


COVID-19, GRADUATE STUDANT AND EMERGENCY AID: dispose or not?

A COVID-19, O PÓS-GRADUANDO STRICTO SENSU E O AUXÍLIO EMERGENCIAL: dispor ou não dispor?
COVID-19, ESTUDIANTES DE POSGRADO Y AYUDA DE EMERGENCIA: ¿tener-la o no?

Ricardo Cortez Lopes

PhD in Sociology (Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul). Member of the Graduate team of IBCMED colleges. rshicardo@hotmail.com

 0000-0003-0808-7203

Gabriel Bandeira Coelho

PhD in Sociology (Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul). Researcher in the research group Technology, Environment and Society (THEMES) at UFRGS. gabrielbandeiracoelho@yahoo.com.br

 0000-0002-6504-0375.

Alice Franz

Master in Territorial Development and Agroindustrial Systems (Federal University of Pelotas). PhD student in Administration (Federal University of Santa Catarina). alicefranz1@gmail.com

 0000-0001-8475-2178.

Mailing address: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Departamento de Ciências Sociais. Avenida Bento Gonçalves 9500 - Agronomia, 91509900 - Porto Alegre, RS - Brazil.

Received: 02.16.2020
Accepted: 03.20.2020.
Published: 04.01.2020

ABSTRACT:

COVID-19 imposed measures of social distance, which caused economic impacts, to some countries. The Brazilian government has proposed measures to resolve this impact, including emergency aid for self-employed and informal workers. At the same time, the functioning of the Brazilian stricto sensu graduate program has a history of precariousness that makes the scholarship holder have the economic profile of the beneficiary of this aid. The development agencies authorized the accumulation, but the moral question still remains: should the scholarship holder request it? The study problematized this question based on data from a questionnaire answered by 63 members of Brazilian graduate groups.

KEYWORDS: COVID-19; Scholarship; brazilian government aid.

Introduction

The year 2020 has begun atypically in the face of the pandemic state caused by the spread of new coronaviruses. COVID-19, a disease caused by the virus, has caused many changes in the functioning of social institutions and practices at the global level. Economic and social consequences can be measured through indicators, or by rendering a stroke of great luck for future studies. In Brazil, one of the measures taken by the federal government before the pandemic arrived in the country was approved, without national congress, of Bill no. 9236/17, of March 26, 2020, qualified to grant Emergency Aid (Emergency Aid) to workers who had their income impaired after an indication of the horizontal isolation measure to lose or circumvent the virus.

Generally speaking, Emergency Aid is characterized by being a financial benefit granted to informal workers, individual microentrepreneurs (MEI), self-employed and

unemployed, as a way of easing the financial difficulties resulting from the crisis caused by the new virus. Among the categories of workers able to apply for Emergency Aid are also graduate scholarship holders.

In this sense and with COVID-19 as the driving force behind this public measure, the following question arises: should the *stricto sensu* graduate scholarship holder (academic master's and doctorate) receive it? Legally, the answer is positive, at least for now. However, there is also the moral question: even if it is legitimate to apply, should scholarship applicants apply? This question is relevant to the extent that, in addition to the effects shared with other citizens, the scholarship student still deals with the ethical dilemma of locating within social groups (such as informal and self-employed workers).

Perhaps a few decades earlier the horizontal isolation could not have been a problem for the expressive majority of Brazilian graduate students. However, with the expansion of the university system in Brazil, there was a diversification of the public currently attending graduate school in university institutions in the country. Thus, one of the most evident consequences refers to the fact that a postgraduate scholarship assumes the main income function for a series of these students – who already have a precarious economic condition. Hence, given the conditions mentioned above, the financial assistance provided by the federal government becomes significant in its income, even for a reduced period. Another aspect that deserves to be highlighted is the fact that graduate scholarships have not been readjusted since 2012 (GOUVEIA, 2012). Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that “externally”, the economic crisis of 2011, in addition to the increase of the unemployment rate in general, ended up causing the change in the funds allocated to the Education sector (MANCEBO, 2017, p. 884). In 2020, there was a new controversy in the ambit of the graduate course because of the Ordinance No. 34 released by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES)¹, whose repercussion could reverberate in the return of the scholarships that had been mistakenly taken from the graduate course programs. The number of scholarships did not increase, but remained stable, at least until the first half of 2020.

This paper analyses the legal norms related to establishing what is legally legal; then, we will present the arguments used to, then demonstrates the method of analysis and, finally, produces a global conclusive analysis concerning this phenomenon. Regarding the study methodology, the paper is characterized by being quantitative,

¹ Capes is a Brazilian federal government agency under the Ministry of Education.

based on surveys sent to groups of graduated students in social networks. Concerning the research instrument, it was developed through an exploratory field study, consisting of specific questions – on schooling, socioeconomic status and, mainly, on the agreement with the receipt of the Emergency Aid by any scholarship student – and an open question – justifying the agreement or not expressed in the last question. That said, in the first part of the analysis, the answers to the quantitative questions will be analysed, and in the second part, the open answers will be analysed, in addition to some data from the field explorer.

In order to undertake the analysis proposed in this article, we opted for the use of Durkheimian root sociology as a theoretical framework. In a simplified way, this theory seeks to understand the sacred values of the groups that serve as a parameter for them to judge morally (DURKHEIM, 1983), taking into account that these sacred values are naturalized and represent an ultimate truth for your group (DURKHEIM, 2007; WEISS, 2012). From a social research perspective, we will deal with a series of sacred ones, such as the role of scholarships, the role of government, the role of social assistance. The sacred expresses the "should be", and when it is contradicted – either by circumstances or by other individuals –, collective discomfort is generated. At various times, as will be illustrated, the participants expressed dismay at the conclusions of other participants or even disdained the interlocutor himself. Such types of empirical manifestations are strong indications that there are sacred ideas intrinsic in the morality of the graduate student concerning Emergency Aid.

COVID-19, isolamento social e Emergency Aid

In the present section of this article, we intend to address the causal connection that exists between COVID-19 and graduate scholarship students, without this necessarily being an approach taken from the perspective of the health sciences. At the end of 2019, in the city of Wuhan, a new disease, COVID-19, originated from a hitherto unknown virus, the new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). A highly contagious disease that ignited the warning from world authorities, its rapid spread being considered, by the World Health Organization (WHO), an international public health emergency (WU et al, 2020). Even if it does not have a high lethality rate, compared to other viruses, the new coronavirus is extremely contagious and its characteristic of causing respiratory failure creates the need to allocate many individuals to hospital beds at the same time - something that, potentially, can collapse the health system as a whole. In general, it can be said that

Covid-19 (Coronavirus Disease 2019) is a respiratory infection caused by the new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) (Brazil, 2020a). Despite evidence that the first cases emerged in October 2019, the disease was only identified in December of the same year in the city of Wuhan, China, and characterized, until then, as an epidemic. Probably of zoonotic origin, but still unknown, the first cases had in common the Wuhan Seafood Wholesale Market² (SCHUCHMANN, SCHNORRENBARGER, CHIQUETTI, GAIKI, RAIMANN, MAEYAMA, 2020, p.3558).

Suddenly, the disease caused by the new coronavirus has spread from the city of Wuhan to other Chinese regions and 66 other countries (WU et al, 2020). It did not take long for the first case to be confirmed in Brazil, a fact that occurred at the beginning of the year 2020:

The country had its first case confirmed on February 26, 2020, a 61-year-old man who had recently travelled to Italy. Twenty days later, states like São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro had already registered cases of community transmission, that is, when the source of the contamination cannot be identified. From then on, a new strategy to contain the disease had to be taken and RJ, pioneeringly, adopted isolation measures, initially for 15 days, reducing the activity of non-essential sectors and suspending classes in the public network. The country declared a state of public calamity on March 18 and two days later declared knowledge of community transmission throughout the national territory. The Ministry of Health, from then on, began to recommend measures of social isolation for the entire Brazilian population³ (SCHUCHMANN, SCHNORRENBARGER, CHIQUETTI, GAIKI, RAIMANN, MAEYAMA, 2020, p.3559).

² A Covid-19 (Coronavirus Disease 2019) é uma infecção respiratória causada pelo novo coronavírus (SARS-CoV-2) (Brasil, 2020a). Apesar de indícios de que os primeiros casos surgiram em outubro de 2019, a doença foi identificada apenas em dezembro do mesmo ano na cidade de Wuhan, na China, e caracterizada, até então, como uma epidemia. De origem provavelmente zoonótica, porém ainda desconhecida, os primeiros casos tinham em comum o Mercado Atacadista de Frutos do Mar de Wuhan

³ O país teve seu primeiro caso confirmado em 26 de fevereiro de 2020, um homem de 61 anos que havia viajado para a Itália recentemente. Vinte dias depois, estados como São Paulo e Rio de Janeiro já haviam registrado casos de transmissão comunitária, ou seja, quando não se pode identificar a origem da contaminação. A partir de então, uma nova estratégia de contenção da doença teve que ser tomada e o RJ, pioneiramente, adotou medidas de isolamento, inicialmente por 15 dias, reduzindo a atividade de setores não essenciais e suspendendo as aulas na rede pública. O país decretou estado de calamidade pública dia 18 de março e dois dias depois declarou conhecimento de transmissão comunitária em todo o território nacional. O Ministério da Saúde, a partir de então, passou a recomendar medidas de isolamento social para toda a população brasileira

Thus, it is clear that from the biological condition found, especially because of the high rate of contamination and spread of the virus, political action was formulated, in this case, social isolation. Indicated and defended even by the World Health Organization (WHO), this form of isolation keeps essential services open and recommends that there be no movement of citizens who do not fall into this category of workers. If the measure is efficient, there will be optimization in the progress of contagion, but the economic impacts will also become evident: the circulation of people is what increases the probability of occasional or fixed financial exchanges. In other words, the measure of social isolation proposed as one of the main strategies to combat contagion by the new coronavirus invariably generates economic impacts due to the restriction of the circulation of consumers. In this sense, to mitigate the economic impact caused by the policy of social isolation, the Brazilian government chose to offer a series of measures voted by the congress, namely:

[...] three main measures proposed by the Government (or Congress) to contain the effects of the pandemic so far: i) Provisional Measure no. 927 of 3.22.2020, which provides for labour measures in the period of public calamity; ii) Amendment to Bill no. 9236/17, dated 3.26.2020, which provides for the payment of emergency aid for self-employed and informal workers; [...] The second measure, on the initiative of Congress, refers to the creation of minimum income or temporary emergency aid (as it was called/baptized), for informal and self-employed workers. This measure was included in Bill no. 9.236 / 2017 which deals with the Continuous Benefit (BPC) for people with disabilities. As the bill refers, it must pass the Senate and then the regulation of the President of the Republic. By the floor of the carriage, the measure will take a long time to reach the hands of the population, with luck, until the end of the isolation period⁴ (KROTH, 2020, p.1).

Among these measures, therefore, is Emergency Aid, which, according to legislation, is aimed at informal workers (who have no formal employment), individual

⁴ [...] três principais medidas propostas pelo Governo (ou Congresso) para conter os efeitos da pandemia até o momento: i) Medida Provisória n. 927 de 22.03.2020, que dispõe sobre medidas trabalhistas no período de calamidade pública; ii) Emenda ao Projeto de Lei n. 9236/17, de 26.03.2020, que prevê o pagamento de auxílio emergencial para trabalhadores autônomos e informais; [...] A segunda medida, por iniciativa do Congresso, refere-se a criação de renda mínima ou auxílio emergencial temporário (como foi denominado/batizado), para trabalhadores informais e autônomos. Essa medida veio inserida no Projeto de Lei n. 9.236/2017 que trata do Benefício de Prestação Continuada (BPC) para pessoas com deficiência. Como se refere a projeto de lei, precisa passar pelo Senado e depois pela regulamentação do presidente da república. Pelo andar da carruagem, a medida demorará muito tempo para chegar nas mãos da população, com sorte, até o fim do período de isolamento

microentrepreneurs (MEI), the self-employed and unemployed. During the field exploratory, information emerged that, at first, ANPG stated that scholarship holders could not receive Emergency Aid. This information, however, was not found in the association's official vehicles, so there is no way to confirm it. What is factual is that she was in favour of reproducing the letter that she previously directed to CAPES.

The critical scenario that took place in the country also aggravated the crisis in the Brazilian scientific field and, questioned by the National Graduate Association (ANPG), CAPES – supported by an opinion from the Attorney General's Office – pointed out that post-graduate scholarship holders undergraduate (master's and doctorate) would also be entitled to assistance. In a reply letter, CAPES points out that:

The receipt of Emergency Aid by Capes' academics does not seem to constitute a possibility of extinction of the scholarship or research, since the program regulations, in general, prohibit only the concomitant exercise of paid activity - besides imposing obligations on third parties. orders - the hypothesis that does not fall within that emergency aid⁵ (CAPES, 2020).

In this excerpt, it is implied (since the verb “seem” was used) that the student has the right to request Emergency Aid if the other prerequisites for assistance are met. This ambiguity in communication can also be part of the dilemma, which was reflected in some positions. Among the arguments mobilized by ANPG to guarantee this right to the Brazilian graduate researcher, the association emphasized the heterogeneous profile of the graduate student, since many of the students come from different realities, from which, in a situation social isolation, the value of the scholarship becomes the only family income (ANPG, 2020). Furthermore, the real devaluation of research grants was highlighted, which have not been readjusted since 2012 (ANPG, 2020).

The economic issue of research grants and scholarships is a problem that has been discussed for some years (MATTOS, 2007; LOPES, 2018). However, the question raised by this article did not originate from this “routine” of precarious work by graduate students, but from the pandemic of the new coronavirus. It turns out that the way postgraduate studies have been organized in recent years contributes so that, in

⁵ O recebimento do Auxílio Emergencial por parte dos bolsistas da Capes não parece configurar hipótese de extinção da bolsa de estudo ou pesquisa, uma vez que os regulamentos dos programas, em geral, vedam apenas o exercício concomitante de atividade remunerada - além de impor obrigações de outras ordens - hipótese essa em que não se enquadra o referido Auxílio Emergencial.

an atypical situation as we are experiencing, scholarship graduate students find themselves in a situation of financial vulnerability. Because of this, it becomes equally relevant to expose, albeit briefly, the historical context of the development of Brazilian graduate studies.

Official regulations: a brief contextualization of the *stricto sensu* Graduate Program in Brazil

The Brazilian graduate system works through programs and funding agencies. These programs and agencies have the autonomy to define their rules, which makes them a guide to the legality of students' actions and a parameter to be considered when making their decisions. There is also, in this institutional game, the National Graduate Association (ANPG), which is organized to mediate the interests that involve students with the other institutions that are part of the structure of graduate research in Brazil, such as CAPES and The Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) development agencies, for example.

According to Balbachevsky (2005), Brazilian postgraduate studies have their roots in the model of professors adopted by Brazilian universities in the 1930s. Several professors from other countries, especially from Europe, came to Brazil in this period and brought with them the first institutional format of research in the scope of postgraduate studies (BALBACHEVSKY, 2005). Balbachevsky states that in those early years postgraduate studies had little impact on Brazilian higher education because it is a small initiative since they were centred in only a few universities.

Balbachevsky (2005) argues that in the years after the first model, graduate school was considered as one, among other entry points to the academic world, and, because of this, in addition to the academic universe, their diplomas were little known. It was only in 1965, under the military regime, says the author, that the Ministry of Education regulated graduate education, making it recognized as a teaching modality.

That year [1965], the main characteristics of Brazilian graduate studies were set out in opinion 977, known as Sucupira opinion, approved by the Federal Education Council. It was this opinion that established, for the first time, the basic institutional format of Brazilian graduate education, differentiating two levels of education, the master's and the doctorate, and establishing a line of continuity between the two,

making the master's a prerequisite for the doctorate⁶ (BALBACHEVSKY, 2005, p. 277).

Based on the regulation of Sucupira led by the military government, which at the time wanted to build inexpensive and domestic solutions for teacher training with a focus on its nationalist project, the Brazilian graduate program began a process of expansion in large steps. Such growth is highlighted by Balbachevsky (2005), who states that in 1965, when the first year of recognition of postgraduate research was recognized, the National Council of Education accounted for 38 postgraduate programs, being 27 masters and 11 doctorates. In 1975, 10 years later, there were 429 masters and 149 doctoral programs. In 2002, the number was 1,506 master's programs and 841 doctoral programs, which shows the exponential evolution of Brazilian graduate studies.

Currently, Master and Doctorate degrees are awarded through graduate programs. Graduation at the *lato sensu* specialization level is much older and dates back to 1925 (DE OLIVEIRA, 1995). The programs were established and overlapped with other previous and specific models for awarding titles so that they also gradually joined the question of research, which begins to be the flagship of its expansion (ALMEIDA, 2017). It is from this emphasis that national postgraduate plans are born, which are also successive. Currently, the programs have the autonomy to deal with scholarships provided by the Brazilian agencies and distribute the funds allocated to them. Scholarship students also have levels of representation, from regional to areas. An organ that has national reach, as we have already pointed out, is the ANPG, registered in 1986, and that "in the course of its existence, it elaborated campaigns and formalized claims to help graduate students to defend their rights" (ANPG, s/d, s/p). In other words, it is an organ that is characterized by its combativeness and, in this sense, it also launches guidelines for its represented.

Outside the internal orbit of the programs, we can list the research promotion agencies and the financial entities regulated by the Central Bank. The main ones are the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) and the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), but other

⁶ Naquele ano [1965], as principais características da pós-graduação brasileira foram fixadas pelo parecer 977, conhecido como parecer sucupira, aprovado pelo Conselho Federal de Educação. Foi esse parecer que estabeleceu, pela primeira vez, o formato institucional básico da pós-graduação brasileira, diferenciando dois níveis de formação, o mestrado e o doutorado, e estabelecendo uma linha de continuidade entre os dois, consagrando o mestrado como pré-requisito para o doutorado

organizations also offer resources for the programs. What would these agencies be? As for CNPq, created in 1949, it has to do with the Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovations and Communications, and is responsible for training and absorbing human resources and financing projects (OLIVEIRA FILHO, HOCHMAN, NAHAS, FERREIRA, 2005). Its function is to provide resources to carry out activities related to scientific activity, including the granting of scholarships. Therefore, it is relevant that a recipient of one of these grants follows its regulations to maintain the link. We did not find, however, any official positioning by CNPq on Emergency Aid. In the field exploratory, some scholarship holders stated that they would follow CAPES regulations because the scholarship amount would be the same for CNPq, which would imply, *a fortiori*, in a similar regulation.

But what would CAPES be? It is responsible for the expansion and consolidation of *stricto sensu* graduate courses in all states, created in 1951 (OLIVEIRA FILHO, HOCHMAN, NAHAS, FERREIRA, 2005). This agency, therefore, has a role in expanding research activity and has a developmental purpose. For this reason, it is strongly linked to graduate programs, which seek to keep within their standards to preserve or increase funds. Otherwise, one of the consequences may be the full return of the amounts previously paid: "In the event of proven disregard for the conditions established in the present ordinance, the student will be obliged to return to CAPES or CNPq the amounts received as scholarship [. ..]" (BRASIL, 2010, p.3).

CAPES' official positioning was found in the letter addressed to ANPG, already presented above. After CAPES' positioning, some other agencies were in favour of accepting Emergency Aid, such as the Minas Gerais State Research Support Foundation (FAPEMIG): "there is no impediment on the part of FAPEMIG to accumulate its scholarships with the Federal Government's Emergency Aid, as long as the federal legislation is fully satisfied" (FAPEMIG, 2020, s / p). In other words, there is no legal dilemma, since it is an acquired right that, in theory, cannot be revoked. However, even with these rules described, there were still those who believed it was immoral to apply for the benefit, and this dynamic will be described in the following section.

Empiric material analysis

As was elucidated in the introduction, the data collection methodology was quantitative, based on the launch of surveys, which were made available in groups of social networks for students – a place where a field exploratory was also carried out. The quality of the data, however, was also qualitative since an open question was asked

in which the respondent was asked to talk about his moral position. More than 63 responses were obtained, analysed in full in the quantitative section, but not completely analysed in the qualitative due to their exhaustion. It is possible to argue, given this, that this sample is too small considering the universe to which it refers. However, more than obtaining statistical representativeness, our objective was to show a mosaic of ideas around the issue, whose sample was adequately rendered.

In the first part of this section we will analyse the results of the specific questions, comparing them with the main and independent variable, which answers the research problem: "In your individual perception, do you consider to be morally correct for ANY *stricto sensu* postgraduate scholarship student (Master and Doctorate degree) to apply for Emergency Aid?". The word "any" was used precisely to avoid the answer "It depends", as this alternative could result in a low engagement in qualitative responses due to the nature of the object of this study - a "depends" would not inspire a more methodical define on the part of the respondent. The other variables were related to this one to problematize the answers. From this study, it was possible to test some associations between judgment and identity that appeared during the field exploratory below.

The analysis was carried out with the categorization of the material and the subsequent assembly of the table presented in the section of the general conclusions of the study. The corpus was assessed according to the following categories *a posteriori* (once conceived in the field exploratory): a) condition of scholarship holder, b) image of the opponent, c) image of the government and d) definition of scholarship. Through this classification it was possible to structure the moral judgment in more detail and, thus, we were able to create a systematization of them in a large framework.

Quantitative analysis

This section performs a bivariate analysis between the different variables (specific questions) and the central question of the study, already explained in the previous section. The objective is analogous to a social formation of "taste": we want to understand the different identities related to the formation of moral judgment.

The total income of the scholarship holders has been widely used as a way to contextualize the ideas presented. The hypothesis brought up by subjects in the field exploratory would be that students who do not depend on the scholarship would be against accepting Emergency Aid. Table 1 allows this observation:

Table 1 Income and agreement regarding the receipt of Emergency Aid

	No	Yes	Total
No apply	3,97%	6,55%	10,52%
No, never	8,18%	4,41%	12,60%
Yes	30,46%	46,43%	76,88%
Total	42,61%	57,39%	100,00%

Source: authors.

According to the table, it is not all participants whose scholarship income meets the needs who responded as opposed to accepting the aid. It is noticeable, however, that 60% of those who declare themselves vulnerable are more numerous than the 33% of non-vulnerable ones. However, it is unclear to say undoubtedly that the answer depends directly on the socioeconomic status of the student.

In table 2, it is possible to test the gender issue, since the situation of single mothers was often brought up in the exploratory:

Table 2 Genr and agreement regarding the receipt of Emergency Aid

	No	Yes	Total
Feminine	15,38%	19,79%	35,17%
Masculine	27,23%	32,09%	59,33%
Non-binary	0,00%	5,51%	5,51%
Total	42,61%	57,39%	100,00%

Source: authors.

Most of the people who answered the questionnaire were male, and we can see that, in all categories, there was a preponderance of positive responses. In other words,

it is not possible to determine some kind of gender associated with the agreement or not about receiving the aid, and not even to trace a solid trend.

Another interesting question is related to scientific areas, as some of them require the physical presence of the researcher in laboratories. At a minimum, in these areas, there is a need to expand the deadlines for defences. In table 3, this situation can be observed:

Table 3 Area and agreement regarding the receipt of Emergency Aid

	No	Yes	Total
Biological Sciences	12,45%	5,51%	17,96%
Health Sciences	2,33%	11,76%	14,09%
Exact and Earth Sciences	12,70%	13,24%	25,94%
Human Sciences	6,65%	10,76%	17,41%
Applied Social Sciences	3,42%	8,28%	11,71%
Engenharias	2,88%	1,44%	4,32%
Linguística. Letras e Artes	2,18%	3,92%	6,10%
Outra	0,00%	2,48%	2,48%
	42,61%	57,39%	100,00%

Source: authors

In this item, biological scientists were the biggest respondents, in addition to being the biggest deniers concerning the Emergency Aid request, together with engineers - areas whose research is very developed in the laboratory. The rest of the areas have a greater number of supporters than deniers, with a greater discrepancy in health sciences – which may have implications for the epidemiology itself, as students in this area tend to wish for less circulation of individuals and Emergency Aid can help with that.

The agencies were not discussed during the exploratory, but knowing the percentages of the subject is an interesting fact, as shown in the analysis in Table 4:

Table 4: agency and agreement regarding receipt of Emergency Aid

	No	Yes	Total
CAPES	30,11%	38,19%	68,30%
CNPq	12,15%	9,57%	21,73%
FAPESP	0,00%	4,51%	4,51%
FINEP	0,00%	2,58%	2,58%
Not Applicable	0,35%	0,05%	0,40%
Another	0,00%	2,48%	2,48%
Total	42,61%	57,39%	100,00%

Source: authors

The proportion of CAPES scholarships was the highest in relation to the others, and it can be noted that these are quite divided concerning the subject. The other scholarships, in turn, responded more uniformly – CNPq scholarships showed a greater inclination towards a negative answer. As already stated, it was not a problem stated by the exploratory, but it is interesting to observe the variety within this group for future studies.

The last table, number 5, shows a relevant investigation in the exploratory since the formal preparation of the interactants was often questioned:

Table 5 Schooling and agreement regarding the receipt of Emergency Aid

	No	Yes	Total
Post Doctoral	6,60%	5,41%	12,00%
Higher Education	0,74%	1,69%	2,43%
Mastering	10,62%	9,28%	19,89%
Incomplete Higher Education	0,35%	2,48%	2,83%
Master	0,00%	2,88%	2,88%
PhD Student	24,31%	35,66%	59,97%
Total	42,61%	57,39%	100,00%

Source: authors

There is more significant participation of master's and post-doctoral students in the sample - which is not surprising on the part of the master's students because there are more scholarships destined for the master's degree than for the other postgraduate modalities. We were able to find other scholarships as well, as well as other individuals who are currently not linked to scholarships, but who had a moral opinion on the issue. This demonstrates the strength of the controversy - even though members of both sides said that the issue was, in fact, simple to resolve and that it would be useless to discuss it. However, if the question were simple to solve, all the qualitative material below would not have been produced in the course of the research.

Qualitative analysis

In this section, we allocated the data obtained by the responses written in the questionnaire. They were transcribed into a single document and categorical analysis was applied. It is within this categorical grid that the data will emerge and take on a greater meaning. One aspect of the exhibition is that, from now on, we will call those who answered "yes" favourable and those who answered "no" contrary. Another final aspect is that we are going to quote just a few lines, so as not to make the text too long. Finally, the sacred and discomfort will be sought in the data collected, to continue according to the Durkheimian theoretical framework:

[...] Society is different; it is, above all, a set of ideas, beliefs, feelings of all kinds, which are realized by individuals; and, in the first echelon of these ideas, there is the moral ideal which is its main reason for being⁷ (DURKHEIM, 2007, p. 74).

Thus, the sacred ones express moral ideals and diversity, hence our choice for the group on social networks. More than studying exactly which group such a sacred belongs to, our goal is to demonstrate the variety and complexity of the issue.

Student condition

In the exploratory, it seemed to be a peaceful point that the value of the stricto sensu scholarships is not enough to bring financial security to the beneficiary. The point of disagreement is the resilience or not with the situation: is it necessary to accept this situation (the pandemic) for a fixed period or should current measures be taken to change the current context? It is at this point that the discussion orbits, as Emergency Aid can help to mitigate the economic difficulties of the students in social vulnerability.

Regarding **whom is considered acceptable** to apply for the benefit, some arguments stand out. The first refers to the Emergency Aid allowing the quarantine to take place by providing the opportunity for the grantee not to have to leave the house for extra work. Another point refers to the different social classes that experience the condition of scholarship holders: "I don't think that everyone should apply just because it is possible, but I think that those who feel the need to apply, that they could do without any judgment". Now, this makes being a scholarship holder a different experience for different subjects, so the answer is that some scholarship holders must ask for help, depending on their needs and financial condition. The sacred Durkheimian, here, is expressed in the assumption of "need" as the maximum value, since it is the parameter that, once transgressed, generates discomfort - "I don't think everyone".

Some affirmed that, as the scholarship is not an employment contract, in theory, the scholarship holders are unemployed or, at most, self-employed. Additionally, on the one hand, it was raised that there are scholars who claim that this is not the only source of income for several beneficiaries, which makes them unassisted with social

⁷ [...] a sociedade é coisa diversa; é antes de tudo um conjunto de ideias, de crenças, de sentimentos de todas as espécies, que se realizam pelos indivíduos; e, no primeiro escalão dessas ideias, se encontra o ideal moral que é a sua principal razão de ser.

isolation. On the other hand, the stock exchange does not unburden the social problems of the income distribution. Another issue is related to the lack of labour rights that unprotect students, both in the normal routine of their work and in crises. In crises, moreover, the purchasing power of the scholarship holder is lower and there is still a need to extend the defence due to isolation. The last argument was the economic one: "economically, this aid fosters the economy at an opportune moment".

Some claim that the individual's little remunerative power must be compensated with other types of social assistance, and not necessarily with an Emergency Aid for those who were left without any source of income during the pandemic: "however, if this family member fits the requirements, you can apply for assistance on your own". In this case, for example, Bolsa Família was evoked, which can be accessed via a single register and which allows the scholarship holder income to be balanced. Thus, there would be no need to access Emergency Aid directly. From this discussion, we can infer that this position sees a rupture in daily life through COVID-19, which places extra income as something "sacred" that protects its value of helping those who are unable to obtain income. For this reason, the exact expression "individual conscience" was used, because, even if the law allows the request, there is still the question of "should be": how could we consider that the student would be wronged if he/she would harm someone more in need?

Another participant stated that accepting the benefit would burden public coffers, which, as will be illustrated below, was contested. Therefore, this idea embraces a notion of finite-state resources: someone receiving Emergency Aid may imply that someone else does not receive it. From this aspect, the notion of "abuse" is generated: using the law will not help to improve the condition in the long run. In this case, the sacred thing is to consider the epidemic as an absolute moment of exception: to accept the benefit is to go against militancy for better conditions in the long run since there must be a transformation of the scholarship into salary or other more permanent measures. Considering the grantee's struggle as something as important as the pandemic causes discomfort in this subgroup.

The opponent's face

There was a construction of two images of the opponents: one of the individual who believes that any grantee should apply for Emergency Aid and another of the individual who does not believe, so that there were many "divinations" about identities through speeches, stereotyped causal attributions (BAPTISTA, 2004). The concept of

opponents also helps to develop part of the arguments. In the first part of this section, we will show the image of those who oppose themselves from those who believe that it is moral for the student to request assistance. The second will be focused on the other side.

The beginning of the construction of the opponent's face is that one of a self-centred individual who cannot see beyond his privileged situation: "It is not all graduate students who live with their parents and toast the bag with bullshit. It is not seeing outside the comfort of the house ". That is, he wants to keep his income concentrated for his class. Thus, he disdains the suffering of other students with social vulnerability, stating that they are benefited compared to other sectors of society as if it were a court. In this case, he is a moralist coupled with the status quo of politics.

Some call the opponent ignorant, who do not know how to interpret a text despite their title, who call themselves "intellectual elite" and who act as inspectors of the lives of others - which is often hampered by income issues, and, embodied in the expression "witch hunt". In other words, reality imposes itself on personal choices; if there are no material conditions, there is no option; however, what the opposites do is to attribute the slogan of greedy to those in need. Finally, there was also an attribution that this critic would be from a position on the political spectrum of the right, as he would attribute Emergency Aid to socialism. However, this was an isolated and unrepresentative case. It is expressed, therefore, in this devastation of ideas, the discomfort with the transgression of the sacred of empathy - which this subgroup also directs with the fellow matte with the scholarship at the time of the crisis.

The face of those who are **favourable** also has its complexities. Beginning that this individual lives with few resources, she/he does not accept the temporary condition and at the right time seeks money regardless of general difficulties - such as those caused by a pandemic. The construction of this identity is carried out by comparing it with the Bolsa Família user since she/he cannot accumulate the benefits simultaneously: they are the true embodiment of those who are socially affected by the crisis. In this case, receiving Emergency Aid would be a character flaw, a kind of "Brazilian way" of thinking about the personal good: "I perceive the use of aid by students as a lack of empathy towards those who need it and are not being welcomed in this delicate moment. ". Additionally, an image is projected on other social groups such as the beneficiaries of the Bolsa Família, who may not find the accumulation of the scholarship with the Emergency Aid correct - which causes political impacts on their own. Terms such as "hypocritical" - because money is public and the favourable

ones do not want to be questioned anyway - and "selfish" - are argued to affirm that the individual in favour of Emergency Aid does not recognize his privilege of having guaranteed income and Emergency Aid from those they need most in a time of crisis. The sacred thing expressed here is that of separating the scholarship student from the rest of society: the fact that there are characteristics such as fixed remuneration and above the minimum wage makes the scholarship student part of the privileged subgroup.

However, how the groups define themselves, there is still the government, the one that effectively provides Emergency Aid. So, there are some discussions about political philosophy that we will address in the next topic.

The governmental face

This section gains special relevance as some participants reported cases in which Emergency Aid was received without the request of the grantee, due to their previous registration in the Cadastro Único. Thus, more than choosing to request, the question of staying with income was also raised. Anyway, there is a relationship that has already been built with the government, and, in the field exploratory, some scholars have expressed concern about whether or not to return the Emergency Aid deposited.

Many **supporters** claim that it is the government's sole responsibility to review the documentation, with funding agencies leaving the role to abide by the final decision, adding that the scholarship case is omitted by law. They argue that, with automation, the databases are crossed, and the receipt of the benefit occurs for those who have the profile, with no possibility of error by the software. There were also reports that CAPES does not operate by law, but by ordinances, which cannot exceed the Emergency Aid law norms - noting that the constitution prevents laws from retroacting to harm a citizen. Finally, another argument used is that the tax money comes from the Brazilian citizen, and therefore cannot be read as a mere help: "It is a right, everyone pays taxes". In other words, there is a strong notion that the State has a commitment, as well as sufficient budgetary capacity for Emergency Aid to be paid.

If in this perspective the government appears as competent, some consider it incompetent in the management of the aid. In this case, the government will end up paying the benefit to many people who have not updated the single registry, including individuals who were already employed before the pandemic. Therefore, this omission would remove any immorality from the action of the scholarship holder in applying. Incompetence also includes the issue of corruption: it is emphasized that the

government helped banks with the amount of 1.3 trillion reais, which opponents did not revolt against, although they do so against the R\$ 600.00 of a scholarship holder. The government's incompetence is more evident since, in theory, should help all citizens in times of crisis, which also includes scholarship holders in the list of those who can receive aid. A single line admitted sabotaging the government: "For me, honestly, the more I can f[...] Bozo [Bolsonaro], and his gang, the better!" The sacred, here, is expressed in the government conceived as autonomous: it intentionally precarious the work of the grantee and intentionally analyses the documentation for the benefit. Discomfort is generated when opponents establish the individual as an agent in this process.

Therefore, what would be the opponents' arguments? Some claimed that they did, in fact, experience socioeconomic difficulties during their time as a scholarship student; and that they do not feel supported by the government in their daily life, as can be seen in the following statement: "Rent is expensive? Apartment debt. Is it still expensive? Debt the fourth ". However, accepting the grant was a personal decision and should not justify the chance of subtracting aid for those affected by the pandemic. Thus, according to this argument, the student is interfering in the government's competence. There are also considerations about the government's (or at least the agencies') loyalty to comply with the aid rules and not change your mind later. This specific topic will be developed later.

The critical positioning also problematized CadÚnico users, as many scholarship recipients received Emergency Aid due to outdated registration. Thus, the government's efficiency in distributing the income is limited to information not passed on individually, and this may have budgetary consequences ahead, which would increase the risk of future benefit reimbursement.

Thus, omitted cases may turn against the scholarship students in the future, as the aid will be paid with public money and this has the chance of resulting in the cancellation of the scholarship itself. It was also reported that the government can act in haste, distribute the benefit and, at the time of the crisis, request the money back. However, another respondent argued that the government is just taking longer to grant Emergency Aid because "[...] it would only make it difficult to analyse those who really need it". Finally, excerpts from the field exploratory also pointed to the aftermath of the crisis: emergency aid could result in a budget breakdown and scholarship students may soon be the scapegoat. Unlike the favourable ones, here comes a notion that the State may not be able to pay the aid, as this is added to the grants. The sacred

idea of government, for this group, is that of heteronomy – because it does not have full control over its actions and this is enhanced by the pandemic, causing discomfort when autonomy is attributed to it.

Definition of scholarship

In this category, we can observe many legal definitions, with the different written codes being the balance of faith for each argument. The first definition is that of income, since acquiring it out of remuneration may result in the cancellation of the scholarship; the second definition is the purse itself.

Concerning the favourable ones, some affirmed that the scholarship holder can have extra income since authorized by the program, and one of the participants directly quoted the ordinance Capes / CNPq (2010, p.2): “they may receive financial supplementation, coming from other sources, as long as they are dedicated to activities related to their area of activity”. Another emerging point is that Emergency Aid is not a fixed income, but a short-term aid, the pandemic. Finally, the scholarship requires the dedication of time, this is the prerequisite for maintaining it and not income - and the participant gave examples of pensioner scholarship holders. Other participants say that the Emergency Aid income would go directly to the family and not to the researcher.

Regarding the scholarships, there are concepts as well. For the favourable, the scholarship does not appear as income: “Scholarship is not income, it is an aid to carry out the research”, and an example of the veracity of this statement is when a bank transaction is going to be carried out and the institution registers the scholarship holder as autonomous: no it is a service provision, but a subsidy for studies or research. Furthermore, the scholarship is also formulated as consistent: it has a certain legal certainty because the postgraduate program also needs to be endorsed to withdraw it - something that only occurs after an internal legal process. Here, there is the sacred defining the scholarship as an idea linked to the individual's livelihood, which does not make it an income because it is not accompanied by other guarantees.

Contrary participants define income as any paid activity, except for teaching at the university itself, exercised with the consent of the program and the advisor. Another participant stated that the concept of income is very comprehensive: it is characterized by any fundraising, which makes the scholarship just a tax-free modality, which has not always been this way. Therefore, “one must understand that the scholarship is an income”. One speech pondered that, if smaller amounts of financial transactions need to be declared (such as income from cleaning), why shouldn't a fixed amount like the

stock exchange be considered as income? Once it is accepted that there is income involved in the scholarship and Emergency Aid, the scholarship income is defined as insufficient since then: it has always been insufficient and the time of the pandemic would not be adequate for claims of this nature. The sacred of the subgroup, here, is to associate stock exchange with income, because the financial exchange is enough to establish this concept, which has legal consequences.

Global data analysis

It is possible to capture some major trends in the material. We will report and detail them from now on. The first major trend is to question the functionality of the State through its own experiences or logic. This translated into two dimensions: 1) in the budget - participants who are against the Emergency Aid request state that there are limited resources in the State, and therefore need parsimony - and 2) the effectiveness of bureaucracy - the government's ability to check and cross-check information from different registers.

The second has to do with the positioning of the socioeconomic condition in achieving moral judgment. On the one hand, a precarious economic condition justifies the assumption of the benefit regardless of any other argument, since "everyone knows their need", and thus the existence of income is contrasted with its quality. On the other hand, the members think that the favourable ones are defending personal interests. This discussion that being at the university should guarantee a better life fits perfectly with the democratic conception of the university, which strives for the social function to the detriment of others (LOPES, 2019).

The third is whether the scholarship holders are privileged or not. Is receiving a scholarship, regardless of the interruption of commercial activity, a privilege? Or is receiving an unfair remuneration throughout your career a problem? In this case, entering socially vulnerable groups is what makes some actors think it is right for the scholarship student to accept the aid, while for others the fixed income does not characterize them within this group and makes them privileged to receive more than one minimum wage.

Another reflection is that the "selfishness" category is completely disputed. Favourable and opposed accuse the other side of being selfish on different levels: the feeling can be towards scholarship students or the poorest citizens in general. In this case, it is observed that none of the groups wants to assume the adjective "selfish" or

admit that they want their well-being above others, not even showing that altruism is an important marker in the social justice for that group.

Another issue is the worldviews that appear in these statements. Favourable conceives the world as experiencing a condition of permanent crisis, which puts scholarship holders under attack from different governments. The pandemic exists; however, public prevention is serving as a pretext to exterminate funds from the education sector. On the other hand, there is a greater demarcation of the crisis, considering it as a state of exception, which is a time when the collective struggle for better conditions will not gain positive visibility.

In dealings with each other, it is clear that the relationship between the scholarship holders is a scapegoat (PICHON RIVIÈRE, 2005), as they turned against each other with great intensity. This justifies the animosity or expressions reported as "I must say the obvious". Thus, the attribution of selfishness is a mechanism of "expulsion": it is not a scholarship student, but a false scholarship student who does not have the values shared by the group as a whole. Thus, it is concluded that those who do not want the Emergency Aid to be automatically provided also do not need it; or that those who ask for Emergency Aid are taking advantage of public calamity to gain personal gain. Furthermore, globally questioning the ability of a researcher, stating that the student does not even know how to read, demonstrates the genuine desire for aggression, which expresses the culture of pervasive violence in Brazil (SANTOS, 2004). We ended this reflection with words found in the field explorer: "Here people only know how to judge and want to show superiority or some kind of "humanity "and a sense of justice".

Armed with this analysis, we can now answer the question that the research problem helped to support: how did COVID-19 affect the lives of graduate students in particular? The scholarship holders, due to the closing of the universities, in theory, achieved social isolation due to their institutional connection and worked in the home office. However, the isolation affected them in more ways than the financial: it also did it in relations with other scholarship students, classmates, with their research and with institutions, which also varied according to the socio-economic situation of each one. The scholar's technical knowledge allows him access to information from different scientific readings, which can desolate him, in addition to presupposing collectivism that cannot be sustained, as we have seen. One can add to this the political question: since the election of a government that previously said that it would reduce public investments, and, besides, an entire institutional crisis that increased uncertainties. That

is, the public of scholarship holders is potentially sensitive to crises and, in light of this, measures must be taken to protect their mental health.

Final considerations

This article dealt with a dilemma expressed in a debate: the morality involved in the acceptance by any *stricto sensu* grantee of the R \$ 600.00 Emergency Aid for informal and self-employed workers, proposed by the government during the horizontal isolation in the COVID-19 pandemic. In this case, the heart of the question is: is it a morally acceptable attitude for a scholarship student to apply for assistance? We analysed the subject through the sociology of Durkheimian root morals. The research was quantitative and also used data collected in the field exploratory.

The themes circulate between considering the scholarship student a precarious worker (in this case the benefit applies) or separating him from people without any income (in this case the benefit does not apply). From this initial separation, a series of arguments are generated, which were analysed during the article. In conclusion, we write some considerations.

The first is related to the material condition of the scholarship students. Although it is not a public directly involved with social vulnerability – this only happens due to specific conditions, such as moving to another city, being the main income of the family or when the scholarship ends. In other words, in the context of unemployment, a situation in which returning to occupation can be time-consuming and the market separates an “excess of qualification”, the possibility of a scholarship student having financial difficulties or receiving a salary that she/he does not consider fair is quite real and tangible.

The second is related to a desire for science to be valued by society. Perhaps it is common for individuals to think that they are underpaid because of the volume or difficulty of their activities. Nevertheless, the scholarship student puts one more element in this relationship: her/his qualification, which makes it unsustainable to receive a remuneration below her/his expectations. What is more, many scholarship holders feel like repositories of the country's future - a conception that either indicates a positivist heritage or is a mechanism for the group's self-exaltation.

References

- ALMEIDA, Karla Nazareth Corrêa de. **A pós-graduação no Brasil: história de uma tradição inventada**. Tese (doutorado) - Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Faculdade de Educação, Campinas, SP: 2017.
- ANPG. **Apresentação e história**. Sem Data. Site Institucional da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduandos. Available: <http://www.anpg.org.br/historia/>. Access: 08/05/2020.
- ASSESSORIA DE COMUNICAÇÃO FAPEMIG. **Nota de esclarecimento: acumulação de bolsas fapemig e o Emergency Aid do governo federal**. FAPEMIG. Available: <https://fapemig.br/pt/noticias/372/>. Access: 29/04/2020.
- BALBACHEVSKY, E. A pós-graduação no Brasil: novos desafios para uma política bem-sucedida. In: BROCK, C.; SCHWARTZMAN, S. **Os desafios da educação no Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2005.
- BAPTISTA, Maria Manuel. Estereotípi e representação social: uma abordagem psicossociológica. In: BARKER, A. **A persistência dos estereótipos**. Aveiro: Universidade de Aveiro, 2004.
- BRASIL. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE DESENVOLVIMENTO CIENTÍFICO E TECNOLÓGICO. **Portaria conjunta no - 1, de 15 de julho de 2010**. Lex: Coletânea de Legislação e Jurisprudência, Brasília, p. 2-3. 2010. Legislação Federal e marginaia.
- CAPES. **Ofício nº 203/2020-GAB/PR/CAPES**. Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. Available: http://www.anpg.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Oficio_1186371.pdf. Access: 29/04/2020
- DE OLIVEIRA, Fátima Bayma. Origem e evolução dos cursos de pós-graduação lato sensu no Brasil. **Revista de Administração Pública**, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, v. 29, n. 1, p. 19-33, 1995.
- DURKHEIM, Émile. **A educação moral**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2017.
- _____. **Lições de sociologia: a moral, o direito e o Estado**. São Paulo: EDUSP, 1983.
- _____. **Sociologia e filosofia**. São Paulo: Ícone, 2007.
- GOUVEIA, Esther Majerowicz. Bolsas de Pós-graduação: a Política por trás dos Números. **Cantareira**, Universidade Federal Fluminense, v.1, n. 16, jan/jul. 2012, pp. 1-18.
- JORNALISTA APG. **Pós-graduando: fique por dentro e ajude quem tem direito a receber o Emergency Aid**. ANPG. Available: http://www.anpg.org.br/09/04/2020/pos-graduando-fique-por-dentro-e-ajude-quem-tem-direito-a-receber-o-auxilio-emergencial/?fbclid=IwAR3lp31fmB1UR1I5pNoqbrwQ9361Y9gZdbelZn0t81TmzKpkBgRomhdX_wU. Access: 29/04/2020.

- LOPES, Ricardo Cortez. **Evasão e persistência de alunos de graduação da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul: um estudo moral das representações sociais**. Tese (Doutorado em Sociologia). Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Sociologia, Porto Alegre, 2019.
- _____. **Jovens pós-graduandos, o desemprego e a falta de bolsas: um campo de serviços acadêmicos?** In: I Simpósio Juventudes Contemporâneas, 2018, Porto Alegre. Anais do I Simpósio Juventudes Contemporâneas. Porto Alegre: EdUPUCRS, 2018.
- MANCENO, Deise. Crise político-econômica no Brasil: breve análise da educação superior. **Educação & Sociedade**, UNICAMP, v. 38, n. 141, p. 875-892, 2017.
- MATTOS, Valéria de Bettio. **Pós-graduação em tempos de precarização do trabalho: um estudo sobre o alongamento da escolarização entre os mestrandos da UFSC**. Dissertação (mestrado) - Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Centro de Ciências da Educação. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação: Florianópolis, 2007.
- OLIVEIRA FILHO, Renato Santos de; HOCHMAN, Bernardo; NAHAS, Fabio Xerfan; FERREIRA, Lydia Masako. Fomento à publicação científica e proteção do conhecimento científico. **Acta Cirúrgica Brasileira**, Sociedade Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento da Pesquisa em Cirurgia, v. 20, n. 2, p. 35-39, 2005.
- PICHON RIVIÈRE, Enrique. **O processo grupal**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005.
- KROTH, Darlan Christiano. **A economia brasileira frente a pandemia do covid-19: entre as prescrições e as propostas do governo**. Texto para discussão - Grupo de Pesquisa Estado, sociedade e políticas públicas. 2020. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340634459_A_ECONOMIA_BRASILEIRA_FRENTE_A_PANDEMIA_DO_COVID-19_ENTRE_AS_PRESCRICOES_E_AS_PROPOSTAS_DO_GOVERNO. Access: 20/05/2020.
- TAVARES DOS SANTOS, José Vicente. Violências e dilemas do controle social nas sociedades da "modernidade tardia". **São Paulo em perspectiva**, Fundação Sistema Estadual de Análise de Dados, v. 18, n. 1, p. 3-12, 2004.
- SCHUCHMANN, Alexandra Zanella; SCHNORRENBARGER, Bruna Luiza; CHIQUETTI, Maria Eduarda; GAIKI, Raiane Suzana; RAIMANN, Bruno Wensing; MEmergency AidYAMA, Marcos Aurélio. Isolamento social vertical X Isolamento social horizontal: os dilemas sanitários e sociais no enfrentamento da pandemia de

COVID-19. **Brazilian Journal of Health Review**, Brazilian Journals, v. 3, n. 2, p. 3556-3576, 2020.

WEISS, Raquel. From ideas to ideals: effervescence as the key to understanding morality. **Durkheimian Studies**, Berghahn, v. 18, n. 1, p. 81-97, 2012.

RESUMO:

A COVID-19 impôs a alguns países medidas de distanciamento social, causadora de impactos econômicos. O governo brasileiro propôs medidas para dirimir esse impacto, e entre elas está o auxílio emergencial para trabalhadores autônomos e informais. Paralelamente, o funcionamento da pós-graduação stricto sensu brasileira apresenta um histórico de precarização que faz com que o bolsista tenha o perfil econômico do beneficiário desse auxílio. As agências de fomento autorizaram a acumulação, porém ainda resta a questão moral: o bolsista deve solicitá-la? O estudo problematizou essa questão com base nos dados de um questionário respondido por 63 membros de grupos de pós-graduação brasileiros.

PALAVRAS-CHAVES: COVID-19; Bolsistas de Pós-Graduação; Auxílio Emergencial.

RESUMEN:

COVID-19 impuso medidas de distancia social en algunos países, lo que causó impactos económicos. El gobierno brasileño ha propuesto medidas para resolver este impacto, incluida la ayuda de emergencia para trabajadores independientes e informales. Al mismo tiempo, el funcionamiento del programa brasileño de posgrado stricto sensu tiene una historia de precariedad que hace que el becario tenga el perfil económico del beneficiario de esta ayuda. Las agencias de desarrollo autorizaron la acumulación, pero la cuestión moral sigue siendo: ¿debería solicitarla el becario? El estudio problematizó esta pregunta basándose en datos de un cuestionario respondido por 63 miembros de grupos de graduados brasileños..

PALABRAS-CLAVES: COVID-19; estudiantes de posgrado com beca; ayuda gubernamental..