Educação em Revista
ISSN: 0102-4698
ISSN: 1982-6621
Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

MACEDO, JOÃO PAULO; REIS, SARA TELES

POLÍTICAS EDUCACIONAIS DOS GOVERNOS PT (2003-2016): IMPACTO NO PERFIL DOS GRADUANDOS EM PSICOLOGIA

Educação em Revista, vol. 37, e234389, 2021
Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698234389

Available in: https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=399369188057

EDUR • Educação em Revista. 2021; 37:e234389
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698234389

ARTIGO

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES OF THE PT GOVERNMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON THE PROFILE OF UNDERGRADUATES IN PSYCHOLOGY

JOÃO PAULO MACEDO[1;2]
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4393-8501
SARA TELES REIS[3]
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0887-6317

ABSTRACT: The objective of this article was to analyze the impact of educational policies for higher education during the Workers' Party/PT governments (2003-2016), regarding the profile of Psychology undergraduate students in Brazil. This is a documental study, based on microdata from the Census of Higher Education and the National Examination of Student Performance, referring to the 2015 cycle, released in the public domain by the Ministry of Education. Students from public and private Higher Education Institutions were selected to compose the final sample of 18,788 students. The analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, version 21, based on the chi-square test ($\chi 2$) of independence and 0.05 significance level ($p<0.05$). It was observed the access of a new profile of students coming from families with lower income; with mothers and fathers with less education; coming from public schools; being the first in the family to attend an undergraduate course. In this logic, it is possible to understand the importance of Prouni, Fies and Reuni both in terms of widening access and in terms of a certain de-elitization of the profile of Psychology students in Brazil. It is noteworthy that such a change has been brought about by the boosting of policies to expand access to higher education, especially those aimed at the private sector (Fies and Prouni).

Keywords: Reuni, Prouni, Fies, non-elitization, training in Psychology.

POLÍTICAS EDUCACIONAIS DOS GOVERNOS PT (2003-2016): IMPACTO NO PERFIL DOS GRADUANDOS EM PSICOLOGIA

RESUMO: Objetivou-se analisar o impacto das políticas educacionais para o ensino superior ao longo dos Governos do Partido dos Trabalhadores/PT (2003-2016), quanto ao perfil dos estudantes de graduação de Psicologia no Brasil. Trata-se de um estudo documental, com base nos microdados do Censo do Ensino Superior e do Exame Nacional do Desempenho dos Estudantes, referente ao ciclo de 2015, divulgado em domínio público pelo Ministério da Educação. Foram selecionados estudantes de Instituições de Ensino Superior públicas e privadas para compor a amostra final de 18.788 estudantes. A análise foi realizada por meio do Software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), versão 21,

[1] Docente dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia da Universidade Federal do Delta do Parnaíba (UFDPar), Parnaíba, PI, Brasil.
[2] Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC). Bolstia Produtividade do CNPQ. Fortaleza, CE, Brasil. <jpmacedo@ufpi.edu.brr>
[3] Psicóloga pela Universidade Federal do Delta do Parnaíba (UFPI). Parnaíba, PI, Brasil. <sarateles10@gmail.com>

com base no teste quiquadrado ($\chi 2$) de independência e grau de significância 0,05 ($p<0,05$). Observou-se o acesso de um novo perfil de alunos oriundos de famílias com renda mais baixa; com mães e pais com menor escolaridade; procedentes de escolas públicas; sendo os primeiros da família a cursarem um curso de nível superior. Nesta lógica, é possível entender a importância do Prouni, Fies e Reuni tanto quanto a ampliação do acesso como quanto a uma certa deselitização do perfil do estudante de Psicologia no Brasil. Entende-se que tal mudança tenha se dado pelo impulsionamento das políticas de ampliação do acesso ao ensino superior, notadamente voltadas para o setor privado (Fies e Prouni).

Palavras-chave: Reuni, Prouni, Fies, deselitização, formação em Psicologia.

LAS POLÍTICAS EDUCATIVAS DE LOS GOBIERNOS DE LOS PT Y EL IMPACTO EN EL PERFIL DE LOS ESTUDIANTES UNIVERSITARIOS DE PSICOLOGÍA

RESÚMEN: El objetivo fue analizar el impacto de las políticas educativas para la educación superior, a lo largo de los gobiernos del Partido de los Trabajadores/PT (2003-2016), respecto al perfil de los estudiantes de pregrado de Psicología en Brasil. Se trata de un estudio documental, basado en los microdatos del Censo de Educación Superior y del Examen Nacional de Rendimiento Estudiantil, correspondientes al ciclo 2015, liberados en el dominio público por el Ministerio de Educación. Se seleccionaron estudiantes de instituciones de educación superior públicas y privadas para componer la muestra final de 18.788 estudiantes. El análisis se realizó con el programa informático Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), versión 21, basado en la prueba de chi-cuadrado ($\chi 2$) de independencia y un nivel de significación de 0,05 ($p<0,05$). Se observó el acceso de un nuevo perfil de estudiantes provenientes de familias con menores ingresos; con madres y padres con menos educación; provenientes de escuelas públicas; siendo los primeros de la familia en cursar un curso de pregrado. En esta lógica, es posible entender la importancia de Prouni, Fies y Reuni tanto en términos de ampliación del acceso como en términos de una cierta deselitización del perfil del estudiante de Psicología en Brasil. Cabe destacar que este cambio se ha producido gracias al impulso de las políticas de ampliación del acceso a la educación superior, centradas especialmente en el sector privado (Fies y Prouni).

Palabras clave: Reuni, Prouni, Fies, noelitización, formación en Psicología.

INTRODUCTION

Thinking about educational policies impact on Psychology undergraduate students profile in recent years requires a historical analysis of the country's. higher education. We know that social inequality in all its facets and molds, especially when it refers to the educational segment, is a product of the capitalist system. In its history, Brazilian education is permeated with contradictions for not having been born on an equality basis and access for all. For Saviani (1944), education acts as an important instrument for production relations reproduction, revealing its segregating and marginalizing character. Thus, in the country, it was never intended to make education a universal model, in view of its function of social inequalities reproduction evidenced by the selective nature of the Brazilian school (Saviani & Duarte, 2012).

The financial capitalism is the one that rules the country's economic structure, and it is this one that commands the policies in general, including educational policies, with its neoliberal rationality (Saviani, 1998). In this sense, current projects and legislations result from an ideology in which education becomes a necessary condition for the capital's economic and ideological reproduction. If, on one hand, the equal opportunities flag becomes subordinated to the market's rational logic, on the other hand, the reforms in the educational segment are reduced to the fulfillment of objectives that meet, primarily, the economic imperative, whose strategic role given to education is to adapt individuals to the labour market,

through investment in the private sector, instituting a logic that favors the market's strengthening (Cruz, 2003; Giron, 2014) .

Education policies reflect a certain societal project or possible collective projects in which the interests defended are anchored in a certain conception of subject and construction of a society model (Giron, 2014). For Netto (1999), societal projects dispute society images they intend to build, based on a set of values that justify their construction and means (material and cultural) to accomplish it: some serve the working and subordinate classes interests, and others the dominant class. In the case of an educational project endorsed by capitalist logic, the prevailing society conception is one that prizes competition, utilitarian ethics, neoliberal meritocracy, and exclusion (Giron, 2014). In the case of higher education, these contradictions deepen, signaling the a system legacy that, in its embryo, was already permeated by social prestige and logics that supported dominant classes (Cavalcante, 2000).

In this sense, educational policies in Brazil, in its historical process, were implemented by logics and intentionalities aimed at adaptations to (neo)liberal models and reproduction of society's ways of life (Giron, 2008). To analyze them, it is necessary to review the historical moment and political conjuncture in which they were implemented, evaluating the social and economic model need in force.

Considering that education in Brazil has undergone significant reforms and transformations in order to keep up with the country's social, political and economic dynamics, we will focus this study on higher education policies during the Workers' Party (PT) governments period at federal level. It is assumed that such policies have resulted in significant changes in students' profile, since it has enabled greater access to higher education.

In 2003, with the entry of the Workers' Party government into the Presidency, the country went through an important historical moment of increasing access to higher education through the expansion and financial investment of public educational policies, through the: University for All Program (PROUNI) and the Support Program for Restructuring and Expansion Plans of Federal Universities (REUNI), implemented during the governments of Luís Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010) and Dilma Vana Rousseff (2011-2016); in addition to the Higher Education Student Financing Fund (FIES) improvement, created in the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC), even though it was expanded in the Workers' Party (PT) governments (Silva & Castro, 2014) .

Among these policies, FIES was the first to be created, in 1999, and regulated by Law number 10.260/2001, with the objective of financing part or all of the tuition of low-income students regularly enrolled in higher education courses at private Higher Education Institutions (IES). For Aprile and Barone (2018), FIES is a program aimed at financing higher education graduation for students who are unable to fully afford their education costs, regularly enrolled in private institutions registered in the Program, and with positive evaluation in the processes conducted by the Ministry of Education (MEC). It was conceived with the purpose of being a self-sustaining program, in financial terms, to replace the Educational Credit Program (PCE/CREDUC).

Initially, FIES covered up to 70% of the tuition charged by the educational institution. As of September 2005, it began to finance 50% of the tuition, and later 100%, with the publication of Law 11.552/2007 (Oliveira & Carnielli, 2010). Such changes sought to expand the number of assisted students, being registered 449,786 thousand students benefited in 2006. In 2016, there were 325 thousand enrollments in the program, and, on the part of educational institutions, 1,110 maintaining institutions, 1,513 IES, 2,059 campuses and 23,035 courses/habilitations participated (Aprile & Barone, 2018).

As for the PROUNI, it was created by Law 11.096/2005 and implemented in the same year with the purpose of creating access conditions in private IES for students coming in their majority from lower social classes or middle class strata who did not have the resources to assume the costs of a higher education in private institutions. It occurs through scholarships of different modalities:

> full scholarship granted to Brazilians who do not have a college degree, whose per capita income does not exceed the value of up to one and a half minimum wages; and partial scholarship (50%) granted to Brazilians who do not have a college degree, whose per capita family income does not exceed the value of up to three minimum wages (Aprile & Baroni, 2018, p. 49) .

According to the authors, Fies and Prouni are educational policies aimed at the low-income and working class population, which includes students from public schools. They are inclusive policies of compensatory, focused and affirmative character. Compensatory because they provide aid for both IES and students, focused once they are directed to publics of a certain social and economic profile, and affirmative because they ensure the participation of people who have suffered class and/or ethnic-racial discrimination, among others, for the maintenance of their educational process, regarding the tuition cost (Aprile & Baroni, 2018).

However, Catani et al. (2006) suggest that, despite the advances made with the "university reform" carried out by the Workers' Party, such as Prouni as a public policy of access to higher education, there was no strategy aimed at guaranteeing student's permanence, a fundamental element for higher education democratization. Furthermore, it is necessary to consider the quality of the institutions and courses in which access for low-income students' was expanded, considering that the evaluations of private institutions courses, largely composed of isolated colleges, have shown a poor performance in the ENADE score.

As can be seen, both programs are aimed at the country's higher education private sector expansion, pointing to an education privatization by placing the public education fund at the disposal of the private sector, from neoliberal policies, thus favoring market heating with higher education financialization (Giron, 2008).

Given the higher education private sector scenario and the privatization logic, according to Galzerano and Minto (2019) , we experience the contemporary phase of capital accumulation, through fictitious capital characterized by education financialization from oligopolization and transnationalization of multinational companies focused on higher education in the country. This form of accumulation occurs, above all, by the development of the credit system, which allows capital to accumulate as money-capital, revealing itself more and more 'unreal', and this is the reason for "fictitious capital" classification (Dominczak, 2015).

In this way, programs financed by the public education fund supported by the Brazilian state such as Fies, Prouni, the National Program for Access to Technical Education and Employment (Pronatec) and the National Program of Books and Teaching Materials (PNLD), are defined by Galzerano and Minto (2019) as essential mechanisms to guarantee the profitability of private companies and their shareholders in the financial market. The same authors refer that the financialization process is a mechanism in which the capital return no longer happens through production, but by the capital retained through loans, as in the case of Fies that worked as a way to "exchange" regular payment of tuition fees for the low-cost financing proposed by the Program, in evident benefit of education companies, thus representing a development of the contemporary capitalist accumulation logic in Brazilian education sector (Galzerano & Minto, 2018, 2019). In this aspect, education becomes a commodity and as result emerges a "double private interest superimposition over education: educational companies have in their activities means to obtain profits and so do their investors from the financial sector" (Galzerano & Minto, 2019, p. 11) .

In addition, Almeida et al. (2012) in analyzing the access democratization process and the rate of higher education in the Brazilian and Portuguese reality, signal that in Brazil, the expansion in higher education was made essentially at the expense of an exponential increase in private sector institutions, also amplified by the multiplication of courses and the number of students entering higher education. The authors identified that the exclusive presence of "cultural and social elites" among Brazilian students, a very common reality in the country's higher education history has changed, revealing a much more heterogeneous picture regarding the students' social and cultural origins. However, they argue that to achieve a successful higher education democratization, institutional and social measures towards these students are needed in order to make the democratization of higher education more effective.

In this logic, Costa and Ferreira (2017) question whether such policies effectively contribute to the democratization of access and permanence in Brazilian higher education. Moreover, they warn about the need to create an alternative policy to Prouni, in the sense of not only promoting access scholarships, but to ensure and guarantee the entry and permanence of students who come from lower

social classes, with continuous and effective measures to keep low-income young people in the courses: food and transportation assistance and funding for materials. In addition, to ensure that graduates have opportunities to enter the labor market, with policies that encourage the first job, through interactions between universities and productive sector, aligned with public policies to compensate income concentration, to address poverty and above all to strengthen the educational network and other public policies (Franco, 2008; Ghelere, 2014; Pereira et al. 2016).

Thus, in order for there to be a democratization for the entrance and conclusion of higher education in the country, a solid equality foundation for all is needed, with the Brazilian State considering equity as essential justice for its citizens development. Therefore, it corroborates Rawls' Theory of Justice, which claims that the justice of laws and economic and social policies should be oriented towards the expansion of expectations for the less favored, respecting equal opportunity conditions and maintaining equal freedoms for all (Silva, 1998; Rawls, 1997), under the perspective not only of the struggle and guarantee of rights, but of human emancipation.

As for the Support Program for Restructuring and Expansion Plans of Federal Universities (REUNI), it is part of the Education Development Plan (PDE) in recognition of federal universities' strategic role for economic and social development. Instituted by Decree Number 6,096/2007, REUNI began in 2008 and expected to be completed by 2012 (Ministério da Educaçao, 2009). According to Camilo (2014) , the principles and strategies that guided this program were present to some extent in the context of the Brazilian universities reform thought in the 1980s. However, they were only implemented, very timidly, throughout FHC Governments (1995-2003), and with greater force in Lula's Governments (2003-2010) and the first term of Dilma's Government (2010-2014). The main REUNI objective refers to the expansion of access and permanence in public higher education, through physical, academic and pedagogical expansions in the federal network with the increase of vacancies in undergraduate courses; the expansion of night courses offerings; ensuring quality through academic innovations; with the creation of new campuses; and the optimization of the use of human resources and infrastructure of federal institutions of higher education, with goals aimed at reducing social inequalities in the country (Ministry of Education, 2009).

The adhesion to REUNI by the Federal Institutions of Higher Education (IFES) was divided into two calls, in which only one of the 54 federal universities did not adhere: 42 IFES adhered in the first call and 11 in the second call (Box 1).

In 2008, REUNI's implementation first year, the number of vacancies in undergraduate courses had an increase of 14,826 new vacancies, from 132,451 to a total of 147,277 vacancies (MEC, 2009). There has also been an increase in the number of undergraduate courses that went from 2,326 to 2,552. In terms of interiorization, 104 new campuses were created, which together with the 151 already existing ones, represent the presence of federal universities in 235 Brazilian municipalities (MEC, 2009).

The Commission's Report, constituted by Ordinance Number 126/2012, to analyze federal universities expansion, confirms that REUNI was articulated as an important process on the path to strengthening the university main objective, in addition to its importance and implementation success. It brings as considerable results of the program the increase in vacancies, enrollments and number of campuses, interiorizing the public university in Brazil. In the period from 2003 to 2010, 14 universities were created as part of the Federal Government effort for the interiorization of public higher education, in addition to the integration with the countries of South America and the Caribbean and Portuguese-speaking countries, especially African ones (Ministry of Education, 2012) .

Box 1. List of Federal Institutions of Higher Education that adhere to REUNI

1st call Adherence	2nd call Adherence
• University of Brasília Foundation - UnB • Federal University of Piauí Foundation - UFPI • Federal University of Viçosa Foundation - UFV • Federal University of Rio de Janeiro - UFRJ • Federal University of the Triângulo Mineiro - UFTM • Federal University of Acre Foundation - UFAC • Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte - UFRN • Federal University of Pernambuco - UFPE • Federal University of Campina Grande - UFCG • Federal University of São Paulo - UNIFESP • Federal University of Maranhão Foundation - UFMA • Federal University of Paraíba - UFPB • Federal University of Roraima Foundation - UFRR • Federal University of Pará - UFPA • Federal University of Grande Dourados Foundation - UFGD • Universidade Federal Rural do Semi Árido - UFERSA, • Federal University of Espírito Santo - UFES • Federal University of São Carlos Foundation - UFSCar • Federal University of Paraná - UFPR • Federal University of Goiás - UFG • Federal University of Santa Catarina - UFSC • Federal University of Mato Grosso Foundation - UFMT • Federal University of Tocantins Foundation - UFT • Federal University of Pelotas Foundation - UFPel • Federal University of Bahia - UFBA • Federal University of Ceará - UFC • Federal University of Juiz de Fora - UFJF • Federal University of Lavras - UFLA • Mato Grosso do Sul Federal University Foundation – UFMS	• Federal University of Minas Gerais - UFMG • Federal University of Sergipe Foundation - UFS • Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro - UFRRJ • Universidade Federal Rural da Amazônia - UFRA • Federal University of São João Del Rei Foundation - UFSJ • Foundation University of Rio Grande - FURG, • Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul - UFRGS • Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro - UNIRIO • University of Amazonas Foundation - UFAM • Amapá Federal University Foundation - UNIFAP • Federal University of Rondônia Foundation - UNIR • Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre - UFCSPA • Universidade Federal Fluminense - UFF • Federal University of Alagoas - UFAL Federal University of Ouro Preto Foundation UFOP • Federal University of the Recôncavo da Bahia - UFRB • Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco - UFRPE • Universidade Federal de Santa Maria - UFSM Universidade Federal de Uberlândia - UFU Universidade Federal dos Vales do Jequitinhonha e Mucuri - UFVJM • Universidade Federal de Alfenas - UNIFAL Universidade Federal de Itajubá - UNIFEI Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná - UTFPR • Federal University of São Francisco Valley Foundation - UNIVASF

Source: Ministry of Education (MEC)

The aforementioned report also points out that in the REUNI implementation period there was a great leap in the number of permanent professors with the authorization to open 21,786 new professorships through public exams and the consequent reduction of 64% of substitute professors. Furthermore, the program has contributed to minimize social inequalities among students by ensuring conditions for academic access and permanence through the National Student Assistance Program (PNAES) investment, which aims to promote the permanence of socially vulnerable students in federal universities and enable equal opportunities for all students and contribute to improving academic performance. It shows that in the expansion period, in addition to public vacancies in undergraduate education, there was a significant increase in the number of graduate scholarships - social demand - granted by Capes, in addition to the very expansion of the sector in the country (Ministry of Education, 2012).

However, Camilo (2014) points out the federal public university difficulties to remain autonomous, when he states that "sectors external to the institution, especially governments and the economic market, at local and global levels, have increasing power in defining the directions of the university" (p. 254). In REUNI's case, the author highlights the economic interests that guided the program, guided by the World Bank dictates with insufficient number of openings created for the Brazilian reality and funds conditioned to the achievement of goals. Moreover, the "voluntary" adherence

to the program was conducted based on dimensions previously defined by the Government, in contradiction to the universities' autonomy.

Duquia and Borges (2016) in their research based on the Federal University of Pelotas case study, addressed the REUNI as a kind of management contract in a institution process of entrepreneurialization. They pointed to the State's neoliberal logic in the form of management restructuring apparatus and instances, which in the case of education, more precisely higher education, transformed universities into the condition of companies by implementing contract relations and achievement of goals. Such logic is even resumed in current times, under the Jair Bolsonaro Government, through the "Future-se/Fature-se" Program proposal, in an overwhelming way, by interfering in the management, in the autonomy and in the didactic-scientific organization, in research and in the extension of the Brazilian university, by placing it under the logic of Social Organizations, turning its physical and intellectual patrimony under the logic of the market.

Considering, therefore, that Brazilian higher education has undergone significant reforms and transformations over time, we will focus on the analysis of the impact of the educational policies of the Workers' Party governments (Prouni, Fies and Reuni) on undergraduate students in Psychology profile, considering its elitist history.

METHOD

This is a documentary study, based on primary information taken from the microdata of the Census of Higher Education in Brazil and the National Exam of Student Performance (ENADE), released in public domain by the Ministry of Education (MEC). The data from the 2015 ENADE cycle are only from students who have finished the course, totaling 549,488 students from 26 higher education courses with bachelor's degrees and technological degrees. In the Psychology course 26,644 students were evaluated, 4,550 from public IESs and 22,094 from private IESs. For this study purpose, we selected only students from private Higher Education Institutions (IES) who did or did not benefit from policies of access to higher education and those from Federal Higher Education Institutions (IFES) to compose the final sample of 18,788 students.

To trace the courses' panorama, the analysis was based on the description of frequencies. The students' profiles analysis was carried out considering seven groups: "self-financed"; benefited by the "full PROUNI", "partial PROUNI", combined "partial PROUNI and FIES"; financed by "FIES"; coming from Federal Institutions of Higher Education (IFES) that joined the "REUNI" expansion programs and those coming from IFES that did not join the same programs, which we called "NOT REUNI".

From the students' classification, according to their link to a private institution or a IFE belonging or not to the access policies to higher education, the distribution of subjects in the seven groups was analyzed based on a set of thirteen variables, as follows: ethnicity (1); marital status (2); family income (3); applicant's financial situation (4); work situation except internship or scholarship (5); schooling of the father (6); schooling of the mother (7); someone in the family completed higher education (8); type of school that attended high school (9); type of high school they completed (10); size of the municipality (11); entry through affirmative action or social inclusion (12) and type of academic scholarship they receive (13).

The analysis was performed using the software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows version 21, based on chi-square test ($\chi 2$) of independence and 0.05 significance level ($p < 0.05$), to verify significant differences or not regarding the investigated characteristics among the seven groups and infer associations between variables and groups. It is worth mentioning that in this study subjects with missing answers were eliminated. From that, frequency tables were built to facilitate the distribution visualization.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Overall, a total of 18,788 students participated in ENADE in the 2015 cycle, as Psychology course graduates in private and federal universities. Of this total, 2,746 were students from the federal

sector, whose courses joined or not the REUNI Program (6.9% and 7.8%, respectively). The remaining, about 16,042 students were from the private sector, being 9% of students benefited by the Full PROUNI, 2.9% by the Partial PROUNI, 3.1% combining Partial PROUNI and FIES, 26.2% with FIES, and 44.2% self-financed.

Comparing these data with those presented by the research of Yamamoto, Seixas and Falcão (2011), one can observe the effects of the PT governments educational policies boosting the country's higher education sector, particularly in Psychology undergraduate courses. In these, we had a higher growth percentage of students in the public sector, which jumped from 10.1% in 2006 to 14.6% in 2015, while in the private sector it went from 83.5% to 85.38% in the same period. Moreover, it contributed to reduce the historical regional imbalance regarding the system's vacancies offer, causing the students' concentration in the Southeast (57.0% in 2006 to 43.3% in 2015) and South (19.1% to 18.3%) regions to decrease, while in the Northeast it increased from 12.5% to 24.2%.

About the profile of the sample of Psychology graduates that participated in the cycle of ENADE in 2015, it is observed that it was mostly composed of women (82.9%), aged between 20 and 26 years (56.3%), single (72.6%), declared white (61.3%), with family income ranging from zero to 4.5 minimum wages (56%). Moreover, they reported that their studies' expenses were financed by government programs (9.1%) or by the family/other people (41.6%); that they did not have a job (54.7%); that they studied the whole high school in public schools (55.2%); that they were linked to Psychology courses that functioned in large-sized cities (53.7%); that they did not enter through affirmative action or social inclusion policies (83%); and that they did not receive any kind of academic scholarship (79.1%).

As for the thirteen variables analyzed in terms of ethnicity, Table 1 shows that the Psychology courses still reflect a larger contingent of white students.

Table 1. Ethnicity of Psychology students who did or did not benefit from policies of access to Higher Education in Public and Private Universities.

	ETNIA													
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PARCIAL PROUNI**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO REUNI**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
White	**5.754**	30.6	843	4.5	284	1.5	2.786	14.8	297	1.6	686	3.7	871	4.6
Black	424	2.6	**229**	1.2	**61**	0.3	**387**	2.1	**74**	0.4	**126**	0.7	**134**	0.7
Brown/Mulatto	1939	10.3	**602**	3.2	**188**	1.0	**1635**	8.7	**199**	1.1	**448**	2.4	**429**	2.3
Yellow (of oriental origin)	**136**	0.7	11	0.1	6	0	**75**	0.4	7	0	16	0.1	16	0.1
Indigenous (or of indigenous origin)	55	0.3	9	0	3	0	**35**	0.2	3	0	11a	0.1	9	0
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
	χ2 547. 195													
	Sig. 0.001*													

p<0.*05, showing significance.

Although this is a profile that remains, if we compare the data of ENADE 2015 with those analyzed by Yamamoto, Seixas and Falcão (2011) regarding the 2006 cycle, it is noteworthy that there was a significant decrease among the percentage of students who declared themselves white (73.2% to 61.3%) and an increase among mixed race (19.3% to 29%) and blacks (4.3% to 8%). In the study by Ristoff (2013), about the socioeconomic profile analysis of respondents of ENADE questionnaire based on two cycles, the author found that there was a reduction in the number of whites on Brazilian university campuses, from 70% to 65%, attributing the adoption of policies such as PROUNI, FIES and REUNI as the main drivers of this change.

When applying the chi-square test on this variable, it was observed that the actual count exceeded the expected count, indicating a relationship between the alternative and the group composition. If we consider the seven investigated groups, we observe a higher incidence of brown (16.4%) and black (4.7%) students benefited by educational policies. The policy that stands out most in this case is PROUNI in its Full, Partial and Combined with FIES modalities, being respectively the scholarship modalities that have the greatest impact on the entry of black people in Psychology courses.

Regarding the indigenous population, it is REUNI that has the greatest impact on the entry of these people in universities to study Psychology, although with extremely low percentages.

As for marital status, as can be seen in Table 2, the highest percentage is of single students (72.5%), followed by married students (20.3%).

Table 2. Marital status of Psychology students who did or did not benefit from policies of access to Higher Education in Private and Public Universities.

CIVIL STATUS														
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PARCIAL PROUNI**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO REUNI**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Single	5.702	30.3	**1.285**	6.8	**427**	2.3	3.396	18.1	403	2.1	**1.107**	5.9	**1320**	7.0
Married	**2.004**	10.7	280	1.5	88	0.5	**1.074**	5.7	**133**	0.7	130	0.7	94	0.5
Separate/ Divorced	**349**	1.9	55	0.3	10	0.1	**247**	1.3	21	0.1	11	0.1	12	0.1
Widower	**42**	0.2	**8**	0	1	0	11	0.1	0	0	2	0	1	0
Another	211	1.1	**66**	0.4	16	0.1	**190**	1.0	**23**	0.1	37	0.2	32	0.2
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 554.363														
Sig. 0.001*														

p<0.05, showing significance.

Facing the policies, it is seen that married people, although in a smaller percentage, are in greater number in the groups referring to PROUNI Integral and FIES. According to the expected count, it was identified that married, separated and widowed students are attracted by Student Financing Policies (FIES) and Partial PROUNI combined with FIES. The highlight regarding students who are not single corresponds to the expectation that these students already have some income, which can justify both the fact that they are concentrated in the group of private institutions without the use of scholarship or financing, and that they meet the requirements to be able to self-finance the course.

Table 3. Family income of Psychology students who did or did not benefit from policies of access to Higher Education in Public and Private Universities.

FAMILY INCOME														
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PARCIAL PROUNI**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO REUNI**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Up to 1.5 SM	427	2.3	**375**	2.0	**66**	0.4	**834**	4.4	**114**	0.6	**170a**	0.9	142	0.8
From 1.5 to 3 SM	1247	6.6	**750**	4.0	**203**	1.1	**1.668**	8.9	**225**	1.2	289	1.5	266	1.4
From 3 to 4.5 SM	1437	7.6	**388**	2.1	**146**	0.8	**1.164**	6.2	**138**	0.7	241	1.3	228	1.2
From 4.5 to 6 MW	**1.269**	6.8	122	0.6	71	0.4	605	3.2	65	0.3	**178**	0.9	194	1.0
From 6 to 10 SM	**1.866**	9.9	57	0.3	52	0.3	492	2.6	36	0.2	**223**	1.2	**320**	1.7
From 10 to 30 SM	**1.673**	8.9	2	0.0	4	0.0	149	0.8	2	0.0	**163**	0.9	**249**	1.3
Above 30 SM	**389**	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.0	0	0.0	23	0.1	**60**	0.3
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 3743. 171														
Sig. 0.001*														

p<0.05, showing significance.

In relation to family income, according to Table 3, 56% of the students indicated having income below four and a half minimum wages, and students from private IESs benefited by access policies such as PROUNI and FIES have an even lower income rate, ranging between 1.5 and 3 wages, when compared to other students groups analyzed in this research. Considering the difference between the actual count and the expected count, it is the PROUNI Integral that most increases the probability of students with income from zero to 3 salaries to study Psychology, while REUNI aggregates students with more favorable economic conditions.

Regarding the financial situation of the student himself, we noticed a larger portion (50.7%) with no income and who does not work (54.7%), having their expenses financed by government programs, by the family or other people, and these are more concentrated in Federal Institutions of

Higher Education (IFES). On the other hand, students from private institutions, benefited or not by access policies, tend to work and have a greater workload.

As for the parents' educational level, as observed in table 4, the highlight is for those with a father (75.9%) and mother (70.9%) with low education, ranging from no education to high school.

Table 4 - Education of parents of Psychology students who did or did not benefit from policies of access to Higher Education in Public and Private Universities

FATHER'S SCHOOLING														
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PARCIAL PROUNI**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO REUNI**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
No	372	2.0	**114**	0.6	25	0.1	**308**	1.6	**41**	0.2	59	0.3	38	0.2
Elementary School 1st to 5th grade	1.734	9.2	**608**	3.2	**192**	1.0	**1.548**	8.2	**223**	1.2	248	1.3	178	0.9
Elementary School 6th to 9th grade	1.054	5.6	**329**	1.8	**101**	0.5	**798**	4.2	**112**	0.6	161	0.9	162	0.9
High School	2.612	13.9	503	2.7	169	0.9	**1.566**	8.3	159	0.8	**439**	2.3	**468**	2.5
Higher Education - Undergraduate	**1.730**	9.2	117	0.6	43	0.2	548	2.9	36	0.2	**240**	1.3	**410**	2.2
Post-graduation	**806**	4.3	23	0.1	12	0.1	150	0.8	9	0	**140**	0.7	**203**	1.1
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 1429. 578														
Sig. 0.001*														
MOTHER'S EDUCATION														
	AUTOFINANDOS		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PROUNI PARCIAL**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO MEETING**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
No	**330**	1.8	**79**	0.4	**26**	0.1	**220**	1.2	**27**	0.1	41	0.2	15	0.1
Elementary School 1st to 5th grade	1.524	8.1	**500**	2.7	**150**	0.8	**1.287**	6.9	**166**	0.9	163	0.9	136	0.7
Elementary School 6th to 9th grade	1.011	5.4	**340**	1.8	**82**	0.4	**751**	4.0	**106**	0.6	117	0.6	129	0.7
High School	2.630	14.0	**559**	3.0	**185**	1.0	**1.613**	8.6	187	1.0	**453**	2.4	**479**	2.5
Higher Education - Undergraduate	**1.743**	9.3	140	0.7	60	0.3	654	3.5	64	0.3	**280**	1.5	**404**	2.2
Post-graduation	**1.070**	5.7	76	0.4	39	0.2	393	2.1	30	0.2	**233**	1.2	**296**	1.6
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 1118. 762														
Sig. 0.001*														

p<0.05, showing significance.

Students from private IESs benefiting from PROUNI and FIES are those who have more parents with less schooling, both in terms of trend, as indicated by the chi-square test expected count, and in percentage terms, 35.9% and 33.5%, referring to fathers and mothers, respectively. In addition, it is observed that mothers have more schooling than fathers. It is also evaluated, more specifically, that PROUNI (full and partial) is the main vector of students' access with parents with low schooling level to study Psychology. Still on family members educational level, most Psychology students in Brazil (73.1%) have someone in the family with higher education completed.

As for the chi-square analysis result of students benefiting from PROUNI and FIES compared to students from IFES and students from private IESs not benefited by policies, it is observed that the former have a greater chance of family members not having attended higher education. In percentages, PROUNI Integral is the main responsible for enabling people access to Psychology course who do not have any family member with higher education, indicating that through this program the student has the possibility of being the first in the family to have a higher education diploma.

In this sense, Felicetti and Cabrera (2017) point to the PROUNI as a factor that has contributed to the access of a new students profile not only in universities, but also in families, communities, and in a larger social context. Being the first in the family to graduate provides a change in

perspectives and attitudes within the family while enabling the construction of a cultural capital that can stimulate other family members to enter higher education, or to return to their studies, thus reflecting on future generations (Felicetti & Cabrera, 2017; Felicetti et al. , 2014).

Regarding school's type where they attended high school, according to Table 5, most Brazilian Psychology students studied their entire high school in public schools (55.2%), and more than half of them benefited from PROUNI and FIES.

Table 5 - Type of school where the Psychology students who did or did not benefit from the policies of access to Higher Education at Public and Private Universities attended high school.

	TYPE OF SCHOOL YOU WENT TO													
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PARCIAL PROUNI**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO REUNI**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
All in public school	3.443	18.3	**1.556**	8.3	**498**	2.7	**3.251**	17.3	**521**	2.8	536	2.9	552	2.9
All in private or private school	**3.717**	19.8	75	0.4	14	0.1	1087	5.8	27	0.1	**631**	3.4	**811**	4.3
All abroad	**14**	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.0	0	0.0	**2**	0.0	0	0.0
Mostly in public school	**547**	2.9	39	0.2	23	0.1	350	1.9	16	0.1	42	0.2	42	0.2
Mostly in private or private school	**538**	2.9	24	0.1	7	0.0	223	1.2	16	0.1	**74**	0.4	46	0.2
Partly in Brazil. partly abroad	**49**	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.0	**8**	0.0
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 2974.154														
Sig. 0.001*														

p<0.05, showing significance.

In percentage terms, we suggest that the main responsible for increasing the access of students from public schools to study Psychology is PROUNI, in the modalities of offering full and partial scholarships. In addition, we found that most of them concluded high school in the traditional way (83.5%). However, chi-square test expected count showed that the groups formed from REUNI, PROUNI (Full, Partial only and Partial combined with FIES) and FIES programs are more likely to be composed of students who concluded high school in technical vocational, teaching vocational, YAE or supplementary and other modalities. The PROUNI, offering full scholarships, is the main responsible for reaching students who come from technical vocational high school, magisterial, and others. As for those who completed high school through YAE or supplementary school, FIES was the main responsible for them being in higher education.

According to Table 6, the majority of Psychology students (53.6%) from public and private Higher Education Institutions (IES) in Brazil are concentrated in large cities.

Table 6. Size of the municipality in which the students of the Psychology course benefited or not from the policies of access to Higher Education of the Private and Public Universities.

	SIZE OF MUNICIPALITY													
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PROUNI PARCIAL**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO MEETING**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Small	159	0.8	**69**	0.4	17	0.1	**187**	1.0	18	0.1	**68**	0.4	16	0.1
Medium Small	520	2.8	**158**	0.8	33	0.2	**485**	2.6	39	0.2	**254**	1.4	20	0.1
Medium	1.699	9	**380**	2.0	**133**	0.7	**1.300**	6.9	129	0.7	**349**	1.9	161	0.9
Medium Large	**1.134**	6	**233**	1.2	61	0.3	**665**	3.5	74	0.4	**219**	1.2	124	0.7
Large	**4.796**	25.5	854	4.5	**298**	1.6	2.281	12.1	**320**	1.7	347	2.1	**1.138**	6.1
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 1007. 836														
Sig. 0.001*														

p<0.05, showing significance.

One can also see that the chances of people coming from small, small-medium, medium and medium-large municipalities to study Psychology have increased with REUNI, PROUNI Integral and FIES programs. In public universities it was REUNI, by the program's very nature, that contributed the most to students' entrance from smaller and rural areas into Psychology courses. In private IESs it was FIES, with the exception of students from small cities, whose highlight was the PROUNI Integral.

Table 7. Admission of Psychology students who did or did not benefit from policies of affirmative action or social inclusion in Higher Education in Public and Private Universities.

	INGRESS THROUGH AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OR SOCIAL INCLUSION POLICIES													
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PROUNI PARCIAL**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO MEETING**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
No	**8.062**	42.9	452	2.4	264	1.4	**4.399**	23.4	313	1.7	1.023	5.4	1.092	5.8
Yes by racial/ethnic criteria	13	0.1	**78**	0.4	**14**	0.1	9	0.0	**16**	0.1	**37**	0.2	**56**	0.3
Yes by income criterion	58	0.3	**268**	1.4	**63**	0.3	**229**	1.2	**44**	0.2	8	0.0	19	0.1
Yes for having studied in public or private school with a scholarship	21	0.1	**349**	1.9	**103**	0.5	118	0.6	**112**	0.6	**177**	0.9	**212**	1.1
Yes per system combining two or more of the previous criteria	14	0.1	**514**	2.7	**82**	0.4	47	0.3	**82**	0.4	31	0.2	**72**	0.4
Yes for different systems than before	140	0.7	**33**	0.2	**16**	0.1	**116**	0.6	**13**	0.1	11	0.1	8	0.0
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 7672.209														
Sig. 0.001*														

p<0.05, showing significance.

On the other hand, according to Table 7, 83% of Psychology students did not enter through affirmative action or social inclusion policies. However, it is noted that students from private institutions benefiting from PROUNI, in form of full scholarships, enter through ethnic-racial and income criteria, or through the criterion of having studied in public or private school with scholarships, or by combining two or more of the previous criteria. These aspects reveal the program as the main access vector for students affected by unequal socioeconomic conditions.

We can see from Table 8 that most Psychology students do not receive any type of academic scholarship (79.1%). However, students from Federal Institutions of Higher Education (IFES) tend to receive more academic scholarships than others.

Table 8. Type of academic scholarship that the students of the Psychology course benefited or not from the policies of access to Higher Education of Private and Public Universities receive.

	TYPE OF ACADEMIC SCHOLARSHIP YOU RECEIVE													
	SELF-FINANCED		**INTEGRAL PROUNI**		**PROUNI PARCIAL**		**FIES**		**PARTIAL PROUNI AND FIES**		**REUNI**		**NO MEETING**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
No	**7.279**	38.7	**1365**	7.3	**486**	2.6	**4258**	22.7	**504**	2.7	464	2.5	481	2.6
Scientific Initiation Scholarship	387	2.1	**137**	0.7	22	0.1	156	0.8	22	0.1	**285**	1.5	**385**	2.0
Extension Scholarship	116	0.6	49	0.3	11	0.1	81	0.4	18	0.1	**200**	1.1	**314**	1.7
Monitor or Tutor Scholarship	201	1.1	**57**	0.3	10	0.1	113	0.6	13	0.1	**115**	0.6	**117**	0.6
Pet Bag	53	0.3	22	0.1	0	0.0	26	0.1	2	0.0	**134**	0.7	**84**	0.4
Other Type of Scholarship	272	1.4	64	0.3	13	0.1	**284**	1.5	21	0.1	**89**	0.5	**78**	0.7
TOTAL	**8.308**	**44.2**	**1.694**	**9.0**	**542**	**2.9**	**4.918**	**26.2**	**580**	**3.1**	**1.287**	**6.9**	**1.459**	**7.8**
χ2 4967. 535														
Sig. 0.001*														

p<0.05, showing significance.

In this logic, it is the REUNI program that is responsible for adding the largest number of students who join monitoring scholarships, Pet grants and other types of scholarships. This reality may happen because these types of scholarships are more widely available in universities (public and/or private) than in private colleges.

That said, we understand from the results found that FIES and PROUNI have contributed over the years to the transformation of the socioeconomic profile of students in the Psychology course. From the socioeconomic profile of ENADE 2015 data, it can be stated that the Psychology course no longer appears as a course hegemonically marked by the presence of white students, from the most elite social classes and coming from private schools. On the contrary, many Psychology students come from families in which they themselves are the first in their homes to experience the opportunity to attend higher education. Such picture reaffirms the thesis of a possible path of popularization of the Psychology course based on expansion of access educational policies to higher education during PT governments. Despite the progress, it is necessary to ponder about the permanence of these students in the course, as well as the quality of the education received.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The expansion of Higher Education in Brazil, whether in the public sector through REUNI, or in the private sector through PROUNI and FIES, has provided a new profile to Psychology students in Brazil: coming from low-income families, with mothers and fathers with less education, who studied in public schools and represent the first in the family to attend a higher education course. Thus, we can see a greater reach of Brazilian higher education among students from popular classes.

However, it was the private sector that was mainly responsible for this change in Psychology undergraduate courses profile in Brazil. Historically, with access concentrated among the most economically favored, today it is the private sector that concentrates the largest number of higher education students from popular classes. It is understood, therefore, the creation of programs for higher education (REUNI and PROUNI) importance or that were strengthened (FIES) in PT Governments (2003-2016), as important vectors for expanding access and de-elitization of undergraduate student profile in Brazilian scenario.

Thus, we warn that despite the advances, we ponder on setbacks, challenges, and criticism on how these inclusion tools have gained strength from neoliberal and market logic in which the Brazilian educational system is inserted. In this way, it is suggested that new studies be carried out on the subject to deepen the analysis of these policies impact from a more qualitative perspective, based on the evaluation of education quality and the need to implement policies of integration and permanence of students in order to make more tangible the quality access to higher education for popular classes.

* The translation of this article into English was funded by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais – FAPEMIG – through the program of supporting the publication of institutional scientific journals

REFERENCES

Almeida, L. Marinho-Araujo, C. M., Amaral, A., & Dias, D. (2012). Democratization of access and success in higher education: a reflection from the realities of Portugal and Brazil. *Avaliação: Revista da Avaliação da Educação Superior (Campinas), 17*(3), 899-920. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-40772012000300014.

Aprile, M. R., & Barone, R. E. M. (2018). Higher education: public policies for social inclusion. *Journal @mbienteeducação, 2*(1), 39-55.

Camilo, S. C. A. (2014). A reforma nas universidades federais brasileiras e a representação cultural do tempo histórico: uma análise do Programa de Apoio a Planos de Reestruturação e Expansão das Universidades Federais (REUNI)-2008-2012. [Paper presentation]. Anais do Décimo Encontro Regional de História: 1964-2014: 50 anos do Golpe Militar no Brasil.

Catani, A. M., Hey, A. P., & Gilioli, R. D. S. P. (2006). PROUNI: democratization of access to Higher Education Institutions*? Educar em Revista*, (28), 125-140. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40602006000200009.

Cavalcante, J. F. (2000). *Educação superior: conceitos, definições e classificações.* Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais. http://www.dominiopublico.gov.br/download/texto/me000095.pdf.

Costa, D. D., & Ferreira, N. B. (2017). The PROUNI in Brazilian higher education: indicators of access and permanence. *Avaliação: Journal of Higher Education Evaluation (Campinas), 22*(1), 141-163. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1414-40772017000100008.

Cruz, R. E. (2003). World Bank and educational policy: cooperation or expansion of the interests of international capital? *Educar em Revista,* (22), 51-75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0104-4060.312.

Dominczak, P. R. R. (2015). Speculation and fictitious profits: parasitic forms of contemporary accumulation. *Argumentum, 7*(2), 318-322. http://dx.doi.org/10.18315/argumentum.v7i2.11632.

Duquia, A. A., & Borges, J. C. P. (2016). O reuni e o processo de empresarização da universidade federal de pelotas. [Paper presentation]. Anais Quarto Congresso Brasileiro e Estudos Organizacionais. *Proceedings of the Brazilian Congress of Organizational Studies.*

Felicetti, V. L., Cabrera, A. F., & Costa-Morosini, M. (2014). Aluno ProUni: Impacto Na Instituição de Educação Superior e na Sociedade. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior (RIES), 13*(5), 21-39.

Felicetti, V. L., & Cabrera, A. F. (2017). Higher Education outcomes: the ProUni in Focus. *Evaluation: Journal of the Evaluation of Higher Education*, *22*(3), 871-893. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1414-40772017000300016.

Franco, A. D. P. (2008). Higher Education in Brazil: scenario, advances and contradictions. *Journal of educational policies*, *2*(4), 53-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/jpe.v2i4.15028.

Galzerano, L. S., & Minto, L. W. (2018). Fictitious capital and education in Brazil: a study on the contemporary logic of privatization. *Eccos Scientific Journal, 47*, 61-80. https://doi.org/10.5585/eccos.n47.10740.

Galzerano, L. S., & Minto, L. W. (2019). Brazilian education: privatization under the rule of fictitious capital. [Paper presentation]. Proceedings of the Seventh International Meeting on Social Policy and Fourteenth National Meeting on Social Policy.

Ghelere, L. S. (2014). O perfil do bolsista prouni da UNESC: entre os limites e as possibilidades do ensino superior [Master's Dissertation, University of Extremo Sul Catarinense].

Giron, G. R. (2008). Public policies, education and neoliberalism: what does this have to do with citizenship? *Revista de Educação PUC-Campinas*, (24), 17-26.

Giron, G. R. (2014, 26 May). Reflections on the history of educational policies in Brazil. https://www.portaleducacao.com.br/conteudo/artigos/direito/reflexoes-sobre-a-historia-das-politicas-educacionais-no-brasil/57059.

Ministry of Education (2009). Programa de Apoio a Planos de Reestruturação e Expansão das Universidades Federais Reuni 2008 - Relatório de Primeiro Ano. Secretariat of Higher Education, Directorate of Development of Federal Institutions of Higher Education. http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=2069-reuni-relatorio-pdf&Itemid=30192.

Ministry of education (2012). Analysis on the Expansion of Federal Universities 2003 to 2012. Report of the Commission Constituted by Ordinance No. 126/2012. http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=12386-analise-expansao-universidade-federais-2003-2012-pdf&Itemid=30192.

Netto, J. P. (1999). The construction of the ethical-political project of Social Service. In Serviço Social e saúde: formação e trabalho profissional (pp. 141-160). Cortez.

Oliveira, Z. D. R. B. B., & Carnielli, B. L. (2010). Higher Education Student Financing Fund (FIES): students' views. *Journal of Educational Policy, 4*(7), 35-40. http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/jpe.v4i7.21861.

Pereira, G. M. C., Castro, F. N., Lanza, L. N. M., & Lanza, D. C. F. (2016). Overview of opportunities for higher education graduates in Brazil: the role of innovation in creating new labor markets. Essay: Evaluation and Public Policy in Education, 24(90), 179-198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362016000100008.

Rawls, J. (1997). A Theory of Justice. Martins Fontes.

Ristoff, D. (2013). Socioeconomic profile of the undergraduate student: an analysis of two complete cycles of the Enade (2004 to 2009). *Cadernos do Grupo Estratégico de Análise da Educação Superior no Brasil 2*(4), 1-32.

Saviani, D. (1944). School and democracy: theories of education, bending the rod, eleven theses on education and politics (9th ed.). Associated Authors.

Saviani, D. (1998). Da nova LDB ao novo Plano Nacional de Educação: por uma outra política educacional. Autores Associados.

Saviani, D., & Duarte, N. (Orgs.). (2012). Pedagogia histórico-crítica e luta de classes na educação escolar. Autores Associados.

Silva, R. P. M. (1998). John Rawls' theory of justice. *Revista CEJ - Revista do Conselho da Justifa Federal,* 138, 193-212.

Silva, J. S. D, & Castro, A. M. D. A. (2014). Expansion policies for higher education in the context of REUNI: the implementation of the program at UFRN. *HOLOS*, *6*, 206-224. https://doi.org/10.15628/holos.2014.2152.

Yamamoto, O. H., Seixas, P. S. & Falcão, J. T. R. (2011). Who is the psychology student in Brazil? *Avaliaçao Psicologica: Interamerican Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *10*(3), 209-232.

Submitted: 22/07/2020
Approved: 29/03/2021