INAD), with the Municipal Health and Civil Defense of Rio de Janeiro (SMSDC-RJ) we noted that the Program Area 5.3 showed, in some units, a different methodology to track their beneficiaries, in addition to a greater participation in the municipal management of the program, in the *intergestor group*.^{*} Thus, we decided to investigate what would these practices actually be, how they were expressed in each unit visited, and what effects could they generate on the monitoring and implementation of the program.

Based on the dialogue with the coordination of AP 5.3 and INAD data, three health units were selected (a polyclinic, a basic health unit and a Family Health Strategy unit). These units were visited between April and May 2009, when we conducted participant observation and semi-structured interviews. All interviews were conducted by the same person and were recorded on digital equipment, being later transcribed by the interviewer.

23 holders of the program were interviewed, randomly selected at Health Units in the region of Santa Cruz in the city of Rio de Janeiro. At the time of the interview, survey participants were at

* The Family Grant Program in the Municipality of Rio de Janeiro has its own settings that were produced by the program's municipal management for its implementation. The decree nº 24,702, of October 8th, 2004, created the *intergestor group* for the development and improvement of appropriate tools for monitoring and evaluating the conditionalities of the Family Grant Program, under the coordination of the Municipal Social Welfare (SMAS). Besides SMAS, this group is formed by the Departments of Municipal Health and Civil Defense (SMSDC), Education (SME), Housing (SMH) Sports and Leisure (SMEL) and Finance (SMF).

health units to follow up on health conditionalities of PBF. To preserve the identity of respondents, we used numbers and letters to identify the responses. These codes represent, respectively: number - the identity of the interviewee within the health unit where they belong; letter - the health unit, with E being code for Family Health Strategy, U being the traditional basic unit and P being the polyclinic.

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Municipal Health Department of Rio de Janeiro, through decision No. 23A/2009.

Results and discussion

Of those interviewed, 20 were women and only three were men. This finding is similar to other studies^{2,5} and is consistent with the legal framework of PBF, indicating the preference for women as program cardholders. We found that the respondents lived in households with an average of 4.5 people.

There were variations among respondents in the category “education”. On average, they presented seven years of attendance of formal studies, which represents the 5th grade of elementary school. Eight respondents (34.7%) reported between nine and 12 years of school attendance and completed at least primary education; on the other hand, five (21.7%) attended school for less than five years, not even completing the first cycle of primary education.

Regarding these families’ work situation, we realize that the vast majority of the respondents were unemployed at the time of the interview or performed some kind of informal work, such as small service work, mason’s helper, selling ready meals and other kinds of food and other similar informal activities.

The *help* as a representation of the benefit

In an attempt to synthesize and identify approaches or distanciings in the interviewees responses, we identified a strong trend in the construction of the representation of a concept about the benefit of PBF: a reference to *help*, a category that appeared recurrently in the speech of respondents, assuming various meanings that we present below.

This finding is not restricted to our study, also being reported in other studies of larger scope.^{2,**} At first, associating the *help* category to a social policy could refer exclusively to social welfare.

** Monnerat GL. Disclosure of preliminary results of the research "Family Grant Program: The implementation of health conditionalities from the perspective of managers and beneficiary families" at an event held at the Faculty of Social Services of the UERJ. Personal Communication. 2009.

And not coincidentally, several representations found in the studies cited refer to a relationship of assistance between the state and the holder: donation, charity, child's grant, among other meanings, found in the literature:⁶ “[...] the fear of losing the benefit, irregularity of payments, lack of clarity about eligibility criteria and termination tended to undermine the development of the program as a social right. The Family Grant thus often became a “charity”, a “relief”, an “aid” or “a payment for child study.”

The words of Magalhães *et al.*⁶ explain some of the possible reasons for the presence of the paternalist view of PBF. One of these reasons is expressed in the following quote, in which the interviewee shows her dissatisfaction and misunderstanding regarding the procedures for setting the values for the benefit for different families:

“Look, the only thing I find wrong is that this benefit is larger for some, who don't need it, and for those who really need it, it's not enough. That's my case [...] some are low, some are above normal, I think that's wrong. If it's a benefit for all, it has to come with the amount specified for each. The right value is “so much”? It's one hundred and fifty? Then it's one hundred and fifty for everybody. Because some get two hundred something, you know, and I think that's super wrong.” (1E)

The study by IBASE² found a similar reality, since 74% of respondents said they did not know why families received different values. This is another sign of poor communication established with the beneficiary of this policy, which has negative repercussions on how the beneficiaries relate to it. Hevia⁷ noticed in a study that “[...] las formas de comunicación e interlocución ente el programa y los beneficiários, puesto que se basan em cartas, médios de comunicación y otras instancias virtuales y esporádicas, generan relaciones “lejanas” entre beneficiários y el programa. Esto repercute em el poco conocimiento de los procesos clave que tienen los beneficiários sobre el Programa.”

A review on the promotion of citizenship from a public policy relates to how it allows its audience to understand its functioning. In this sense, we perceive a deficiency of the PBF in clarifying a key point of the program, the calculation of the amount received per family, which indicates miscommunication between the beneficiary and program managers. Silva⁸ alerts to the lack of methodologies for assessing the PBF's potential to generate citizenship and considers fundamental the advance in this field of program evaluation.

Another issue identified in most speeches is that there is a consensus on the feeling of change in the family when entering the program. This change is directly related to the financial benefit, which impacts the purchasing power and access to certain goods that were previously distant from the reality of families. This highlights the central role that the income transfer (TR) assumes in this social policy, as explained in the following statements:

“Ah! It changed in the sense that every month I can count, at the same place *where I receive it, I can go and buy the milk for her, you know? I can buy a notebook, a pencil, you know? Everything that the school gives you, but they ask sometimes, you know? If they need socks to go to school, you know? So when it changed it really helped me a lot. I'm not gonna say that “oh, it's just for food”, I won't, because I'd be lying if I said that. But it helps them in every sense. It helps them because it's their benefit, you know?”* (4U)

“Ah! I think it did change. It changed because it helps buy more things for the kids, right, **I don't know if I can tell you this, but my son had no shoes, so I went and bought a him sneakers, right? We can buy, like, fruit and things we need more, a notebook, these little things.**” (9P)

“So now I set some aside, some money goes to them. I don't need to be worrying so much, with notebooks, pencils, and I do have a large gang, you know? (laughs) **So those are things that I put aside for them, I use it just for them.**”(4E)

The statements presented are full of meanings and appropriations of various natures. In the first speeches, we realize that the *help* represents the ability to have access to their needs. Other authors also report that security generated by the income forecast to be received next month was present in their findings.⁶

A matter present in the discourse of the very professionals (health, education and welfare) that operate in PBF stands out in these speeches: the association of the benefit transferred with the exclusive purchase of food. The phrase, “*I'm not gonna say that “oh, it's just for food”,* by the interviewee, when saying she spent her money with shoes for her son, exemplifies the existence of this association.

The statements that we present indicate that, at some point (either at the health unit, school, neighborhood, home), these women were faced with the prospect that the money from the PBF was to be used exclusively for food.

The history of Brazilian policies to fight hunger may be related to this intrinsic charge to the speech of some health professionals. According to Leão & Castro, 9 the Food Grant Program introduced the link between the health service and the monetary transfer policies. It is possible that this first experience of direct income transfer, which originated in the transformation of previous experiences of other kinds of transfers - Milk is Health Program (PLS) and Malnutrition Combat Incentive (ICCN) - had directly influenced the understanding and performance of health professionals. The unfolding of this influence is the idea that the money transferred to the families should be spent on food. However, one must envision that the change in these policies aimed at granting more autonomy to families in the use of funds received. In this sense, according Suplicy: 10 “If the goal is to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, we must understand that the poor

person needs more than stave off hunger. If it's getting cold, they need to buy a coat or a blanket. If the tile or door of their home are damaged, they need to fix them. If a child got sick, they need to buy medicine urgently. If it is the birthday of a daughter, it is possible that the mother wants to give her a pair of shoes as a gift. If the neighborhood is selling one very cheap type of food, they better buy it because there will be more money for other things" [...] [...]

In this passage, Suplicy¹⁰ reinforces a discourse that is present in the literature, which refers to the influence of direct monetary transfer in the economy.¹¹ The injection of capital in small municipalities, for example, can generate financial transactions and heating of the local markets, which is very favorable for its development.

Several studies^{2,11,12} demonstrated that inducing the use of the PBF benefit in food purchases is at least unnecessary, since it is perceived that this has largely been the fate of the money received by these families. One of these studies shows that the PBF had an impact on the household food basket, ensuring increased consumption parcels with food, education and children's clothing.¹²

IBASE's research² shows that the PBF money is spent mostly on food (87%), school supplies (46%) and clothing (37%). According to the same study, it can be seen that the higher the level of poverty, the greater the proportion of income spent on food. Burlandy¹¹ also highlights that studies of TR programs in countries such as Nicaragua, Colombia, Mexico and African countries showed an average increase in food spending.

The impact related to increased access to food that the BFP brings is undeniable, which is directly related to the nutritional status of the families assisted. Despite the low values of the benefits transferred, especially considering the cost of basic food and inflation in the country, we can see its importance, especially in families in extreme poverty, as reported below:

[...] *"hunger is also lower, because there's people saying: 'a hundred reais is nothing' ... it's ...because when you look in your closet and see nothing [emotional voice]... if you get a hundred reais it's all for groceries. I say: in this sense the Family Grant helped a lot."* (2P).

Another very common widespread idea among beneficiaries, and quite possibly relates to the inheritance of previous social policies, is that, for many families, the variable benefit (conditioned to the existence of children, adolescents and or expecting moms) is unique to that individual, as can be seen in the following account:

"It helped me a lot. More for my daughter, because back home I use the Family Grant more for school, to buy supplies. Even the fruit is hers, everything that's hers i use it with her." (5P)

Santos¹³ also describes that the local meaning for the federal benefit transferred to the nuclear family was that it was directed to the child. The author's understanding is that, in the context

studied, “the family who enters the ‘Family Grant’ tends to be seen locally by residents as the children” (p.15). However, it is important to note that a feature of this policy is to conduct the transfer directed to families and not only or exclusively to one of its members. This differs substantially from the targeted financial transfers to family members who require special assistance for any reason.

Resuming the various dimensions of the “help” to find reports that question the sufficiency of the aid on the life situation of these families. The reports demonstrate the notion that, in addition to being financially unable to meet the basic needs of the family, this help does not extend to other elements that interviewees deemed fundamental for change in their lives. When asked about the changes in their life since entering the PBF, they responded:

*“In my situation it hasn’t changed anything, right? I finished my studies, you know, I was able to finish. But it is a secondary degree that doesn’t give you any option at all, because it’s not a professionalizing course. My daughter also finished and is there doing nothing. You know how a first job goes, right? No experience, no work. **And the first job they offer you is a PAC construction site***.** It’s their first job, you can see there on the poster. PAC ... is ... I dunno, all I know is it did not help much. You gotta run, right? **I wish I could help her finish a college,** right? Something like that... **But with a help like that it’s not easy...**” (2U).*

*“Look, I think ... for once it helps but it is not enough. Enough, I think, is for the husband to have his job, you know? Because that over there is a **help**, I’m not going to say that... it really helps me a lot, but I think it’s **not enough**. [...] We, as fathers, **want to work**, to have a job. **Because you with a job**, hey ... **it’s a whole other thing**. Surely, that doesn’t... I won’t say it doesn’t help, cause it helps, right?” (6E)*

As we can see, despite having limited capacity to transform the lives of these families, this support is not something that can be dropped in the circumstances of life in which they find themselves. Work arises, then, as an issue, as it is explicit, including by the eligibility criteria of the program, that this benefit is only due to the lack of work. Hence the failure, related to the lack and expropriation of labor as part of family life, and as a means of survival and, according to Engels,¹⁴ as foundational category of human life.

It is this reality that Castel talks about,¹⁵ when describing the situation of the French working class that separate from the so-called wage society, sees its security and social inscription damaged. In the Brazilian case, the so-called complementary programs that include conducting activities to generate employment and income, do not guarantee the inclusion of any beneficiary in the labor market.

*** The Growth Acceleration Program (PAC), created in 2007, aimed at the resumption of the planning and execution of major works of social , urban, logistic and energy infrastructure of the country.

No campo dos programas complementares, a geração de emprego e renda ainda se coloca muito aquém do desejado para possibilitar a entrada do beneficiário no mercado formal de trabalho e saída do programa. Research conducted in the city of Montes Claros, Minas Gerais,⁵ showed the perception of the beneficiaries about the incipience of such shares. When asked about the development of a condition of employment, most beneficiaries responded that it did not improve after joining the PBF.

Santos & Magalhaes¹⁶ confirm this perception, through the statements of program managers in the municipality of Rio de Janeiro. The authors reveal that managers take the low supply of supplementary programs, and that the existing ones do not dialogue with the demands of the beneficiaries, since their implementation took place vertically. Still according to the authors: “Excluding the local context and not recognizing the demands and characteristics of the beneficiary families, complementary programs will hardly achieve their goals of sustained emancipation and empowerment of beneficiary families.”

Transfer of income: right or help?

The centrality that income transfer assumes in the social policies developed to fight hunger and poverty allows us to question the role that the TR assumes in these policies. It is important to differentiate income transfer from income distribution. We recorded some approximation between these two concepts in the legal framework of some policies, and the transfer of income understood as a transitional measure to a redistribution of income in countries with high levels of social inequality.

However, the very implementation of income transfer policies, their use in political campaigns and government programs and their representation for TR programs beneficiaries demonstrates a major limitation with regard to the real possibility of leading TR to a redistribution of income and constitution of rights.

Of the main minimum income policies in Latin America, Fonseca & Viana¹⁷ highlight at least three similarities between them: the focus on poor or extremely poor families, with children and adolescents (with some exceptions such as the Uruguayan program, which is ampler); the principle of compensations or conditionalities; and the non-belonging to the domain of rights.

According to Salmón,¹⁸ the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) describes poverty as “a condition that prevents the individual or his family from meeting one or more basic needs and participating fully in social life” (p. 154). The phenomenon has fundamentally economic bases, despite being permeated by social, political and cultural dimensions.

Costa¹⁹ discusses that one of the difficulties in criminalizing/punishing the so-called “human rights violations” is the fact that all these are not consolidated in the form of legal framework in the nations. According to this author, statements such as “poverty is, in itself, a violation of several fundamental human rights” (p. 89) reflect the political position that poverty does not guarantee conditions for the full development of the human being.

This approach¹⁹ brings elements to discuss poverty as a violation of rights, which is not yet implemented and is described clearly in policies to combat poverty and legal systems. According to her, poverty is a consequence of a series of rights violations and thus must be analyzed and fought. To the extent that we see poverty more generally as a violation of rights, we do not specify its multiple causes and can lapse into a moral concept that distances itself from political posturing to analyze its origins.

If we understand that poverty consists of various rights violations; such violations do not currently have legal enforceability criteria; and that conditional income transfer policies historically did not take these violations into consideration, we conclude that the transfer of income alone could not be constituted as a right. Somehow, the TR, by linking social rights to the transfer of the financial benefit, has been addressing rights violations caused by poverty, not on violations of rights that lead to poverty. We see in the Brazilian example, although it mitigates emergency problems of extreme poverty and promotes universal access to social rights such as health and education, the PBF has been unable to act consistently in reducing social inequality and in the inclusion of beneficiaries in the labor market, more structural actions toward a situation of termination from the program and leaving poverty.

Costa¹⁹ further reinforces that by working poverty in its scale of denial of human rights, we can not refer only to economic and social rights, but to civil and political rights that are also denied to human beings in a poverty situation. Thus we see that poverty not only violates human rights, but does it in full, covering virtually every dimension of life and the human constitution.

Therefore, we reinforce here the need to reflect on the role of income transfer policies, which, not incidentally, appear only as an “aid” to its beneficiaries, not ever being mentioned as a right.

Final remarks

The Programa Bolsa Família has been a prominent landmark, introducing the policy of direct income transfer with conditionalities as a landmark of Brazilian social policies. Few substantive changes were observed throughout the implementation and expansion of PBF. However, the broad reach and impact on income and nutritional status of the families assisted by the program need to be highlighted.

By focusing the beneficiary's view on direct income transfer, we believe that this emergency measure can not be discarded in the condition in which it finds itself. However, the representation of the benefit to these subjects led to the construction of the category *help*.

The main points that we emphasize on this categorization are: finding that the benefit is insufficient to the needs of the family; disregard of this benefit as a right, that is, the understanding that it is some kind of concession; and the feeling of disaffiliation from the labor market, which generates personal devaluation and sensation of social inertia, unsolved by the program.

These findings demonstrate the fragility of the PBF in relation to the construction of citizenship, both from the perspective of knowledge/empowerment of civil rights, as in creating means for termination from the program and insertion in the labor market.

Moreover, understanding that a public policy is built and evolves from the representations of who implements it, we believe it is necessary to further understand and study the comprehensions of health, education and social assistance professionals involved with the PBF.

The changes and adaptations in these programs also need to be considered when investigating the design of social policies adopted in Brazil. Recently incorporated into the Family Grant, CaringBrazil is a measure that, in addition to bringing new elements (related to health and education), directly impacts on the benefit to be transferred to families program, focusing and adding more value to families with children. The impact of these measures and their representation for beneficiaries need to be investigated over its implementation.

However, it is possible to identify that those measures do not bring new milestones for the program and cause little effects on the difficulties and dilemmas highlighted by the speeches of the beneficiaries herein. Issues related to the subject's empowerment through information and communication with government bodies and so-called complementary policies that deal with the amount of work and income generation are not affected by the new measures.

Finally, we point out the need to incorporate to the debate on Brazilian social policies, discussions on human rights violations in poverty and the creation of mechanisms to criminalize these violations, if the goal is to advance the reduction of social inequality and push the boundaries of income transfer programs.

References

1. IPEA. Objetivos de desenvolvimento do milênio: Relatório nacional de acompanhamento. [S.l.: s.n.]; 2010.
2. Instituto Brasileiro de Análises Sociais e Econômicas. Repercussões do Programa Bolsa Família na Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional das Famílias Beneficiadas: Documento Síntese. [S.l.: s.n.]; 2008.
3. Brasil. Secretaria Nacional de Renda de Cidadania. Apostila compilada pela Equipe de Capacitação/ MDS/Senarc. Brasília: [s.n.]; 2009.
4. Minayo MCS. O desafio do conhecimento pesquisa qualitativa em saúde. 10a ed. São Paulo: HUCITEC; 2008.
5. Barbosa JFP et al. O Programa Bolsa Família, como medida de combate à pobreza: uma análise de alguns de seus impactos no município de Montes Claros-MG. [Anais do] XIII Seminário sobre a Economia Mineira; 2008; Diamantina, MG: [s.n.]; 2008.
6. Magalhães R et al. A implementação do programa Bolsa Família: as experiências de São Francisco de Itabapoana e Duque de Caxias. Ciênc. saúde colet. 2007 jan.;12(6).
7. Hevia FJ. Relaciones lejanas. Cantidad y calidad de información que poseen los beneficiarios sobre el programa Bolsa Familia. [S.l.: s.n.]; 2008 [Acesso em : 2009 out.]. Disponível em: <<http://www.ipc-undp.org/mds.do>>.
8. Silva RR. Programa Bolsa Família: necessidades de metodologias de avaliação para identificar a sua potencialidade na construção da cidadania. Revista Ágora: Políticas Públicas e Serviço Social. 2006 jul.;2(4).
9. Leão MM, Castro IRRC. Políticas públicas de alimentação e nutrição. In: Kac G, Sichieri R, Gigante DP. Epidemiologia nutricional. Rio de Janeiro: Fiocruz: Atheneu; 2007.
10. Suplicy EM. O direito de participar da riqueza da nação: do Programa Bolsa Família à Renda Básica de Cidadania. Ciênc saúde colet. 2007;12(6).
11. Burlandy L. Transferência condicionada de renda e segurança alimentar e nutricional. Ciênc saúde colet. 2007;12(6).
12. Soares FV, Ribas RP, Osório RG. Avaliando o impacto do Programa Bolsa Família: uma comparação com programas de transferência condicionada de renda de outros países. Brasília: Centro Internacional da Pobreza; 2007. (IPC evaluation note, 1). Disponível em: <<http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/port/IPCEvaluationNote1.pdf>>
13. Santos JC. Direito ou privilégio: o Programa Bolsa Família e o significado local. [S.l.: s.n.]; 2008 [Acesso em : 2009 out.]. Disponível em: <<http://www.ipcundp.org/mds.do>>
14. Engels F. O papel do trabalho na transformação do macaco em homem. 4a ed. Global: São Paulo; 1990.
15. Castel R. As metamorfoses da questão social: uma crônica do salário. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes; 2008.

16. Santos CRB, Magalhães R. Pobreza e Política Social: a implementação de programas complementares do Programa Bolsa Família. *Ciênc. saúde colet.* 2012 maio;17(5):1215-24.
17. Fonseca AMM, Viana ALA. Direito à saúde, atenção básica e transferências condicionadas de renda na América Latina. *Ciênc. saúde colet.* 2007 dez.;12(6).
18. Salmon GE. O longo caminho da luta contra a pobreza e seu alentador encontro com os direitos humanos. *Sur, Rev int. direitos human.* 2007;4(7).
19. Costa FD. Pobreza e direitos humanos: da mera retórica às obrigações jurídicas: um estudo crítico sobre diferentes modelos conceituais. *Sur, Rev int. direitos human.* 2008;5(9):88-119.

Submitted: 10/30/2012

Accepted: 11/25/2012