

Impact of the Bolsa Família Program on Children and Adolescents' Educational Level

Juliane Borchers¹ and Marina Silva da Cunha²

¹ PhD student in State University of Maringá (Brazil), Professor at the Department of Economic Sciences at the State University of Maringá (Brazil)

Received: 12 April 2021 Accepted: 5 May 2021 Published: 15 May 2021

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the impacts of the Programa Bolsa Família (PBF) on educational indicators for Brazilian children and adolescents aged six to seventeen. The methodology used to investigate the impacts of the PBF was the Propensity Score Matching method according to data from the 2019 National Continuous Household Sample Survey. The results of the impact of the PBF indicated that beneficiaries are more likely to attend school and less likely to fall behind in school and drop out. It was also possible to observe that the program shows a greater impact on the older-age group, boys, non-whites and students from rural areas in relation to school attendance and dropout. Regarding the results of the impact on school delay, they are also higher for the older-age group, especially for girls, in the Central-West and Northeast regions and in the rural area. Thus, there is confirmation of the hypothesis that the PBF has impacts on educational indicators, improving the performance of its beneficiaries. The contribution is the analysis of the impact of the current PBF, after sixteen years of its implementation, the results of the work suggest the relevance of the cash transfer program as, in the absence of the PBF, school evasion and delay would be at levels even bigger.

Index terms— bolsa família program; educational indicators; poverty; propensity score matching.

1 Introduction

overty is an economic and social development problem in countries and still remains an important issue in many of them (Bourguignon & Chakravarty, 2003). In Brazil, the incidence of poverty was reduced by almost 68% between 1990 and 2018, going from 20.6% to 6.5% (World Bank, 2018). However, the country still has a significant percentage of the population in poverty and extreme poverty. In addition, the expectation of years of schooling for Brazil is 15.4 years, according to the 2019 United Nations Development Program (UNDP) report, being a higher level than the one registered for the world, which is 12.7 years, but still lower than for some South American neighbors, as Argentina (17.6 years old), Uruguay (16.3 years old) and Chile (16.5 years old).

These high levels of poverty are problematic not only in the social area, as high inequality is associated with the poverty trap, but also highlight a negative relationship between inequality and economic growth (Perry et al., 2006; Myrdal, 1968). Economic development, income inequality and poverty are often associated with educational differences. Individuals from poor families enter the labor market with lower educational level than richer families and, as a result, earn lower wages. When families with lower income have restrictions in the credit market and, therefore, cannot anticipate the income needed to invest in their children's education, it creates a cycle in which poverty is carried from generation to generation. Thus, one of the solutions raised by the economic literature to reduce income inequality and also break the intergenerational transmission of poverty is the promotion of policies that increase the accumulation of human capital in the poorest families (Heckman & Masterov, 2007), as education has the capacity to break vicious circles (Nurkse, 1969; Myrdal, 1968), boost the process of economic

2 II. CASH TRANSFER PROGRAMS AND IMPACTS ON EDUCATION

43 growth and productive restructuring (Kuznets, 1955) and generate the processes of access to the labor market,
44 gains productivity and wage improvements (Becker, 1964;Mincer, 1958). Access to education has been evidenced
45 alongside public policies that favor the reduction of income inequality and poverty, such as income transfer
46 policies like the Bolsa Família Program.

47 Thus, the fight against poverty requires specific actions capable of interrupting this trap between generations,
48 among which the role of targeted cash transfer programs stands out. Aimed at needy families, the objective
49 of these policies is to eliminate and/or alleviate, in the short term, the difficulties caused by the condition of
50 poverty. Furthermore, by enabling direct income transfer with conditionalities, such as school attendance and
51 medical care, the programs combat two aspects that characterize the reproduction of the intergenerational cycle
52 of poverty: they ensure the minimum level of subsistence income for poor families and preserve the attainment
53 of human capital of its beneficiaries.

54 These cash transfer programs were widespread in underdeveloped countries, mainly after the 1990s. In
55 Latin America, conditional cash transfer programs were initially carried out in Mexico (Oportunidades, 1997),
56 Chile ??Chile Solidario, 2004), Argentina (Asignación Universal Por Hijo, 2009), Uruguay (Nuevo Régimen de
57 Asignaciones ??familiares, 2008) and Brazil ??Bolsa Família Program, 2003).

58 On October 20th, 2003, Brazil created the PBF with the objective of reducing poverty and, consequently,
59 income inequality, as it transfers income to a group of eligible families, establishing some conditionalities that
60 encompass basic rights, such as education and health. The purpose of the program's conditionalities is to ensure
61 the offer of basic actions to health and education services and to social policies of a more structural nature
62 (microcredit, cooperativism, literacy, etc.), as well as enhance the improvement of quality of life of families and
63 contribute to their social inclusion. The number of families benefiting from the PBF grew progressively between
64 2003 and 2006, when it reached 11 million families; in 2011, it increased to 13.8 million beneficiary families (Paiva
65 et al., 2013) ??t al., 2015). In the health area, it was found that the participants of the Oportunidades and Chile
66 Solidario Program are experiencing improvements in health (Gertler, 2000;Galasso, 2006). In the area of food
67 security, Progresia also had important impacts on food consumption, with higher calorie consumption and a more
68 diversified diet (Hoddinott et al., 2000). For the ??olsa Família Program (Brazil) Therefore, the objective of
69 this work is to evaluate the impact of the Bolsa Família Program (PBF) on educational indicators, attendance,
70 dropout and school delay, of beneficiary children and adolescents, from six to seventeen years old, according
71 to the most recent data made available by the National Survey by Continuous Household Sample (PNADC) of
72 2019 for the whole country, being able to even analyze the dimension of impacts regionally, using the method
73 of Propensity Score Matching, since the PBF is a public policy aimed at improving access to education in the
74 country.

75 2 II. Cash Transfer Programs and Impacts on Education

76 The works of Schultz (2000a), Behrman et al. (2001), Behrman et al. (2009) and Parker (2011) found that
77 the Oportunidades program had positive and significant impacts on the education and school enrollment of
78 beneficiaries. For the Chile Solidario program, the results of the study by Galasso (2006) indicate significant
79 and consistent increases in the enrollment of children and adolescents participating in the program in relation
80 to non-participation in the program. Participation in the Nuevo Régimen de Asignaciones Familiares program
81 represented an increase in the service provided by the educational center for adolescents aged twelve to seventeen
82 years old. In terms of school permanence, it appears that the greatest impact is for adolescents between sixteen
83 and seventeen years old (Machado et al., 2012). The Asignación Universal por Hijo program shows a reduction
84 in school dropout, and at the aggregate level, this impact was more favorable for men than for women and
85 greater for adolescents aged sixteen and seventeen when compared to those aged fourteen and fifteen (Salvia et
86 al., 2015;Jiménez & Jiménez, 2016).

87 There are studies that seek to explore the effects of the PBF on education. The work of Pellegrina (2011)
88 sought to assess the impact of the PBF on school performance variables on benefited students in the State of São
89 Paulo and found a reduction in school dropout of around 20%, a reduction of 3% on absences and no change in
90 student performance on report card or standardized exams. The work by Oliveira and Soares (2013) analyzed the
91 impact on school failure using the Cadastro Único database of 2008 and 2009, performing a logistic regression,
92 and found out that the program has a significant impact on children's progression, although it was relatively
93 modest: when simulating the probability of predicted repetition, it is 14.6% for nonbeneficiaries belonging to the
94 Cadastro Único against 13.2% for beneficiaries.

95 There are also studies that analyze the relationship between education and the labor market, observing the
96 impact of the PBF on the relationship between school and youth work. The work by Silveira et al. (2014) using
97 the 2010 Demographic Census through the Propensity Score Weighting, found evidence that program beneficiaries
98 have greater possibilities of studying than non-beneficiaries, being 80% against 70% when considering for young
99 people between ten and eighteen years old. The study by Pedrozo (2007) using a multinomial logit model built
100 through the National Household Sample Survey (PNAD) of 2004 observed a reduction in the decision to study
101 and work, while those who only study grew significantly. And it concluded that there was a decrease of about 2/3
102 in the number of children between ten and fifteen years of age who do not study, and this effect is even greater
103 for the lower income groups.

104 In addition to works that assess the impact of the program on school performance, there are also works that
105 analyze the impact of the program on school attendance, as in the case of the work by Neto et al.

106 (2020), which aims to investigate the impact of the PBF on educational indicators, enrollment rate and school
107 gap, of children aged six to seventeen, but only for the states and mesoregions of the Northeast region, from the
108 Propensity Score Matching method and from the 2010 Demographic Census information. The results showed
109 that the PBF has a significant impact on the enrollment rate. Furthermore, it was observed that the impact
110 is higher for adolescents between fifteen and seventeen years old. However, for school lag, the effects in general
111 were not significant.

112 The study by Chitolina et al. (2013a) also verified a positive and significant effect of the PBF on school
113 attendance and that this effect was greater among young males and the youngest children of families, considering
114 the information from the 2006 and 2009 PNAD through the estimator of difference in differences. Kern et al.
115 (2017) aimed to assess the impact of the PBF on school enrollment on educational indicators such as progression,
116 repetition and dropout of children aged six to seventeen in Brazil and large regions. It was observed through
117 longitudinal panel data at the individual level, based on the AIBF I and AIBF II data 1 The work by Cacciamali
118 et al. (2010), which analyzes the impact of the PBF on the incidence of child labor and school attendance by
119 children, using microdata from the 2004 PNAD with a bivariate probit model, found that the PBF increases
120 the school attendance of children. However, they found perverse effects on the incidence of child labor as they
121 obtained results that, for the poorest children, the probability of its occurrence is higher. Another study that
122 analyzed the impact of the PBF on school attendance is the one by Melo and Duarte (2010), who evaluated the
123 impact of the program on the school attendance of children and adolescents aged five to fourteen in family farms
124 in the states of Pernambuco, Ceará, Sergipe and Paraíba. The authors used primary data (field research) and
125 secondary data (PNAD, 2005) to obtain estimates of the Propensity Score. The results of the study indicate, in
126 , that the PBF did not impact the school enrollment of children from 2005 to 2009 when it was disaggregated by
127 gender. However, the PBF increased the probability of children enrollment, especially in rural areas of the North
128 and Central-West region. Regarding progression and repetition, the program impacted children aged fifteen to
129 seventeen from the rural area of the Northeast region and in the urban area of the South/Southeast, expanding
130 progression and reducing the probability of repetition. The PBF also reduces the likelihood of children in the
131 rural area of the Northeast to drop out of school.

132 general, that the program raises the school attendance of these children in the range of 5.4 to 5.9 percentage
133 points.

134 However, Ribeiro and Cacciamali's work (2012) did not find significant differences between beneficiary and
135 non-beneficiary families in relation to school attendance indicators and age-grade gap when using data from the
136 2006 PNAD and the Propensity Score Matching method. Cavalcanti et al. (2013), who verified the impact of
137 the PBF on families in the Northeast of Brazil using PNAD data from 2004 and 2006, applied to the Propensity
138 Score Matching methodology, observed that there were 19% more children and young people attending school
139 in families beneficiaries in a situation of poverty in 2004. This result, however, is proportionally lower (15%) in
140 2006, suggesting that the program has a positive impact on the number of children and young people who attend
141 school, but this increase occurs at decreasing rates.

142 Thus, it does not seem to be a consensus regarding both the direction and the size of the impact of the PBF on
143 variables that measure school performance among beneficiary families as the aforementioned works show positive,
144 negative or nonsignificant results in these variables, since it directly impacts on child labor and on the persistence
145 of poverty. However, these results change in relation to the location analyzed, the database and the methodology
146 used in the studies. In addition, these works analyzed an initial period of the PBF, from 2004 to 2010.

147 3 III.

148 4 Methodology

149 The impact analysis of the PBF, like any other public policy, is not a simple task due to the impossibility of
150 observing the same individual in different situations, that is, as treated and not treated. Thus, it is necessary
151 to find a control group formed by those who do not receive the benefit but have similar characteristics to the
152 beneficiaries. In this work, the Propensity Score Matching (PSM) is used as a methodological approach, seeking
153 to obtain more robust estimates due to the problem of self-selection bias present in more traditional approaches.

154 5 a) Propensity Score Matching

155 Propensity Score Matching (PSM) is an econometric method that aims to find control groups comparable to
156 treatment groups by matching them by their observable characteristics. This method emerged to solve the
157 problem of selection bias that some methodologies encountered when making this comparison, as they did not have
158 a common support between among groups. In other words, "Propensity Score" estimates, through a logit/probit
159 regression, the probability of belonging to the treatment group and "Matching" associates the untreated units
160 with a more approximate propensity score so that the comparison is Volume XXI Issue VI Version I 15 (E)
161 the best possible. Originally developed by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983), the propensity score is defined as the
162 conditional probability of receiving a treatment, given pretreatment characteristics:

$$163 (1)$$

164 Where Y_{1i} is the result variable when family i participates in the program and Y_{0i} denotes the result variable
165 when family i does not participate in the PBF. X is a vector of observable household characteristics where D is
166 an indicator of exposure of the treated (0 [zero] for untreated and 1 [one] for treated). Thus, the average of the
167 treatment effect on the treated (ATT) is given by:

168 (2)

169 It is worth noting that a propensity score estimate is not enough to estimate the ATT of equation (??), it is
170 necessary to combine it with the matching because the probability of observing two units with exactly the same
171 propensity score is, in principle, zero, given that $p(X)$ is a continuous variable. In this regard, the literature has
172 developed several matching methods, the most used are, according to Becker and Ichino (2002), Stratification
173 Matching (SM), Nearest Neighbor Matching (NNM), Radius Matching (RM) and Kernel Matching (KM).

174 For the present study, Kernel Matching is the main algorithm. It was chosen because it does not present the
175 problem of matching among families with different propensity scores, given that this is done via the weighted
176 average of the control group, making the two compared groups more homogeneous, and it was the matching
177 method that presented the lowest selection bias.

178 According to Oh et al. (2009), in Kernel Matching, all benefited individuals are paired with the weighted
179 average of non-benefited individuals, with weights inversely proportional to the distance between the propensity
180 score of benefited and non-benefited individuals.

181 6 b) Database

182 The database used to achieve the objective of this work was the PNADC, made available by the Brazilian Institute
183 of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), regarding the second quarter of 2019, the most current period with available
184 data. The sample used is restricted to households that responded to the first interview in 2019 with per capita
185 family income up to half the minimum wage (R\$499.00). This amount above the PBF eligibility line (R\$178.00)
186 seeks to control the cyclical nature of income, as at some point the poor family may receive more than the limit
187 amount. In any case, cutoff tests based on the PBF eligibility line generally do not change the results.

188 The research focus on children and adolescents from six to seventeen years old in PBF beneficiary residences,
189 which were also analyzed separately, considering the initial and final years of basic education.

190 The first group is made up of children from six to fourteen years old and a second one by those from fifteen to
191 seventeen years old. This separation is necessary due to the fact that there are unobservable variables depending
192 on the age group, for example, the first group is formed by individuals who necessarily have a higher probability
193 of attending school in relation to the second, since the age group from six to fourteen is characterized by children
194 who are or should be attending elementary school and the age group from fifteen to seventeen are teenagers who
195 are or should be attending high school. Thus, it is possible to verify at which school level the impact of the PBF
196 is greater or has a greater level of significance. It was considered 8,973 total observations. The choice of the
197 sample is based on variable V5002A, which asks "whether, in the reference period, the household had received
198 income from the Bolsa Familia Social Program. In turn, the impact variables that can be observed according to
199 the PNADC are: School Attendance, which considers individuals duly enrolled in school on the day of the survey,
200 with a value of 1 for those enrolled and 0 otherwise; School Dropout, which considers individuals who were not
201 enrolled in school on the day of the survey, with a value of 1 for those not enrolled and 0 otherwise; and School
202 Delay, which considers all individuals who were enrolled in school on the day of the survey, with 1 for those who
203 are behind in school taking into account the grade/age ratio and 0 otherwise and contemplating the purpose
204 of capturing those individuals with two years of delay or more. The decision to consider as lagged those aged
205 two or more was made since in some cases the date of birth of the children would prevent the identification of
206 lagged ones in just one year. In addition, variables associated with the characteristics of the child or adolescent,
207 the reference person in the family and the household were included in the equation of impact of participation in
208 the program, as shown in Table 1, to ensure that the model captured the effect of the program on the variables
209 previously presented. In Figure 1, the behavior of the impact or outcome variables analyzed in this work can be
210 observed over the years of the Brazilian educational cycle, in which there is a higher school attendance at the
211 beginning of basic education. However, it presents a more significant reduction from the age of fifteen and the
212 age group of seventeen has the lowest school attendance, around 80%. In turn, it appears that Brazil has a lower
213 school delay in the age groups from eight to fourteen years, which corresponds to elementary education, but in
214 the age groups from fifteen to seventeen years it presents a high level of school delay, highlighting the age group of
215 seventeen years old that presents the highest percentage of school delay. Regarding school dropout, it is noticed
216 that it exists from the age of fourteen onwards and increases until it reaches the highest level in the age group of
217 seventeen, in which 21.36% of adolescents have dropped out of school. This section discusses the impact of the
218 PBF on educational indicators, measured through the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT). The results
219 were first estimated for children and adolescents from six to seventeen years old and, later, the age groups from
220 six to fourteen years old and fifteen to seventeen years old were also considered. Additionally, these impacts were
221 estimated segmentally by sex, race/color, regions and by urban/rural area in order to capture different effects of
222 the program on these subgroups of the population.

223 7 Source(s): Own elaboration from PNADC

224 Estimates of the impacts of the PBF on school attendance, dropout and delay can be seen in Table 2. Analyzing
225 the results for school attendance, it appears that the PBF has a positive impact on it since, as, as noted, the
226 program increases the probability of school attendance among beneficiaries for children and adolescents aged six
227 to seventeen when compared to the control group. The program had a positive impact of 2.48 pp on school
228 attendance considering all ages and an impact of 0.62 pp for children aged six to fourteen. On the other hand,
229 the impact is greater for adolescents aged fifteen to seventeen, around 6.14 pp.

230 Regarding the results for school delay, it can be seen that the program reduces school delay by around 4.74 pp
231 for the age group from fifteen to seventeen years old, the overall impact is a reduction of 2.09 pp. The PBF has
232 no significant effect on the eight to fourteen age group. Regarding the results for school dropout, it is observed
233 that the PBF reduces school dropout by 2.20 pp for all ages and it reduces 0.62 pp for the age group from six
234 to fourteen years old. The age group from fifteen to seventeen show greater reduction, around 6.14 pp. The
235 results in Table 2 show that the PBF increases school attendance and reduces school delay and dropout, with
236 the expected results for both the frequency and for the delay and for the school dropout.

237 Table 3 shows the results on educational indicators while considering the segmentation by sex, race/color,
238 regions of the country and by household situation. In the case of school attendance for boys, there are higher
239 and significant results than those for girls. According to the estimates presented, the PBF supported by its
240 conditionalities increases the school attendance of beneficiary boys from six to seventeen years old by 3.10 pp.
241 For beneficiary girls, the probability of being attending school is 2.13 pp more. As expected, the impact among
242 young people is higher, as a beneficiary boy is more likely to be enrolled, reaching 7.35 pp. Considering the results
243 for race/color, it appears that for all age groups only the results for non-whites were significant. Analyzing the
244 age group from six to fourteen years old, it is observed that the impacts are smaller than for the age group from
245 six to seventeen years old, the impact of receiving benefits increases school attendance by only 0.65 pp in this
246 group. However, in the age group of fifteen to seventeen, the impact is quite expressive, showing a probability of
247 7.23 pp more.

248 Regarding the regions of the country, only the Central-West and Southeast regions did not show statistically
249 significant results for ages six to seventeen. Regarding the ones that showed significant results, the greatest impact
250 occurs in the Northern region of the country, in which participating in the program increases school attendance
251 by 3.00 pp, followed by the Northeast region with an impact of 2.81 pp. Considering ages from six to fourteen,
252 none of the regions showed a significant result, but for ages from fifteen to seventeen, only the Northeast region
253 has a statistically significant result, in which the impact is greater than when considering all ages. Regarding
254 the situation of the household, only the estimate for ages six to fourteen for the rural area was not significant. In
255 relation to the ones that were significant, the greatest impact occurs for ages fifteen to seventeen living in rural
256 areas, in which a beneficiary of the program residing in rural areas is 7.08 pp more likely to enroll in school.

257 Examining the same subgroups, the results for school delay for girls show that the program has worked to
258 reduce it, since the chances of delay are lower among those who receive the benefit than for nonbeneficiaries. The
259 ages from eight to fourteen years old are the only ones that do not present statistical significance, but in the age
260 group from fifteen to seventeen by the end of basic education, the impact of the program on school delay is a
261 reduction of 13.96 pp. The results for boys show no significance for all age groups, suggesting that the program is
262 not proving effective for them. Regarding race/color, it appears that only for the age group from eight to fourteen
263 years old the results were significant for whites. For the result that showed statistical significance, the impact for
264 whites is that a beneficiary has a lower probability of 4.85 pp of not being enrolled in the correct grade. Again,
265 the estimates highlight that the PBF is not effective in reducing school delay, especially for non-whites, a group
266 that historically presents the highest percentage of students who are lagging behind in school.

267 Analyzing the results for the regions, it appears that only the Central-West and Northeast regions presented
268 statistically significant results for all age groups. The significant results show that the greatest impacts are found
269 in the Central-West region of the country and especially in the ages of fifteen to seventeen, where the probability
270 of not being enrolled in the correct grade is 14.12 pp less. The results for urban and rural areas showed only
271 significance for the rural area and when considering all ages and the age group between fifteen and seventeen
272 years old. The greatest impact is found for young people living in rural households, which probability of not
273 being enrolled in the correct grade is 10.62 pp less.

274 Finally, the results for school dropout show that the PBF supported by its conditionalities reduces school
275 evasion of beneficiary boys from six to fourteen years old by 2.75 pp. For beneficiary girls, the probability of
276 dropping out of school is 1.85 pp less. As expected, the impact among young people is more expressive, as a
277 beneficiary boy is less likely to drop out of school, reaching 7.35 pp. While observing the results for race/color,
278 it appears that for all ages only the results for non-whites were significant: the negative impact for nonwhite
279 beneficiaries is 2.68 pp from dropping out of school. Analyzing children from six to fourteen years old, it is
280 observed that the impacts are smaller than for the age group from six to seventeen years old, the impact of
281 receiving benefits reduces school evasion by only 0.65 pp in this group. However, in the ages referring to the final
282 years of basic education, the impact is quite expressive, with a lower probability of dropping out of school of 7.23
283 pp.

284 For regional differences in the country, it appears that only the Northeast and North regions showed statistically
285 significant results, with the greatest impact occurring in the Northern region of the country, where participating

286 in the program reduces school dropout by 2.78 pp. Initial years of basic education, from six to fourteen years
287 old, have no significant results and in the final years, from fifteen to seventeen years old, only the Northeast and
288 North regions have statistically significant results, in which the impact is greater than considering all the ages.
289 Regarding the household situation, all estimates were significant. The greatest impact occurs for adolescents
290 aged fifteen to seventeen living in rural areas, in which a program beneficiary residing in the rural area has a
291 lower probability of dropping out of school than 7.08 pp.

292 Based on these results, the need for the continuity of the PBF is evident, and it can even be expanded. In this
293 process of continuation and expansion of the program, it would be interesting to add objectives, in partnership
294 with other public policies in order to improve the indicators of school delay and the school performance of children
295 and adolescents benefiting from the program. V.

296 8 Discussion of Results

297 The results of the study suggest that participation in the PBF increases school attendance and reduces school
298 dropout, especially for non-white boys, aged between fifteen and seventeen, living in rural areas and in the
299 Northeast and North regions. In addition, participation in the PBF also reduces school delays, but it happens
300 especially for girls, whites, adolescents aged between fifteen and seventeen and residents of rural areas and in the
301 Central-West and Southeast regions of the country.

302 These results are similar to those obtained in studies of cash transfer programs in Mexico, Chile, Uruguay and
303 Argentina. In Mexico and Chile, Oportunidades and Chile Solidario have increased school enrollment (Schultz,
304 2000a;Behrman et al., 2001;Behrman et al., 2009;Parker, 2011;Galasso, 2006). In Uruguay, the work by Machado
305 et al. (2012) also observed an increase in school enrollment, but mainly in adolescents between sixteen and
306 seventeen years old, which is also observed in this work for the Brazilian program. Regarding the results of
307 school dropout, they are consistent with those found in the study by Salvia et al. (2015) and Jiménez and
308 Jiménez (2016) for the Argentinean program, in which they point out that school dropout rates for program
309 participants have reduced, being the greatest reduction for men and for the sixteen to seventeen age groups, this
310 impact is similar to the one from PBF on its beneficiaries.

311 The general results for school attendance are in agreement with most studies found in the Brazilian literature,
312 regardless of the database and methodology adopted. However, these results are in the opposite direction to those
313 found by Ribeiro and Cacciamali (2012), since, for the authors, there is no distinction between the rates of school
314 attendance and school delay of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the program. The difference between genders
315 is significant, once the program has more expressive and positive effects among boys for school attendance, a
316 result different from that presented in Melo and Duarte (2010) and Kern et al. (2017) since in their results, those
317 for boys were not statistically significant.

318 Evidence for dropping out of school suggests that the program has achieved its main objective, which is
319 to reduce school dropout rates among benefited children and adolescents and, consequently, increase school
320 attendance. These results for school dropout, when confirming those obtained for attendance, indicate the
321 robustness of the analysis. In turn, the results for school delay do not follow the literature, probably due to
322 the use of a different methodology and database for a more recent period. The analysis period for school delay
323 is a very important factor, as the improvement in school performance happens in the long term, unlikely the
324 impacts on school attendance. For example, the most recent study, Neto et al. (2020), used data from the 2010
325 Demographic Census, carrying out the study only for the Northeast region of the country, in which it did not
326 find significant effects on school lag.

327 The results show that progressing in school has a more significant effect on young beneficiaries aged fifteen to
328 seventeen. The cost of staying in school seems higher for young people in this age group, especially those living
329 in rural areas, who often lose interest in school or do not give up working. It shows that the creation of the
330 Youth Variable Benefit meant that these young people, who had often already left school or needed to work to
331 supplement the family income, dedicated more time to school, thus increasing their progress and keeping them
332 in school.

333 In this sense, it is important to emphasize that the PBF is an income transfer program that is still showing
334 significant effects on educational indicators, that is, attendance, dropout and school delay as this study analyzed
335 data from 2019 and showed that an increase is occurring in school attendance and a reduction in dropouts and
336 school delays, and that the PBF is still working to break the generational cycle of poverty, bearing in mind that
337 the results of the objectives of the income transfer programs will be achieved in the long term.

338 VI.

339 9 Conclusions

340 This study aimed to investigate the impact of the PBF on educational indicators for children and adolescents
341 aged six to seventeen in Brazil, considering that the program has a conditionality directly related to education.
342 Additionally, seeking to identify and highlight heterogeneities and specificities, these estimates were also obtained
343 for the initial and final years of basic education, the country's macro-regions, race/color and gender.

344 The effect of the program, initially estimated for children aged between six and seventeen, confirmed that
345 there is a significant impact on educational indicators, showing an increase in school attendance and a reduction

346 in dropout and school delays among its beneficiaries. However, this effect is greater at the end of basic education,
 347 for adolescents. Furthermore, the results also showed differences in the effects of the Bolsa Família Program when
 348 considering some subgroups. The impact on school attendance and dropout is more relevant for boys, non-whites
 349 and residents of the North and Northeast regions and rural areas. In the case of school delay, its reduction is
 350 more significant for girls, whites and residents of the Central-West and Northeast regions and rural areas of the
 351 country.

352 Thus, the results of this study allow us to state that the PBF, through educational conditionality, has a positive
 353 impact on school attendance, indicating that beneficiaries are more likely to attend school, although important
 354 heterogeneities are also observed when considering macro-regions, gender, race/color or area of residence. In
 355 turn, in the case of school delay and school evasion, the effect is negative, indicating a smaller delay and school
 356 evasion than the group of nonbeneficiaries. Thus, it is necessary to expand public policies for this portion of
 357 the population, since the current ones are causing an increase in attendance and consequently reducing school
 358 dropouts and school delays, thus making it possible to interrupt the intergenerational cycle of poverty.

Volume XXI Issue VI Version I 21 (E) ^{1 2}



Figure 1:



Figure 2: Figure 1 :




Figure 3:

359

¹Impact Assessment of the Bolsa Família Program (AIBF), a database that aims to monitor beneficiaries of the PBF, developed under the command of the Ministry of Social Development and Fight against Hunger in 2005 and 2009.

²Year 2021 © 2021 Global Journals Impact of the Bolsa Família Program on Children and Adolescents' Educational Level

Figure 4:

1

Variable	Description
Characteristics of the child or adolescent	
Sex	Binary variable equal to 1 if female.
Race/color	Binary variable equal to 1 if Non-White (includes black, brown and indigenous).
Age	Age in years.
Teaching network	Binary variable equal to 1 if the child attends a private education system.
Characteristics of the reference person	
Sex	Binary variable equal to 1 if female.
Race/color	Binary variable equal to 1 if Non-White (includes black, brown and indigenous).
Age	Age in years.
Married	Binary variable equal to 1 if married
Scholarity	Binary variable equal to 1 if incomplete elementary school
Characteristics of the residence	
Number of residents	Number of people in the household
Poor	Binary variable equal to 1 if per capita income is less than R\$179
Central-West	Binary variable equal to 1 if it resident in the Central-West region of the country
Northeast	Binary variable equal to 1 if it resident in the Northeast region of the country
North	Binary variable equal to 1 if it resident in the North region of the country
South	Binary variable equal to 1 if it resident in the South region of the country
Metropolitan	Binary variable equal to 1 if it resident in the metropolitan region
Urban	Binary variable equal to 1 if it resident in the urban area

Figure 5: Table 1 :

2

Segmentation	Treatment Group	Group Control	Difference	Standard Deviation	t-value	In Support	Not Treated	Treated Tre
School Attendance								
6-17 years	0.9672	0.9424	0.0248***	0.0058	4.27	3,281	5,666	
6-14 years	0.9956	0.9894	0.0062**	0.0030	2.06	2,333	4,285	
15-17 years	0.8789	0.8175	0.0614***	0.0186	3.29	948	1,379	
School Delay								
8-17 years	0.2055	0.2264	-0.0209*	0.0126	-1.66	2,704	4,628	
8-14 years	0.1485	0.1693	-0.0208	0.0130	-1.59	1,874	3,400	
15-17 years	0.3578	0.4052	-0.0474*	0.0287	-1.65	830	1,213	
School Dropout								
6-17 years	0.0327	0.0547	-0.0220***	0.0058	-3.77	3,281	5,683	
6-14 years	0.0044	0.0106	-0.0062**	0.0030	-2.06	2,333	4,285	
15-17 years	0.1211	0.1825	-0.0614***	0.0186	-3.29	948	1,379	

[Note: Source(s): Own elaboration from PNADC (2019). Note(s): (*) Significant at 10%; (**) Significant at 5%; (***) Significant at 1%.]

Figure 6: Table 2 :

3

Year 2021
 19
 Volume XXI Issue VI Version I
 E)
 (
 Global Journal of Human Social Science -

Figure 7: Table 3 :

9 CONCLUSIONS

Characteristics of the residence						
Central-West	-	0.0020	-	-	-	-
	0.0052	(0.34)	0.0370	0.0775*	0.0986**	0.1412**
	(-		(-	(-	(-	(-
	0.42)		0.64)	1.83)	2.17)	2.05)
Northeast	0.0281***	0.0034	0.0884***	-	-	-
	(2.83)	(0.72)	(2.93)	0.0505**	0.0409**	0.0875*
				(-	(-	(-
				2.56)	2.06)	1.95)
North	0.0300**	0.0103	0.0915**	0.0112	0.0046	0.0262
	(2.25)	(1.05)	(2.22)	(0.41)	(0.16)	(0.41)
Southeast	-	-	-	-	-	0.0468
	0.0006	0.00003	0.0339	0.0190	0.0299	(0.85)
	(-	(-	(-	(-	(-	
	0.06)	0.01)	0.88)	0.79)	1.19)	
South	0.0217*	0.0038	0.0144	-	0.0157	-
	(1.69)	(0.77)	(0.20)	0.0128	(0.43)	0.0715
				(-	(-	
				0.33)		0.60)
Urban	0.0219***	0.0088**	0.0525**	-	-	0.0139
	(3.36)	(2.57)	(2.41)	0.0081	0.0213	(0.40)
				(-	(-	
				0.54)	1.37)	
Year 2021	0.0264**	(2.57)	Source(s): Own elaboration from PNADC (2019).			0.0055 Rural (1.14)
						Note(s): (*) S

20
Volume
XXI
Issue
VI
Ver-
sion
I
E)
(
Global
Jour-
nal
of
Hu-
man
So-
cial
Sci-
ence

-
- 360 [Biometrika] , *Biometrika* 70 (1) p. .
- 361 [Larrañaga et al. ()] , O Larrañaga , D Conterras , J R Tagle . 2009.
- 362 [Cavalcanti et al. ()] , D Cavalcanti , E Costa , J Silva . 2013.
- 363 [Barbosa and Corseuil ()] , A L N D H Barbosa , C H L Corseuil . 2014.
- 364 [Nurkse ()] ‘Alguns Aspectos Internacionais do Desenvolvimento Econômico’. R Nurkse . *A Economia do*
365 *Subdesenvolvimento*, A N Agarwala, S P Singh (ed.) (Editora Forense, Rio de Janeiro) 1969.
- 366 [Salvia et al. ()] ‘Asignación Universal por Hijo para la Protección Social: Impacto Sobre el Bienestar Económico
- 367 y el Desarrollo Humano de La Infancia’. A Salvia , I Tuñón , S Poy . *Revista de Estudios Sociales* 2015. (2)
- 368 p. 22.
- 369 [De Brauw et al. ()] ‘Bolsa Família and Household Labor Supply’. A De Brauw , D O Gilligan , J Hoddinott , S
- 370 Roy . *Chicago Journals* 2015. 63 p. .
- 371 [Bolsa Família E O Nordeste ()] Programa Bolsa Família E O Nordeste . 10.1590/S1415-98482013000100004.
- 372 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-98482013000100004> *Impactos na Renda e na Educação, nos anos*
- 373 *de, 2004 e 2006*. 17 p. .
- 374 [Jannuzzi et al. ()] *Bolsa Família e Seus Impactos nas Condições de Vida da População Brasileira: Principais*
- 375 *Resultados da Pesquisa de Avaliação de Impacto do Bolsa Família II*, P M Jannuzzi , R M Bichir , R Ritzl .
- 376 2012. Brasília: MDS/Sagi.
- 377 [Paiva et al. ()] ‘Do Bolsa Família ao Brasil sem Miséria: Um Resumo do Percurso Brasileiro Recente na Busca
- 378 da Superação da Pobreza Extrema’. L H Paiva , T Falcão , L Bertholo . *Programa Bolsa Família: Uma década*
- 379 *de Inclusão e Cidadania*, M C Neri, T Campello (ed.) (Org.; Brasília, Ipea) 2013. p. .
- 380 [Kuznets ()] ‘Economic Growth and Income Inequality’. S Kuznets . *American Economic Review* 1955. 45 (1) p.
- 381 .
- 382 [Jiménez and Jiménez ()] ‘Efectos del programa Asignación Universal por Hijo en la deserción escolar adoles-
- 383 cente’. M Jiménez , M Jiménez . *Cuadernos de Economía* 2016. 35 (69) p. .
- 384 [Machado et al. ()] *El Nuevo Régimen de Asignaciones Familiares*, A Machado , M Moreno , F Terra , M
- 385 Hernández . 2012. Su Impacto en La Participación y Permanencia en El Ciclo Básico de Educación Media.
- 386 Mimeo, MIDES
- 387 [Família] *Escolha Ocupacional e Informalidade no Brasil*, Bolsa Família . Brasília, IPEA.
- 388 [Becker and Ichino ()] ‘Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Based on Propensity Scores’. S O Becker , A
- 389 Ichino . 10.1177/1536867X0200200403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X0200200403> *The Stata*
- 390 *Journal* 2002. 2 (4) p. .
- 391 [Martínez and Trajtenberg ()] *Evaluación del Impacto de La Asignación Universal Por Hijo Para Protección*
- 392 *Social Sobre la Formalidad Laboral: Profundización del Caso Argentino*, J C Martínez , L Trajtenberg . 2016.
- 393 Anales Li Reunión Anual de La Asociación Argentina de Política Económica
- 394 [Oh et al. ()] ‘Evaluation of Credit Guarantee Policy Using Propensity Score Matching’. I Oh , J D Lee , A
- 395 Heshmati , G G Choi . 10.1007/s11187-008-9102-5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-008-9102-5>
- 396 *Small Business Economics* 2009. 33 (3) p. .
- 397 [Gertler (2000)] *Final Report: The Impact of PROGRESA on Health*, P J Gertler . 2000. November. Washington,
- 398 D.C: International Food Policy Research Institute. (Report submitted to PROGRESA)
- 399 [Neto et al. ()] ‘How Bolsa Família Program Impacts on Basic Education? An Analysis for the Brazilian
- 400 Northeast’. A G Neto , A M A Santos , T M Prates . *Revista Econômica* 2020. 51 (1) p. .
- 401 [Behrman et al. ()] *How Conditional Cash Transfers Impact Children and Adolescent Youth in Urban Mexico*, J
- 402 R Behrman , J Gallardo , S W Parker , P E Todd , V Vélez . 2009. University of Pennsylvania
- 403 [Becker ()] *Human Capital a Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, With Special Reference to Education*, G S
- 404 Becker . 1964. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 405 [Pellegrina ()] *Impacto de Curto Prazo do Programa Bolsa Família Sobre o Abandono e o Desempenho Escolar*
- 406 *do Alunado Paulista. Dissertação de Mestrado, Instituto de Pesquisas Econômicas*, H Pellegrina . 2011. São
- 407 Paulo. Faculdade de Economia e Administração, Universidade de São Paulo
- 408 [Melo and Duarte ()] ‘Impacto do Programa Bolsa Família Sobre a Frequência Escolar: O Caso da Agricultura
- 409 Familiar no Nordeste do Brasil’. R M S Melo , G B Duarte . 10.1590/S0103-20032010000300007. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-20032010000300007> *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural* 2010. 48 (3)
- 410 p. .
- 411
- 412 [Silveira et al. ()] *Impactos do Bolsa Família na Alocação do Tempo*, F G Silveira , R Van Horn , B Campolina
- 413 . 2014. (entre Escola e Trabalho de Crianças e Adolescentes)

9 CONCLUSIONS

- 414 [Cacciamali et al. ()] ‘Impactos do Programa Bolsa Família Federal sobre o Trabalho Infantil e a Frequência
415 Escolar’. M C Cacciamali , F Tatei , N F Batista . 10.1590/S1415-98482010000200003. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-98482010000200003)
416 [10.1590/S1415-98482010000200003](https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-98482010000200003) *Revista de Economia Contemporânea* 2010. 14 (2) p. .
- 417 [Kern et al. ()] *Impactos do Programa Bolsa Família na Educação das Crianças*, A P Kern , M D T Vieira , R
418 S Freguglia . 2017. Natal. 45º Encontro Nacional de Economia
- 419 [Ribeiro and Cacciamali ()] ‘Impactos do Programa Bolsa Família Sobre os Indicadores Educacionais’. R Ribeiro
420 , M Cacciamali . *Revista Economia* 2012. 13 (2) p. .
- 421 [Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios Contínua (PNADC (ed.) (2019))] *Instituto Brasileiro de*
422 *Geografia e Estatística (IBGE)*, [https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/trabalho/](https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/trabalho/9173-pesquisa-nacional-por-amostra-de-domicilios-continua-trimestral.html?Edicao=20653&t=downloads)
423 [9173-pesquisa-nacional-por-amostra-de-domicilios-continua-trimestral.html?](https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/trabalho/9173-pesquisa-nacional-por-amostra-de-domicilios-continua-trimestral.html?Edicao=20653&t=downloads)
424 [Edicao=20653&t=downloads](https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/trabalho/9173-pesquisa-nacional-por-amostra-de-domicilios-continua-trimestral.html?Edicao=20653&t=downloads) Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios Contínua (PNADC (ed.)
425 2019. June 16, 2020. (Retrieved)
- 426 [Mincer ()] ‘Investment in human capital and personal income distribution’. J Mincer . *Journal of Political*
427 *Economy* 1958. 66 (4) p. .
- 428 [Chitolina et al. ()] *O Impacto da Expansão do Programa Bolsa Família sobre a Frequência Escolar*, L Chitolina
429 , M N Foguel , N Menezes-Filho . 2013a.
- 430 [Oliveira and Soares ()] ‘O Impacto do Programa Bolsa Família Sobre a Repetência: Resultados a Partir do
431 Cadastro Único’. L F B Oliveira , S S D Soares . *Projeto Frequência e Censo Escolar. Instituto de Pesquisa*
432 *Econômica Aplicada* 2013.
- 433 [Perry et al. ()] *Poverty Reduction and Growth: Virtuous and Vicious Circles*, G Perry , O Arias , H Lopez , W
434 Maloney , L Servén . 2006. The World Bank.
- 435 [Behrman et al. (2001)] *Progressing through PROGRESA: An Impact Assessment of a School Subsidy Exper-*
436 *iment*, J R Behrman , P Sengupta , P Todd . 2001. April. Washington, D.C: International Food Policy
437 Research Institute.
- 438 [Parker ()] ‘Resultados de Oportunidades en Educación en Zonas Urbanas, en Evaluación Externa del Programa
439 Oportunidades’. S W Parker . *en Zonas Urbanas*, (México, Secretaría) 2011. 2010. 2002 -2009. de Desarrollo
440 Social.
- 441 [Schultz (2000)] *School Subsidies for the Poor: Evaluating a Mexican Strategy for Reducing Poverty*, T P Schultz
442 . 2000a. June. Washington, D.C: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- 443 [Social Monitoring Panel: Bolsa Família Program: Benefits. Brasília Ministry of Social Development (2019)]
444 ‘Social Monitoring Panel: Bolsa Família Program: Benefits. Brasília’. [https://aplicacoes.mds.gov.](https://aplicacoes.mds.gov.br/sagi/vis/dash/painel.php?d=137)
445 [br/sagi/vis/dash/painel.php?d=137](https://aplicacoes.mds.gov.br/sagi/vis/dash/painel.php?d=137) *Ministry of Social Development*, 2019. April 25, 2020.
- 446 [Myrdal ()] *Teoria Econômica e Regiões Subdesenvolvidas*, G Myrdal . 1968. Editora Saga, Rio de Janeiro.
- 447 [Rosenbaum and Rubin ()] *The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects*,
448 P R Rosenbaum , D B Rubin . 1983.
- 449 [Marinho and Mendes ()] ‘The Impact of Government Income Transfers on the Brazilian Job Market’. E Marinho
450 , S Mendes . *Estudos Econômicos* 2013. 43 (1) p. .
- 451 [Hoddinott et al. (2000)] *The Impact of PROGRESA on Consumption: A Final Report*, J Hoddinott , E Skoufias
452 , R Washburn . 2000. September. Washington, D.C: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- 453 [Parker and Skoufias (2000)] *The Impact of PROGRESA on Work, Leisure, and Time Allocation*, S Parker , E
454 Skoufias . 2000. October. Washington, D.C: International Food Policy Research Institute. (Report submitted
455 to PROGRESA)
- 456 [Bourguignon and Chakravarty ()] ‘The Measurement of Multidimensional Poverty’. F Bourguignon , S R
457 Chakravarty . 10.1023/A:1023913831342. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023913831342> *Journal of*
458 *Economic Inequality* 2003. 1 (1) p. .
- 459 [Heckman and Masterov ()] ‘The Productivity Argument for Investing in Young Children’. J Heckman , D Mas-
460 terov . 10.1111/j.1467-9353.2007.00359.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9353.2007.00359.x>
461 *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 2007. Oxford University Press. 29 (3) p. .
- 462 [Pedrozo ()] *Uma avaliação ex-ante dos impactos do Bolsa Família na redução do trabalho infantil*, E Pedrozo .
463 2007. Anais do XXXII Encontro Nacional de Economia
- 464 [Galasso ()] *With Their Effort and One Opportunity: Alleviating Extreme Poverty in Chile*, E Galasso . 2006.
465 Washington, D.C.