

A Service of



Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre

Savedoff, William D.

### **Working Paper**

Regional wage differences and segmentation in Brazil's urban labor markets

Discussion Paper, No. 22

#### **Provided in Cooperation with:**

Institute of Applied Economic Research (ipea), Brasília

Suggested Citation: Savedoff, William D. (2015): Regional wage differences and segmentation in Brazil's urban labor markets, Discussion Paper, No. 22, Institute for Applied Economic Research (ipea), Brasília

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/220111

#### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

#### Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.





Originally published by Ipea in October 1989 as number 176 of the series Texto para Discussão.



REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENCES AND SEGMENTATION IN BRAZIL'S URBAN LABOR MARKETS

William D. Savedoff



# DISCUSSION PAPER

Originally published by Ipea in October 1989 as number 176 of the series Texto para Discussão.

Brasília, January 2015

## REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENCES AND SEGMENTATION IN BRAZIL'S URBAN LABOR MARKETS

William D. Savedoff

#### **Federal Government of Brazil**

# Secretariat of Strategic Affairs of the Presidency of the Republic

Minister Roberto Mangabeira Unger



A public foundation affiliated to the Secretariat of Strategic Affairs of the Presidency of the Republic, Ipea provides technical and institutional support to government actions — enabling the formulation of numerous public policies and programs for Brazilian development — and makes research and studies conducted by its staff available to society.

#### **President**

Sergei Suarez Dillon Soares

#### **Director of Institutional Development**

Luiz Cezar Loureiro de Azeredo

#### Director of Studies and Policies of the State, Institutions and Democracy

Daniel Ricardo de Castro Cerqueira

# **Director of Macroeconomic Studies** and Policies

Cláudio Hamilton Matos dos Santos

# Director of Regional, Urban and Environmental Studies and Policies

Rogério Boueri Miranda

#### **Director of Sectoral Studies and Policies, Innovation, Regulation and Infrastructure** Fernanda De Negri

**Director of Social Studies and Policies, Deputy** Carlos Henrique Leite Corseuil

#### Director of International Studies, Political and Economic Relations

Renato Coelho Baumann das Neves

#### **Chief of Staff**

Ruy Silva Pessoa

#### **Chief Press and Communications Officer**

João Cláudio Garcia Rodrigues Lima

URL: http://www.ipea.gov.br

Ombudsman: http://www.ipea.gov.br/ouvidoria

#### **DISCUSSION PAPER**

A publication to disseminate the findings of research directly or indirectly conducted by the Institute for Applied Economic Research (Ipea). Due to their relevance, they provide information to specialists and encourage contributions.

© Institute for Applied Economic Research - ipea 2015

Discussion paper / Institute for Applied Economic

Research.- Brasília: Rio de Janeiro: Ipea, 1990-

ISSN 1415-4765

1. Brazil. 2. Economic Aspects. 3. Social Aspects. I. Institute for Applied Economic Research.

CDD 330.908

The authors are exclusively and entirely responsible for the opinions expressed in this volume. These do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Applied Economic Research or of the Secretariat of Strategic Affairs of the Presidency of the Republic.

Reproduction of this text and the data it contains is allowed as long as the source is cited. Reproductions for commercial purposes are prohibited.

Tiragem: 100 exemplares

Trabalho concluído em: Setembro de 1989

Instituto de Pesquisas do IPEA
Instituto de Planejamento Econômico e Social
Avenida Presidente Antonio Carlos, 51 - 13 - 17 andares
Rio de Janeiro/RJ
20020

Este trabalho é de inteira e exclusiva responsabilidade de seu autor. As opiniões nele emitidas não exprimem necessariamente, o ponto de vista da Secretaria de Planejamento e Coordenação da Presidência da República.

# REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENCES AND SEGMENTATION IN BRAZIL'S URBAN LABOR MARKETS

William D. Savedoff\*

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. WAGE DETERMINATION IN BRAZIL AND APPROACHES TO REGIONAL DIFFERENTIALS
- III. FINDINGS
- IV. CONCLUSIONS: RECOMPOSING THE DECOMPOSITION OF REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENTIALS
- V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ph.D. Candidate at Boston University and Visiting Researcher at INPES/IPEA, Rio de Janeiro. Funding provided by the Institute for the Study of World Politics, Washington, D.C.

#### ABSTRACT

This paper investigates whether the workforce in Brazil is geographically segmented by analyzing variation in workers' earnings. It finds that standard market explanations for regional wage disparities, such as variations in the cost of living or workforce quality, can explain only a part of the disparities. The paper concludes that geographical obstacles to factor flows are not significant in Brazil. Rather, the persistence of regional wage differentials, in spite of the increasing integration of the Brazilian economy, can be largely attributed to regional variation in the composition of labor demand.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Income varies widely across Brazil's diverse regions, as in many other countries, but the degree of regional inequality is more acute than elsewhere. In the Northeast, where a majority of Brazil's impoverished citizens reside, wages are significantly lower than in the South and Southeast. An unskilled worker in the Northeast can almost double his or her earnings by obtaining comparable work in São Paulo. The persistence of large wage differentials challenges standard market theories of the labor market in Brazil and necessitates investigation in terms of theories of market segmentation and patterns of regional economic structures.

This paper investigates whether the workforce in Brazil is geographically segmented by analyzing variation in workers' earnings. It finds that standard market explanations for regional wage disparities, such as variations in the cost of living or the quality of the workforce, can explain only a part of the disparities. The regional composition and peculiarities of labor demand contribute significantly to the pattern of regional wage differentials and explain the persistence of these patterns of wage inequality, in spite of the increasing integration of the Brazilian economy. The paper concludes that geographical obstacles to factor flows are not significant in Brazil. Rather, the disparities in wages reflect other kinds of labor market segmentation—by sector, occupation, work card status, and perhaps also by differential access to education.

#### II. WAGE DETERMINATION IN BRAZIL AND APPROACHES TO REGIONAL DIFFERENTIALS

A variety of theories have been applied to explaining regional disparities in income in Brazil. Some argue that these regional disparities are temporary disequilibria in the national market, resulting from the isolation of regional labor markets with varying conditions of supply and demand (Morley 1984, Pfefferman and Webb 1982, Schmitz 1985:74). Such a view

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Consider the United States, Italy, and India in works by Sahling and Smith, Dunford, and Mathur. Williamson compares Brazil and 23 other countries.

would expect regional wage differentials to diminish over time with the increasing integration of the national economy. A second view argues that the wage differences reflect regional variation in the productivity of the workforce, generally measured by the level of schooling (Dabos and Psacharopoulos 1987, Behrman and Birdsall 1983). A third approach argues that real wage differentials are probably the same across regions and that nominal differentials reflect the wide variation in cost of living (Thomas 1987:267). Finally, regional wage disparities may be a result of continuing differences in regional patterns of growth, labor demand, or mechanisms of wage determination (Baer 1964, Fishlow 1972, Storper 1984).

This paper will investigate these issues from a microeconomic perspective, using cross-sectional analysis of household survey data from the 1980s, to separate the various factors described above and to test the proposition that Brazil's urban labor markets are geographically segmented. It will show that the cost of living and composition of the workforce can explain only part of the variation in earnings across regions. Further, it will show the regional pattern to be stable in spite of the growing economic integration of the national economy. It will conclude that the structure of economic organization and opportunity is important to the generation and persistence of regional wage differentials in Brazil.

# II.1 Wage Determination in Brazil's Urban Labor Market

The Brazilian economy has had extremely high inflation (over 60% annually since 1960 and over 100% annually since 1982) and extensive government intervention in the labor market since the 1930s. Nevertheless, wages and employment responds to shifts in demand and prices. This responsiveness of the labor market to changes in supply and demand has been documented in various studies (e.g. Luque and Chahad). Private sector firms appear to follow government guidelines and policies of indexation, in particular making use of the indexation of the minimum wage to organize their pay scales in the context of imperfect information about general inflation (Souza and Baltar).

On the other hand, firms use numerous strategies to evade government restrictions on their ability to adjust wages when it is to their advantage to

do so (Macedo 1974). The relative ease with which firms can dismiss workers under the FGTS system, and the pervasive and high rates of turnover, make it possible for firms to recontract labor almost continuously and thereby reshape their wage bill. My interviews with people active in business and unions confirmed that market conditions are an important part of contract negotiations and wage determination. Based on these studies, then, the process of wage determination will be treated largely as a market process in which profit maximizing firms organize production and employ workers such that the wage paid is equal to the marginal productivity of a particular class of worker.

The presence of segmentation between formal and informal sectors. industries, and occupations leading to divergent wages is widely observed in modern market and mixed economies -- a consequence of supervision costs. lumpy technology, organizational forms, efficiency wages. and selection problems under imperfect information (Doeringer and Piore 1971, Stiglitz 1987, Lang and Edwards, eds. 1987). In Brazil, segmentation of labor opportunities is also apparent along many dimensions -- formal vs. informal (Paes de Barros 1988), Internal Labor Markets (Morley 1979), Private vs. Public (Macedo 1986), technique of production (Schmitz 1985). In my interviews with managers. negotiators, and union leaders in Rio de Janeiro and Recife, these agents indicated that they are themselves aware of such segmentation of opportunity: primarily between small firms which have short promotion ladders and little latitude for paying much more than negotiated wage floors, and larger "dynamic" firms which pay premia over the negotiated settlements to ensure stability in their labor force and to reduce intra-firm tension. In addition. all those interviewed discussed market conditions only in the context of particular well-defined categories. That is, agents referred to market conditions for particular occupational, sectoral and geographical subgroups of the working population, and not for the labor force as a whole.

Brazilian workers are clearly motivated to better themselves economically. A key motivation for migration in Brazil is economic, as shown by the net flows of people toward high income areas (Ablas and Fava 1985:61), and the higher average earnings for migrants relative to non-migrants (Medeiros 1982:88). Furthermore, a large part of labor turnover and searching for new jobs is a result of voluntary separations. A great deal of mobility between self-employed and employed positions shows active searching for income

opportunities all the way from the bottom of the income scale (Sedlacek)--perhaps even stronger there, driven by the abysmally low wages and income received by this portion of the population.

For this part of the study, then, workers are treated as individuals who seek to do the best for themselves as they can, given constraints presented by opportunities in the labor market. For this, certain choices (e.g. amount of schooling, choice to migrate) are relatively more open to them than others (e.g. absence of employment in a high wage industry) which are constrained by external conditions.

#### II.2 Details of Estimation and Assumptions

The wage differences between regions were estimated here with an earnings function, and were further evaluated through analysis of covariance. The regional wage variation was also studied by disaggregating the sample into various subgroups, and by testing it for temporal stability. The variables used in the analysis are listed in Appendix C, Table C.1, and the specific regressions are shown in the same appendix, Table C.2.

As described above, the worker's wage is taken to be determined by the conjunction of the worker's own characteristics and the premia associated with the labor market segment in which he or she is employed. The log hourly wage is regressed on explanatory variables which include education and experience as proxies for a worker's own skills and productivity. These variables may be interpreted as measures of "human capital" (Mincer 1975; Dabos and Psacharopoulos 1987). The interpretation of these variables is difficult, however, because of the high correlation of education with social status and with parent's income class (Medeiros 1982). The variables will be employed here as controls for individual variation which may or may not be linked to productivity.

In addition to education and experience, gender and head of household status were included as personal characteristics which affect earnings—indicative of discrimination and attachment to the labor force, respectively. Indicators of the individual's place within the structure of labor demand included occupation, sector of economic activity, place of residence, and work card status. Finally, the regional price level is

included as an explanatory variable--accounting for the difference between the real and nominal wage.

Deflating wages by a regional price index is a key part of the analysis and deserves some attention since the results may be highly sensitive to this. Since we are interested in real and not nominal wages, it is necessary to include an adjustment for regional variations in the price level. particular, a worker's nominal wage should be deflated by an index of the cost of living faced by that particular worker in his or her region, relative to the cost of living that would be faced by the same worker if relocated to another region. To do such an adjustment rigorously would require specification of the utility function for each individual or group of similar individuals, derivation of the corresponding price index, and data on the necessary weights and prices for each individual and region. were possible, it would be impossible to determine a unique index, since the choices of base weights for comparison -- whether a particular region or a national average -- are numerous. The choice of base weights is likely to yield widely differing estimates of relative inflation in a country like Brazil with high and accelerating rates of inflation.

The regional price index used in this study can be found in Vinod Thomas (1982). The regional comparison of the cost of living in Thomas' paper was derived from the household expenditure survey of 1974-75 (ENDEF). For the present work, Thomas' index was updated to account for regional variations in the pace of inflation, using price indexes calculated by the Fundação Getulio Vargas and the IBGE. The resulting index is shown in Table 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Details of the calculation of the regional price index are available in a technical appendix which is available from the author upon request.

Table 1

Calculated Comparison of Price Levels across Metropolitan Regions

Updated with Price Indices and with 1974/75 as Base Year

| Metropolitan   | Leveis  | 1     | IGP   |       |              |       |       | 1     | NPC   |       |       |       |
|----------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Region         | 1974-75 | *     | 1978  | 1979  | 1980         | 1981  | 1982  | 1983  | 1984  | 1985  | 1986  | 1987  |
| Belem          | 132     | 123.0 | 125.0 | 125.8 | 123.8        | 119.6 | 116.6 | 116.8 | 120.7 | 116.8 | 121.2 | 122.9 |
| Fortaleza      | 103     | 99.8  | 98.0  | 97.2  | 97. <b>9</b> | 98.6  | 98.8  | 101.2 | 103.8 | 105.9 | 103.8 | 109.9 |
| Recife         | 111     | 105.7 | 108.2 | 108.5 | 108.4        | 108.6 | 110.0 | 110.6 | 115.0 | 112.2 | 112.4 | 116.6 |
| Salvador       | 130     | 130.0 | 134.5 | 137.7 | 138.3        | 139.9 | 137.1 | 134.4 | 137.2 | 139.6 | 139.2 | 132.8 |
| Belo Horizonte | 127     | 127.9 | 124.3 | 124.6 | 124.7        | 121.4 | 122.2 | 126.7 | 126.1 | 131.6 | 130.3 | 124.7 |
| Rio de Janeiro |         | 166.5 | 163.6 | 169.4 | 170.6        | 171.8 | 170.9 | 170.0 | 171.3 | 167.1 | 165.7 | 163.7 |
| Sao Paulo      | 179     | 181.6 | 184.6 | 180.8 | 180.8        | 180.5 | 179.8 | 178.0 | 174.5 | 176.5 | 177.5 | 185.3 |
| Curitibe       | 125     | 125.7 | 123.1 | 124.8 | 123.2        | 122.8 | 126.3 | 127.5 | 125.9 | 126.7 | 129.4 | 127.2 |
| Porto Alegre   | 144     | 154.0 | 155.8 | 149.9 | 151.3        | 149.9 | 153.1 | 154.9 | 155.3 | 152.3 | 151.6 | 128.7 |
| Brazil         | 100     | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0        | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

NOTE: Base level from Vinod Thomas, WB, 1982. Ave. National and 40th percentile basket. Base updated by splicing the Indice Geral de Precos ao Consumidor por Capitais for 1974-1979 to the Indice Nacional de Precos ao Consumidor por Capitais for 1974-1979 to the Indice Nacional de Precos ao Consumidor por Regioes Metropolitanas (IBGE).

While the index is not theoretically rigorous, it does correlate significantly with deviations of nominal wages across metropolitan regions, and appears to capture most of the impact of the cost of living on wages. The elasticity of nominal wages to the price index in 1984 is 0.61, when controls are introduced for human capital, personal characteristics, occupation and sector of activity. Although the hypothesis of an elasticity equal to one is rejected easily by an F-test at the 0.1% level, the price index still accounts for considerable variation in nominal wages, as will be shown below.

An additional problem arises in deflating by the price index when the dummy variables for metropolitan regions are included—the data matrix becomes singular since the regional price index is a linear function of the intercept

and the included dummy variables. To address this, I chose to estimate the elasticity of nominal wages with respect to regional price level with one sample (1984) and to restrict the parameter to this value for the other years analyzed. As a result of this two step process, the standard errors for 1984 are underestimated, however the accuracy of the standard errors for the other samples is maintained.

The function to be estimated, then, including price adjustments, characteristics of labor supply and segmentation of labor demand is:

Log W=  $\alpha$  +  $\beta$ 1 • PRECO +  $\beta$ 2 • HC +  $\beta$ 3 • PC +  $\beta$ 4 • CARTA +  $\beta$ 5 • OCC +  $\beta$ 6 • RAMO +  $\beta$ 7 • METROPO +  $\mu$ ,

and  $\mu = \varepsilon 3 + \log \varepsilon 1j + \log \varepsilon 2i$ ,

individual has a work card;

where: HC is a vector of variables representing human capital—years of schooling and its square, potential years of experience in the labor force and its square, and an interaction term of years of schooling and years of potential experience;

PRECO is the negative log of the ratio between the regional price index for the region of residence to the regional price index for the excluded region;
PC is a vector of personal characteristics, namely gender and whether the individual is a head of household;
CARTA is a dummy variable which equals one if the

OCC is a vector of 9 dummy variables for occupational categories;

RAMO is a vector of 37 dummy variables for sector of economic activity; and

METROPO is a vector of 8 dummy variables for the 9 metropolitan regions in the study.

(See Appendix C for details of occupational and sectoral classifications.)

The error term has three components corresponding to the individual error in measuring observed variables, the regional error in the price index and the individual-specific error in the price index, respectively. 3

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$ The error contains several terms as a consequence of errors in

The vector of coefficients  $\beta 2$  represents the returns to schooling and experience, while  $\beta 4$ ,  $\beta 5$ , and  $\beta 6$  represent wage premia attached to obtaining employment in a particular segment. The vector  $\beta 3$  shows the wage advantage attached to personal characteristics. The coefficient  $\beta 1$  is restricted to 0.61, i.e. the elasticity estimated in the 1984 sample for reasons discussed previously. The earnings function will be used to test whether the vector  $\beta 7$  is different from zero, and thus provide evidence of regional segmentation of the labor market. Since the coefficients measure the wage premia relative to the excluded sector, occupation, or region, a simple linear transformation is applied to aid interpretation of the results. The transformed coefficients will be presented in tables, showing the deviation of wages from the mean, rather than from the excluded classification. This function will also be used

Let A be a square matrix whose elements in each column j are the share of observations in region j, that is an j = nj/N. Then equation (9) can be rewritten in matrix form as:

(10)  $\phi = (I - A) f$ .

The variance of the coefficients, the diagonal elements of the covariance matrix Df, then must be adjusted as

 $(11) \Delta = (I - A) D_f (I - A),$ 

the price index. In particular, the price index for region j (Pj) is an incorrect measure of the relative prices faced by individual i in region j ( $\rho$ ij) because of errors common to all members of the region, and errors specific to the individual. Write the observed index Pj as,

Pj=  $\rho$ ij \*  $\epsilon$ 1j \*  $\epsilon$ 2i where  $\epsilon$ 1j is the region specific error and  $\epsilon$ 2i is the individual-specific error. The error terms are assumed to be distributed log normal with mean 1 and covariance  $\Sigma$ 1 and  $\Sigma$ 2 respectively. When the estimated price index is substituted for the true index in deflating the log wage, two additional error terms are generated: log  $\epsilon$ 1j and log  $\epsilon$ 2i.

 $<sup>^4</sup>$ In particular, the regression yields the coefficients fi which estimate by what percentage the average wage in metropolitan region i differs from the average wage in the excluded metropolitan region. Let f be a vector of 9 coefficients, where fk = 0 for the excluded metropolitan region. Then a simple linear transformation makes it possible to adjust the coefficients to show the deviation of regional wages from the mean, i.e.

<sup>(9)</sup>  $\phi_i = f_i - (1/N) \sum n_j \circ f_j$  where  $n_j$  is the number of workers in department j, and

 $N = \Sigma nj$ 

The square root of the diagonal elements of matrix  $\Delta$  are then the adjusted standard deviations for  $\phi$ , the new coefficient vector. The adjusted vector, showing the regional wage structure for 1986, for example, appears in Table 5.

in an analysis of covariance to determine the upper and lower bounds of the explanatory power of these variables in the determination of the dispersion of wages.

The estimates may be biased, depending on the degree of codetermination of included variables—such as education and occupation. This problem will be dealt with through analysis of covariance below. Furthermore, the estimators will not be least variance estimators, due to heteroscedasticity in the error term as a consequence of income dependent variance of measurement errors in the cost of living. A General Linear Model estimation would be preferable, but extremely difficult. The use of rather large samples (between 20,000 and 50,000) yields Ordinary Least Squares estimators with very low variance, regardless.

#### III. FINDINGS

#### III.1 Nominal Wages in Brazil and Sample Characteristics

The sample considered here comprises non-agricultural private sector employees in Brazil's nine major metropolitan regions. The sample was restricted to urban workers in the metropolitan regions for three reasons. First, it is difficult to compare wage data between urban and rural areas because of non-monetary payments in rural areas which systematically underestimate earnings. Secondly, cost-of-living comparisons are difficult across metropolitan regions, but would present even greater problems in comparing across urban and rural areas. Finally, since this paper is testing the proposition that wage differentials may persist across regions in spite of integration, taking the urban areas which are more clearly linked in a national economy allows me to test the proposition where it theoretically

The ten metropolitan regions distinguished in IBGE surveys are Belém, Fortaleza, Recife, Salvador, Belo Horizonte, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Curitiba, Porto Alegre, and the Distrito Federal. The Distrito Federal is not analyzed in this paper because its economy is heavily dependent on the public expenditures associated with the seat of the federal government and hence represents a special non-comparable case.

should hold most strongly.

The data analyzed are from the <u>Pesquisa Nacional de Amostra de Domicílios</u> (PNAD), a household survey collected by the Instituto Brasileira de Geografia e Estatisticas (IBGE) in the third quarter of every year, using sampling based on the decennial census. The surveys of 1977 through 1987 were all analyzed, with special attention to 1985 and 1986. The survey for 1986, which will be used extensively, included 255,554 individuals of whom 27,575 were included in the sample studied in this paper. This sample of non-agricultural employees in Brazil's nine major metropolitan regions represents 14% of the working age population surveyed, and 28% of the remunerated labor force (See Table 2). Some general characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 3.

Table 2
Selection and Representativity of Sample
PNAD 1986

|                                     |          | rcent<br>Total | Percent<br>of Remunerated |
|-------------------------------------|----------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Total Persons                       | 255,554  | 100.0%         |                           |
| Less than 10 Years of Age           | (64,441) |                |                           |
| 10 Years and Older                  | 191,113  | 74.8%          |                           |
| Unremunerated                       | (88,834) |                |                           |
| Remunerated                         | 102,279  | 40.0%          | 100.0%                    |
| Not Employee                        | (36,884) |                |                           |
| Employee                            | 65,395   | 25.6%          | 63.9%                     |
| Primary or Public Sector            | (11,206) |                |                           |
| Included Sectors and Occupations    | 54,189   | 21.2%          | 53.0%                     |
| Not Resident in Metropolitan Region | (23,065) |                |                           |
| Resident in Metropolitan Region     | 31,124   | 12.2%          | 30.4%                     |
| Missing Data                        | (3,549)  |                |                           |
| Sample                              | 27,575   | 10.8%          | 27.0%                     |

Table 3
Sample Characteristics
All Workers--PNAD 1986

| Total in Sample     | 27,575 |           |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| % Male              | 62.8%  |           |  |  |  |  |
| % Head of Household | 46.1%  |           |  |  |  |  |
|                     |        | Standard  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable            | Mean   | Deviation |  |  |  |  |
| Log Wage            | 2.28   | 0.95      |  |  |  |  |
| Education (Years)   | 6.38   | 3.89      |  |  |  |  |
| Age (Years)         | 30.52  | 12.70     |  |  |  |  |
|                     |        |           |  |  |  |  |

| <b>5</b> : | Occupations:  |   |
|------------|---|---|
| 7.0%       | Administrative  | 3.2%  |
| 7.6%       | Clerical  | 17.0%   |
| 8.4%       | Technical   | 4.0%  |
| 7.8%       | Professional  | 2.7%  |
| onte 14.6% | Supervisory   | 1.0%  |
| eiro 14.2% | Blue Collar   | 27.9%   |
| 19.9%      | Transportation  | 5.1%  |
| 7.8%       | Retail  | 9.5%  |
| e 12.6%    | Personal Service  | 22.4%   |
|            | Miscel Laneous  | 7.1%  |
|            | 7.6%<br>8.4%<br>7.8%<br>onte 14.6%<br>eiro 14.2%<br>19.9%<br>7.8% | 7.0% Administrative 7.6% Clerical 8.4% Technical 7.8% Professional onte 14.6% Supervisory eiro 14.2% Blue Collar 19.9% Transportation 7.8% Retail re 12.6% Personal Service |

Average nominal wages vary widely across the metropolitan regions (See Table 4). At the extremes, average nominal wages are some 37% higher than the national mean in São Paulo while they are 44% below the national mean in Fortaleza. The weighted standard deviation of these regional differentials is 0.240. Nominal monthly income is distributed similarly with slightly lower variance, indicating that to some degree workers in lower wage areas work more hours.

Table 4

Effects of Adjustments for Cost of Living and Controls on Regional Wage Differentials

PNAD 1986 -- All Employees -- N=27,575

(Differences from Sample Mean)

------Without Controls for Other Characteristics------

|                    | Nominal Hour<br>Difference | ·ly Earnings<br>STD | Real Hourly<br>Difference | Earnings<br>STD | N     |  |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|
|                    |                            |                     |                           |                 |       |  |
| Belem              | -21.1%                     | 2.0%                | -11.7%                    | 2.0%            | 1,941 |  |
| Fortaleza          | -43.5%                     | 1.9%                | -24.5%                    | 1.9%            | 2,116 |  |
| Recife             | -32.3%                     | 1.9%                | -18.2%                    | 1.9%            | 2,323 |  |
| Salvador           | -10.7%                     | 1.9%                | -9.6%                     | 1.5%            | 2,177 |  |
| Belo Horizonte     | -7.7%                      | 1.3%                | -2.5%                     | 1.3%            | 4,068 |  |
| Rio de Janeiro     | -0.7%                      | 1.4%                | -10.2%                    | 1.4%            | 3,944 |  |
| Sao Paulo          | 36.8%                      | 1.1%                | 23.1%                     | 1.1%            | 5,536 |  |
| Curitiba           | 9.8%                       | 1.5%                | 15.4%                     | 1.9%            | 2,172 |  |
| Porto Alegre       | 11.7%                      | 1.5%                | 7.6%                      | 1.5%            | 3,500 |  |
| Standard Deviation |                            |                     | 15.4%                     |                 |       |  |

------With Controls for Other Characteristics-----

|                                    | Nominal Hour | ly Earnings | Real Hourly | Earn ings | N     |  |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------|--|
|                                    | Difference   | STD         | Difference  | STD       |       |  |
| Belem                              | -17.3%       | 1.2%        | -7.8%       | 1.2%      | 1,941 |  |
| Fortaleza                          | -25.1%       | 1.2%        | -6.0%       | 1.2%      | 2,116 |  |
| Recife                             | -25.7%       | 1.1%        | -11.6%      | 1.1%      | 2,323 |  |
| Salvador                           | -11.9%       | 1.2%        | -10.8%      | 1.2%      | 2,177 |  |
| Belo Horizonte                     | -1.0%        | 0.8%        | 4.1%        | 0.8%      | 4,068 |  |
| Rio de Janeiro                     | -7.4%        | 0.8%        | -16.9%      | 0.8%      | 3,944 |  |
| Sao Paulo                          | 29.9%        | 0.7%        | 16.2%       | 0.7%      | 5,536 |  |
| Curitiba                           | 6.8%         | 1.1%        | 12.4%       | 1.1%      | 2,172 |  |
| Porto Alegre                       | 7.4%         | 0.9%        | 3.3%        | 0.9%      | 3,500 |  |
| Standard Deviation of Differential |              |             | 11.7%       |           |       |  |

STD = Standard Deviation of Estimated Differential
Control Characteristics include years of education and its square; experience
and its square; interaction of education and experience; gender; head of
household; work card status; 9 occupation dummies; and 37 sectoral dummies.

#### III.2 Impact of Adjustments for Cost of Living

When regressed against a price index to reveal the regional differences in real hourly wages, the regional wage variation does decline significantly. The standard deviation of average nominal wages across metropolitan regions is 0.240 as against only 0.154 for real wages. The elasticity of wages to regional price level was restricted to 0.61 as described above, and the test on the restriction shows it to be extremely robust—it cannot be rejected with a t-test at the 0.01% level. The regional effects are diminished by the correction for cost of living, but they nonetheless remain.

Adjustments for regional differences in the composition of the labor force and in labor demand also significantly reduce the variation of wages across metropolitan regions. Specifically, the controls for worker characteristics, work card, occupation, and sector reduce the weighted standard deviation of regional wage differentials from 0.240 to 0.182 for nominal hourly earnings, and from .154 to .117 for for real hourly earnings. Therefore, between 28% and 35% of the variation in nominal wages can be accounted for by differences in regional prices, while an additional 25% to 39% of variation in nominal earnings can be attributed to differences in labor force characteristics and composition of labor demand.

After these adjustments, the remaining regional differentials are smaller but still significant. An average worker in São Paulo has real earnings which are 16% higher than the mean while a the same worker in Fortaleza would have real wages which are some 6% below the mean. In Salvador, Recife, and Rio de Janeiro average real wages are even further below the mean. Belo Horizonte and Porto Alegre have wage premia slightly above the mean, 4% and 3% respectively, while an average worker in Curitiba receives a real wage premium comparable to São Paulo. An F-test on the joint hypothesis that the coefficients on the Metropolitan Region variables are zero is easily rejected at the 0.01% level.

In addition, the regional differences are extremely robust in the sense that the regional wage pattern—not its variance—is relatively unaffected by the inclusion of other variables. Comparing the coefficients from regressions 1 and 10 (See Appendix C, Table C.2), shows how much the regional effects are modified by taking into account variation in personal characteristics, human

1

capital, occupational categories, and industry composition. The correlation of the adjusted and unadjusted regional wage structure is shown for the 1986 sample in Table 4, and is a highly significant 0.883. The correlations for other years are equally significant.

Because the regional wage differentials before adjusting for covariates are closely correlated with those adjusted for covariates, some part of the regional influence on wages must be entirely independent of the other factors. This makes it difficult to argue that the remaining regional differentials are caused by unobserved differences in worker productivity, since this would require virtually no covariance between observed and unobserved worker characteristics. Similar arguments may be made about unmeasured effects of industrial and occupational composition of labor demand to the degree that they are also unaffected by the introduction of covariates.

The regional wage structure shown above reflects the history of spatial economic development in Brazil. The dynamic, high productivity regions of the south and southeast have higher than average wages, while the metropolitan regions in the northeast have lower than average wages. The migration flows reflect this pattern, as well, with the largest net flows aiming for São Paulo and originating in Recife, Fortaleza and Salvador. The one unexpected result is the extremely low position of Rio de Janeiro in the regional wage After São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and Belo Horizonte represent the structure. most dynamic economies of Brazil (Ablas and Fava 1985). Rio de Janeiro's low position is not apparent in the nominal wage averages -- where it is close to The cost of living in Rio de Janeiro, however, is the national mean. comparable to that of São Paulo without the compensation of proportionally In addition, when adjustments are made for education higher nominal wages. (Rio has one of the highest average levels of education) and for industrial composition (Rio has a highly diversifed and high-wage industrial structure) the real adjusted wage is reduced further (Compare Rio de Janeiro to São Paulo and Recife in Table 5).

Table 5

Characteristics and Composition of the Labor Force by Selected Metropolitan Regions for 1986

|                                    | Recife      | Rio de Sa       | ao Paulo     | Relat | ive to Sao P  | aulo |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|-------|---------------|------|
|                                    |             | Jane iro        |              |       | lio de Janeir | 0    |
|                                    |             |                 |              |       |               |      |
| Wage (Ave. Cz\$/Hour)              | 7.69        | 10.66           | 15.01        | 0.51  | 0.71          |      |
| Monthly Salary (Ave. Cz\$)         | 6 <b>76</b> | 1876            | 264 <b>3</b> | 0.26  | 0.71          |      |
| Price Level (%)                    | - 18%       | 22%             | 31%          | -0.58 | 0.71          |      |
| Education (Ave. Years)             | 6.2         | 6.9             | 6.52         | 0.95  | 1.06          |      |
| Potential Work Experience          | 21.0        | 21.9            | 19.7         | 1.07  | 1.11          |      |
| (Ave. Years)                       |             |                 |              |       |               |      |
| Age (Ave. Years)                   | 33.2        | 34.8            | 32.22        | 1.03  | 1.08          |      |
| % Male                             | 63%         | 61%             | 62%          | 1.02  | 0.99          |      |
| % Head of Household                | 50%         | 50%             | 48%          | 1.04  | 1.04          |      |
| % With Signed Work Card            | 65%         | 69%             | 74%          | 0.87  | 0.93          |      |
|                                    |             |                 |              |       |               |      |
| Occupations:                       |             |                 | ~**          | 0.47  | 4.00          |      |
| Administrative                     | 2%          |                 | 3%           | 0.67  | 1.00          |      |
| Clerical                           | 12%         |                 | 17%          | 0.71  | 0.88          |      |
| Technical                          | 4%          |                 | 5%           | 0.80  | 1.00          |      |
| Professional                       | 5%          |                 | 5%           | 1.00  | 1.20          |      |
| Supervisory                        | 1%          |                 | 1%           | 0.85  | 0.85          |      |
| Production                         | 23%         |                 | 30%          | 0.77  | 0.80          |      |
| Transportation                     | 5%          |                 | 4%           | 1.20  | 0.96          |      |
| Retail                             | 15%         |                 | 11%          | 1.33  | 1.06          |      |
| Personal Service                   | 22%         |                 | 17%          | 1.27  | 1.39          |      |
| Miscellaneous                      | 10%         | . 8%            | 7%           | 1.36  | 1.09          |      |
| Sectors:                           |             |                 |              |       | 0.51          |      |
| Non-Metallic Process.              | 1.2%        |                 | 2.1%         | 0.59  | 0.51          |      |
| Metalurgical Manuf.                | 3.4%        | 2.6%            | 4.3%         | 0.79  | 0.59          |      |
| Mechanical Manuf.                  | 0.2%        |                 | 3.0%         | 0.08  | 0.33          |      |
| Elect. & Comm. Manuf.              | 1.02        | 1.2%            | 4.5%         | 0.22  | 0.27          |      |
| Transport Manuf.                   | 0.5%        | 4 1.7%          |              | 0.07  | 0.24          |      |
| Wood Manuf.                        | 1.0%        | 6 0.4%          | 0.2%         | 4.94  | 1.78          |      |
| Furniture                          | 1.1%        | 1.2%            | 1.7%         | 0.63  | 0.69          |      |
| Paper & Cardboard                  | 0.77        | 0.4%            | 1.2%         | 26.0  | 0.36          |      |
| Rubber                             | 0.2         | 0.4%            | 1.1%         | 0.22  | 0.32          |      |
| Leather                            | 0.0         | 0.1%            | 0.0%         | 0.00  | 1.43          |      |
| Chem. & Petro.                     | 0.9         | 1.9%            | 1.9%         | 0.44  | 0.99          |      |
| Pharmac. & Vetrinar.               | 0.1         | % 0.7%          | 0.7%         | 0.18  | 1.02          |      |
| Perfume, Soaps & Candles           | 0.1         | % 0.5%          | 0.6%         | 0.19  | 0.77          |      |
| Plastics                           | 0.6         | % 0. <b>9</b> % |              | 0.29  | 0.44          |      |
| Textile                            | 4.0         | % 1.1%          | 2.4%         | 1.70  | 0.48          |      |
| Clothing                           | 1.7         | % 4.7%          | 6.1%         | 0.28  | 0.77          |      |
| Footwear                           | 5.4         | % 2.3%          | 3.4%         | 1.57  | 0.68          |      |
| Beverages                          | 0.7         | % 0.9%          | 0.4%         | 1.65  | 1.90          |      |
| Tobacco                            | 0.2         |                 | 0.0%         | 4.94  | 2.85          |      |
| Editorial & Graphics               | 1.1         |                 |              |       | 0.87          |      |
| Civil Construction                 | 10.1        |                 |              | 2.00  | 1.81          |      |
| Public Utilities                   | 2.8         |                 |              |       | 1.52          |      |
| Retail Sales                       | 9.6         |                 |              |       | 1.07          |      |
| Retail Sales<br>Wholesale Commerce | 5.6         |                 |              |       | 1.32          |      |
| Muoresare Confidence               | <i>-</i> 1\ |                 |              |       |               |      |

(continued)

# Characteristics and Composition of the Labor Force by Selected Metropolitan Regions for 1986 (continued)

| KIO GC OG        | Paulo  | Relative to Sao Paulo   |   |  |  |
|------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Jan <b>e</b> iro | Recife Rio de Janeiro  |   |   |  |  |
| 6.2%             | 4.3%   | 1.42  | 1.44  |  |  |
| 1.1%             | 1.0%   | 0.74  | 1.14  |  |  |
| 5.0%             | 3.0%   | 1.58  | 1.66  |  |  |
| 2.8%             | 1.8%   | 2.00  | 1.54  |  |  |
| 1.0%             | 0.7%   | 1.41  | 1.43  |  |  |
| 16.2%            | 9.4%   | 1.81  | 1.72  |  |  |
| 0.9%             | 0.7%   | 0.71  | 1.22  |  |  |
| 2.6%             | 2.5%   | 0.49  | 1.03  |  |  |
| 1.8%             | 1.8%   | 1.47  | 1.00  |  |  |
| 0.0%             | 0.0%   |   |   |  |  |
| 3.5%             | 1.9%   | 1.84  | 1.79  |  |  |
| 3.0%             | 2.3%   | 0.75  | 1.33  |  |  |
|                  | Janeiro  6.2%  1.1%  5.0%  2.8%  1.0%  16.2%  0.9%  2.6%  1.8%  0.0%  3.5% | Janeiro  6.2% 4.3%  1.1% 1.0%  5.0% 3.0%  2.8% 1.8%  1.0% 0.7%  16.2% 9.4%  0.9% 0.7%  2.6% 2.5%  1.8% 1.8%  0.0% 0.0%  3.5% 1.9% | Janeiro Recife ( 6.2% 4.3% 1.42 1.1% 1.0% 0.74 5.0% 3.0% 1.58 2.8% 1.8% 2.00 1.0% 0.7% 1.41 16.2% 9.4% 1.81 0.9% 0.7% 0.71 2.6% 2.5% 0.49 1.8% 1.8% 1.47 0.0% 0.0% 3.5% 1.9% 1.84 |  |  |

100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

This section has shown that nominal wage differences across Brazil's metropolitan regions reflect an underlying real wage difference that is statistically robust. The magnitudes of these regional wage differences are somewhat diminished by adjustments for variations in the cost of living, characteristics of the labor force, and the composition of labor demand; however, the pattern of wage differences is strongly invariant to these adjustments. The strength of these results leads to the expectation that adjusted real wage differentials may account for a significant amount of variation in Brazilian wages. The following section shows that, in spite of being statistically significant, the adjusted regional wage differentials are overshadowed by the influence of other factors in accounting for wage variation.

#### III.3 Decomposing Wage Variation: Analysis of Covariance

How much of an effect do the regionally-specific factors have on the overall variation in wages? This section uses analysis of covariance to determine upper and lower bounds for the contribution of human capital, personal characteristics, occupation, work card, industry composition, and regions on the overall distribution of wages.

Analysis of covariance makes it possible to decompose the variation in log wages so as to estimate an upper and lower bound for the impact of any particular variable. The upper bound is the proportion of wage variance accounted for in a regression which includes only one particular set of variables (e.g. Human Capital, Work Card Status, or Occupation), measured by the R-squared. The lower bound is proportion of wage variance which the particular set of variables contributes to the model after all other variables have already been included. The lower bound, then, measures how much the model's predictive power improves with the addition of a particular variable. The results of this analysis of covariance appear in Table 6.

Table 6

#### Analysis of Covariance Household Survey Data for Various Years

(All bounds statistically significant at the 0.1% level)

|                           |        | Personal<br>Charact. |        |         |                      | Region |
|---------------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|---------|----------------------|--------|
|                           |        |                      |        |         | N=27,57<br>Iare = 0  |        |
|                           |        |                      |        |         |                      |        |
| Lower Bound               | 0.11   | 0.02                 | 0.00   | 0.03    | 0.02                 | 0.01   |
| Upper Bound               | 0.51   | 0.16                 | 0.16   | 0.39    | 0.33                 | 0.06   |
| No. of Variables          | 5      | 4                    | 2      | 10      | 38                   | 9      |
| # of Covariate Cells      | 5028   | 2910                 |        |         | 632                  |        |
| Ave. Observations per Cel | l 4.78 | 9.20                 | 6.07   | 14.17   | 42.56                | 17.15  |
|                           |        |                      |        |         |                      |        |
|                           |        |                      | PNAD-  | 1985    | (N=50,64             | ,      |
|                           |        |                      |        |         | uare = C             |        |
| Lower Bound               | 0.09   | 0.02                 | 0.02   | 0.02    | 0.03                 | 0.01   |
| Upper Bound               | 0.48   | 0.15                 | 0.23   | 0.41    | 0.38                 | 0.04   |
| No. of Categories         | 5      | 4                    | 2      | 10      | 38                   | 9      |
|                           |        |                      |        | 4084    |                      |        |
|                           |        |                      |        |         | (N=48,09<br>ware = ( |        |
| Lower Bound               | 0.12   | 0.02                 | 0.01   | 0.02    | 0.02                 | 0.01   |
| Upper Bound               | 0.52   | 0.15                 | 0.12   | 0.39    | 0.33                 | 0.04   |
| No. of Categories         | 5      | 4                    | 2      | 10      | 38                   | 9      |
|                           |        |                      |        |         |                      |        |
|                           |        |                      |        |         | (N=80,4              |        |
|                           |        |                      | Adjust | ed R-Sc | uare =               | U.56   |
| Lower Bound               | 0.09   | 0.03                 | 0.01   | 0.03    | 0.01                 | 0.08   |
| Upper Bound               | 0.30   | 0.05                 | 0.10   | 0.23    | 0.09                 | 0.08   |
| No. of Categories         | •      | 5 4                  | 2      | 10      | 9                    | 9      |

As can be seen for selected years, the proxies for human capital  $^{6}$ contribute significantly to the overall observed variation in wages, from 11% to 51% of the total variation. When personal characteristics are analyzed, they contribute from 2% to 16% of the total nominal wage variation. occupation, remaining factors--work card. sector, and region--have lower bounds which range from 1% to 3%. The upper bounds. however, show that dividing the workforce between those with and without signed work cards may contribute as much as 16% to the variation in wages; while occupational and sectoral segmentation may each contribute as much as one-third of the variation. By contrast, the division between metropolitan regions explains at most 6% of the variation in earnings.

This difference in upper bounds does not automatically mean that regional differences are less significant than the other factors. apparently small contribution has more to do with independence of the regional wage structure and the consequent compression of the range of its contribution to wage variance. As mentioned above, the correlation in 1986 between the unadjusted regional wage differentials and the differentials after adjustment for potential covariates is 0.883. This explains why, although the upper bound contribution of regional variation appears low relative to other factors, it is still a significant influence on wage variation. because the regional wage structure is not strongly diminished by controls for personal characteristics, occupation and sector of activity, its range of Thus, the apparently high contribution of other contribution is tighter. factors like occupation and sector--apparent because of the high upper bound--may have more to do with their covariance with human capital and personal characteristics than with their own importance per se.

On the other hand, the combination of education, experience, gender, and head of household status are not necessarily the major contributors to wage variation. When combined, these variables can account for 57% of the total variation in log hourly wages, but a large part of this explanatory power can be attributed to covariation with the labor demand variables. After attributing all of the variation possible to occupation, sector, work card

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Reminder that the interpretation of the human capital proxies is problematic, since it is difficult to discern social selection mechanisms from returns to embodied productivity.

status, and region, the individual's characteristics when combined account for an additional 16% of variation, significantly lower than the upper bound.

# III.4 Temporal Stability of The Regional Wage Differentials

How then are we to view these remaining regional differentials? Do they represent a temporary disequilibrium across labor markets in 1986? Or if a permanent phenomena, why does anyone remain in a region where their earnings are as much as 15% or 20% lower than for a comparable worker elsewhere?

An easy explanation for the regional wage differentials are that they represent a temporary imbalance or disequilibrium in the national economy. For example, regions respond to different parts of the business cycle depending on their composition of exports and industry. Within industries, fluctuations in product demand will influence the fortunes of different regions based on the prosperity of particular firms. To test whether the regional wage differentials described above are a temporary phenomena, correlations were calculated across several years.

Table 7 shows the adjusted real wage differentials across regions for 1977 through 1987. As can be seen, the regional wage differentials are highly Table 8 shows weighted correlations of the comparable through the 1980s. regional wage differentials for all employees across the different years. The difference between the pre-1980 and post-1980 estimates has to do with the low level of sectoral disaggregation than was possible for the earlier years. Within the 1980s, in spite of the extreme changes in domestic growth and external trade experienced by the economy--from the recession of 1981-1983, through the recovery of 1984-1985, and the Plano Cruzado of 1986--the regional wage differentials are relatively stable. The weighted correlations for 1981 through 1987 are all statistically significant, with the exception of 1985. The significant correlations range as high as 0.97 between 1981 and 1982 and as low as 0.58 between 1981 and 1985. This stability is robust, holding even more strongly when using Spearman Rank Correlations. These high correlations regional wage make untenable the proposition that t h**e** across time

differentials are solely a phenomena of market disequilibria.  $^{7}$ 

Table 7

Adjusted Real Regional Wage Differentials

|                       | 1977# | 1978# | 1979# | 1981  | 1982  | 1983  | 1984  | 1985  | 1986  | 1987  |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Belem                 | -0.15 | -0.35 | -0.47 | -0.16 | -0.12 | -0.08 | -0.02 | 0.05  | -0.08 | -0.12 |
| Fortaleza             | -0.51 | -0.57 | -0.65 | -0.07 | -0.06 | -0.05 | -0.04 | -0.08 | -0.06 | -0.16 |
| Recife                | -0.37 | -0.43 | -0.52 | -0.07 | -0.04 | -0.02 | -0.06 | 0.04  | -0.12 | -0.13 |
| Salvador              | -0.07 | -0.08 | -0.13 | -0.04 | 0.03  | 0.05  | 0.01  | 0.01  | -0.11 | 0.04  |
| Belo Horizonte        | -0.03 | 0.05  | -0.04 | 0.12  | 0.10  | 0.05  | 0.01  | -0.00 | 0.04  | 0.04  |
| Rio de Janeiro        | 0.33  | 0.22  | 0.11  | -0.10 | -0.13 | -0.13 | -0.14 | -0.16 | -0.17 | -0.16 |
| Sao Paulo             | 0.54  | 0.49  | 0.40  | 0.08  | 0.07  | 0.06  | 0.07  | 0.07  | 0.16  | 0.14  |
| Curitiba              | -0.00 | -0.02 | -0.15 | 0.12  | 0.10  | 0.11  | 0.10  | 0.10  | 0.12  | 0.17  |
| Porto Alegre          | 0.22  | 0.14  | -0.03 | 0.01  | 0.03  | 0.02  | 0.06  | 0.06  | 0.03  | 0.09  |
| Standard<br>Deviation | 0.32  | 0.34  | 0.33  | 0.09  | 0.09  | 0.07  | 0.08  | 0.08  | 0.12  | 0.12  |

Table 8

Temporal Correlations of Adjusted Real Regional Wage Differentials

|      | 1977# | 1978# | 1979# | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 |
|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1977 | 1.00  | ***   | ***   | -    | •    | -    |      | _    |      | •    |
| 1978 | 0.97  | 1.00  | ***   | -    |      | -    | -    | -    | •    | -    |
| 1979 | 0.96  | 1.00  | 1.00  | -    | •    | •    | •    | -    | -    | -    |
| 1981 | 0.34  | 0.49  | 0.47  | 1.00 | ***  | **   | *    | *    | **   | **   |
| 1982 | 0.24  | 0.38  | 0.36  | 0.97 | 1.00 | ***  | **   | *    | ***  | **   |
| 1983 | 0.16  | 0.27  | 0.26  | 0.87 | 0.93 | 1.00 | ***  | **   | **   | ***  |
| 1984 | 0.23  | 0.27  | 0.24  | 0.72 | 0.83 | 0.91 | 1.00 | ***  | **   | ***  |
| 1985 | 0.19  | 0.20  | 0.16  | 0.58 | 0.72 | 0.83 | 0.96 | 1.00 | *    | **   |
| 1986 | 0.48  | 0.53  | 0.50  | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.89 | 0.81 | 1.00 | **   |
| 1987 | 0.53  | 0.58  | 0.54  | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.89 | 1.00 |

Note: \* indicates statistically significant at the 5% level;

<sup>\*\*</sup> indicates statistically significant at the 1% level;

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> indicates statistically significant at the 0.1% level.

<sup>#</sup> indicates years for which 9 aggregated Sectors of Economic Activity are used instead of 38 Sectors.

This temporal stability of regional wage differentials also holds over longer periods of time as indicated by Industrial Census data (1949-1980) and Demographic Census data (1960-1980) (Savedoff 1989).

In addition, there is no secular trend in the variance of the regional wage differentials for the period encompassing 1981 to 1987. If anything, the evidence for this period indicates a widening of these disparities since the variance of the regional wage differentials increases by one-third, from 0.09 to 0.12.

It is important to note that 1984 and 1985 were atypical years, particularly 1985, in having regional wage differentials significantly different from the other surveys of the 1980s. Due particularly to the exceptional improvement in wages for work-card employees in Recife and Salvador, the regional wage differentials are less highly correlated with the other years. There are clearly some cyclical effects in the 1985 sample. If we look at Belo Horizonte through 1985, we can see the impact of that metropolitan region's poor performance during the recovery. Also, Belem improves in 1985, for employees with and without work cards. Nevertheless, the business cycle cannot account for the observed slight variation in the regional wage pattern since years of growth (consider 1985 and 1986) are sometimes correlated (1986) and sometimes not correlated (1985) with other years—including recessions (e.g. 1982).

If the pattern of regional wage differentials is relatively stable over time, what is its origin? Does it reside in the isolation of the metropolitan region labor markets? in the regionally-specific features of their sectoral composition or the quality of education? in the manner and process of contracting and utilizing workers in the workplace? The following section attempts to answer this question.

## III.5 Accounting for the Regionally-Specific Effects

As can be seen above, the level of disaggregation in industrial composition had a large effect on the resulting regional wage differences for the pre-1980 and post-1980 samples. This section seeks to test whether this issue might explain the real wage differentials noted above. The analysis is applied to two very different years: 1986, whose regional wage differentials were highly correlated with other years, and 1985 which was shown to be atypical.

Once more, the earnings function was used, accounting for variation in log nominal wages with variables representing the price level, human capital, personal characteristics, work card status, occupation, sector, and region. interaction terms were included--interaction time. however. metropolitan region with human capital, personal characteristics, work card status, occupation, and sector (See Appendix C, Table C.2, Regression 3). This added 430 variables to the regression, but due to the large size of the freedom  $\mathbf{of}$ was not the reduction in degrees problematic. Joint-hypothesis to whether tests were run determine these various combinations of variables were signficant in accounting for wage variation.

For 1986, which is the more typical The results are shown in Table 9. year, the joint-tests on the interaction variables are all significant at the 0.01% level--with the exception of the regional dummies themselves. The 1985 data also shows that all the interaction variables are jointly This indicates that the wage significant -- including the regional dummies. advantage attached to any of these factors varies systematically across The coefficients on each term, however, were not statistically regions. different from zero--due to the high degree of multicollinearity that enter with the extra terms--so that further analysis of these regionally-specific returns was not possible with the existing data and the current model.

Table 9
Significance Tests of Regional Variables and Interactions

#### From PNAD 1985:

|         | Degrees of Freed | om F          | Prob > F |
|---------|------------------|---------------|----------|
| Mode l  | 494              | 250.132       | 0.0001   |
| Error   | 50,148           |               |          |
| C Total | 50,642           | Adj. R-Square | 0.71     |

#### Degrees of Freedom

| Tests                  | Numerator | Denominator | F-Value | Prob > F | Remark    |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|----------|-----------|
| METRO1=METROJ==0       | 8         | 50,148      | 3.93    | 0.0001   | Reject Ho |
| MHC1=MHCj==0           | 56        | 50,148      | 30.79   | 0.0001   | Reject Ho |
| MCARTA i=MCARTA j==0   | 8         | 50,148      | 11.12   | 0.0001   | Reject Ho |
| MOCCij=Mocckl==0       | 72        | 50,148      | 2.35    | 0.0001   | Reject Ho |
| MRAMij=MRAMkl==0       | 272       | 50,148      | 3.31    | 0.0001   | Reject Ho |
| METRO :=MHC ]=MCARTAk= |           |             |         |          |           |
| MOCCLm=MRAMOnp==       | 0 416     | 50,148      | 11.42   | 0.0001   | Reject Ho |

#### From PNAD 1986:

|         | Degrees of Freedom | n F           | Prob > F |
|---------|--------------------|---------------|----------|
| Mode l  | 492                | 119.8         | 0.0001   |
| Error   | 27,083             |               |          |
| C Total | 27,575             | Adj. R-Square | 0.68     |

#### Degrees of Freedom

| Tests                | Numerator | Denominator     | f-Value | Prob > F | Remark  |             |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------|----------|---------|-------------|
| METRO:=METRO;==0     | 8         | 27,575          | 1.61    | 0.117    | Cannot  | Reject Ho * |
| MHC1=MHCj==0         | 56        | 27,575          | 3.9     | 0.0001   | Re ject | Но          |
| MCARTA i=MCARTA j==0 | 8         | 27,575          | 3.52    | 0.0005   | Reject  | Но          |
| MOCCij=MOCCkl==0     | 72        | 27,575          | 2.3     | 0.0001   | Re ject | Но          |
| MRAMij=MRAMkl==0     | 270       | 27,575          | 1.97    | 0.0001   | Reject  | Но          |
| METRO1=MHCj=MCARTAk= |           |                 |         |          |         |             |
| MOCCLm=MRAMOnp==     | 0 414     | 27 <b>,57</b> 5 | 5.44    | 0.0001   | Re ject | Но          |

It is possible to generate some hypotheses about the regionally-specific impact of some of the variables. For example, numerous studies have considered the possibility of regional variation in the returns to schooling, an issue which is highly complex. Behrman and Birdsall consider the impact that regional variation in the <u>quality</u> of education may have on the estimates. Dabos and Psacharapoulos argue that regionally different returns reflect varying conditions of scarcity for labor skills across regions. Medeiros argues the estimates are artifacts of the correlation of education to parental status; hence, interaction terms would capture the regionally differing impact of inherited social placement on earnings. Regardless of the approach, some regionally-specific impact of education would be an expected result.

It is also reasonable to expect regional differences in the advantage attached to work card status. Employees without signed work cards are concentrated in different jobs depending on which region is being considered. In Salvador, the majority of these workers are in low wage sectors—categories 29 through 32 include 58% of the Salvadoran workers without work cards while the same categories account for only 35% of those in São Paulo (See Table 10). The largest group of workers without work cards is concentrated in domestic service (category 32), accounting for 41% of those in Salvador and only 24% in São Paulo. Thus for the national sample, work card status tells a great deal about a workers expected income, but in each region, the explanatory power of the work card status will differ depending on where this group of workers is employed.

Table 10

Comparison of Workers Without Work Cards
Salvador and Sao Paulo in 1986

|                            | Salvador | Sao Paulo | Salvador/ |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
|                            |          |           | Sao Paulo |
| Real Wage (Ave. Cz\$/Hour) | 1.07     | 1.26      | 0.85      |
| Education (Ave. Years)     | 4.49     | 5.38      | 0.83      |
| Age (Ave. Years)           | 24.9     | 26.74     | 0.93      |
| % Male                     | 48%      | 45%       | 1.07      |
| % Head of Household        | 21%      | 24%       | 0.88      |
| Sectors:                   |          |           |           |
| Non-Metallic Process.      | 0.5%     | 1.2%      | 0.39      |
| Metalurgical Manuf.        | 0.5%     | 1.4%      | 0.32      |
| Mechanical Manuf.          | -        | 0.7%      | -         |
| Elect. & Comm. Manuf.      | -        | 1.2%      | •         |
| Transport Manuf.           | -        | 1.7%      | •         |
| Wood Manuf.                | 0.5%     | 0.2%      | 1.94      |
| Furniture                  | 0.5%     | 3.1%      | 0.15      |
| Paper & Cardboard          | -        | 0.5%      | •         |
| Rubber                     | -        | •         | -         |
| Leather                    | •        | -         | -         |
| Chem. & Petro.             | 0.9%     | 0.5%      | 1.94      |
| Pharmac. & Vetrinar.       | •        | 0.2%      | -         |
| Perfume, Soaps & Candles   | •        | 0.7%      | •         |
| Plastics                   | •        | 1.4%      | •         |
| Textile                    | •        | 1.4%      | -         |
| Clothing                   | 0.5%     | 7.6%      | 0.06      |
| Footwear                   | 0.9%     | 3.1%      | 0.30      |
| Beverages                  | •        | 0.2%      | =         |
| Tobacco                    | •        | •         | •         |
| Editorial & Graphics       | 0.5%     | 1.2%      | 0.39      |
| Civil Construction         | 12.9%    | 6.9%      | 1.87      |
| Public Utilities           | 0.5%     | 0.5%      | 0.97      |
| Retail Sales               | 9.2%     | 9.5%      | 0.97      |
| Wholesale Commerce         | 4.1%     | 6.0%      | 0.70      |
| Insurance & Finance        | 0.9%     | 0.7%      | 1.29      |
| Real Estate & Diverse      | 0.5%     | 1.7%      | 0.28      |
| Transportation             | 1.4%     | 2.4%      | 0.58      |
| Communications             | -        | •         | -         |
| Restaurants & Hotels       | 7.8%     | 4.5%      | 1.73      |
| Repair Services            | 8.3%     | 4.3%      | 1.94      |
| Personal Services          | 1.4%     | 2.1%      | 0.65      |
| Domestic Services          | 40.6%    | 23.6%     | 1.72      |
| Misc. Services             | 0.5%     | 2.1%      | 0.22      |
| Professional Serv.         | 0.9%     | 2.6%      | 0.35      |
| Aux. Econ. Serv.           | 1.4%     | 1.4%      | 0.97      |
| Community Service          | -        | •         | •         |
| Priv. Medical Service      | 2.8%     | 3.3%      | 0.83      |
| Private Education          | 0.9%     | 2.1%      | 0.43      |
|                            | 100.0%   | 100.0%    |           |

Additionally, the degree of sectoral aggregation may seriously affect the ability of these variables to capture fully the impact of inter-industry differentials. For example, the chemical industry of Salvador is more highly concentrated than that of Rio de Janeiro, heavily influenced by federal investment in the "Petrochemical Pole". Furthermore, the plants operating in Salvador are newer and employ more recent technologies. These factors account for the unexpected observation that average measured levels of capital intensity are higher in Salvador than in São Paulo or Rio de Janeiro (Almeida As a group, chemical workers are among the most highly paid workers in Brazil; however, the aggregation may obscure intra-sectoral heterogeneity of wages in this industry--which produces a wide range of products from petrochemicals to household paints. The intra-industry differentials were not captured in this study. Rather, they affected the estimate of average regional wage differentials by attributing the unexplained advantage observed for the chemical workers in Salvador to the metropolitan region, instead of attributing it to the concentration of chemical workers in petrochemical refining.

In conclusion, the residual regional wage differentials shown in Table 7 appear stable through time and are the consequence of regionally-specific attributes of workforce characteristics and labor demand composition. The variation in nominal wages across regions is the consequence of variation in cost of living and the different composition of the regions with respect to other types of labor market segmentation—specifically those dividing the workforce on the basis of education and experience, and those dividing the workforce by occupation and sector. It remains for further research to determine whether the differential wage advantages of these personal and job characteristics have to do with differential returns or unmeasured quality of the included variables.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS: RECOMPOSING THE DECOMPOSITION OF REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

The foregoing analysis decomposed nominal wages step by step through cost of living, work force characteristics, and labor demand composition. It then showed that the residual regional wage differentials may be themselves artifacts of the level of disaggregation or of unexplored regional differences

in rates of return.

In terms of the various perspectives on regional wage differentials presented in previous studies, this research has shown that regional differentials for comparable workers will not converge over time—to the degree that the distribution of work card status, economic sectors, and occupation remain spatially concentrated. Instead, the regional wage differentials were more widely dispersed in 1986 and 1987 than at the beginning of the decade.

The variation in the cost of living does affect the variation in nominal earnings across metropolitan regions, as has been hypothesized in various However, the regional price variation can explain at most one-third Human capital can account for a substantial portion of of this variation. wage variation but it is highly correlated with the other variables and may 11% to total variation. Furthermore. little as contribute as interpretation of the explanatory power of education is made difficult by its dependence on parental income and social status. Thus the recourse of standard market theories to cost of living differences and human capital variation is only part of the story of regional wage disparities.

Real wage differentials for comparable workers across Brazil's regions are a persistent fact of its recent history. The stability of this pattern must reside in the different composition of labor demand and structure of economic organization apparent across regions. Approaches within this framework, however, may vary widely.

One such approach focuses on differential bargaining power of labor across regions. High wage firms fleeing areas of sectoral concentration may find relief from worker resistance (See Storper 1984). This advantage in bargaining power should not be underestimated. On the other hand, these firms will probably still face wage premia requirements characteristic of their sectors. There appears to be little geographical segmentation which would allow firms to continue to profit from low-cost labor in real terms. Firms which sell in the national or export markets, however, can still gain through "arbitrage" in the sense of reducing the nominal cost of labor by producing in areas with lower consumer prices.



Another approach might focus on further disaggregating the industrial variation across regions and in analyzing the generation of inter-industry It is clear from this and other studies that sector of economic activity and education are the major correlates with the wage distribution, and overshadow regional differences (Fishlow 1972, Almeida dos Reis 1989). It is an open question, however, as to what generates and <u>maintains</u> labor market segmentation along these dimensions. The persistence of regional wage disparities in spite of the increasing integration of national factor and product markets implies some form of job rationing and differential restrictions on opportunities facing workers. This study then substantiates the need for further exploration of (1) educational opportunity in Brazil, (2) the interpretation of returns to education as rewards to productivity or screening, (3) the generation of inter-industry differentials, and (4) selection of workers by firms.

Public policy can take advantage of the regional deconcentration of poverty to target poverty programs. Public services which reduce the cost of living and/or improve quality of life can contribute significantly to the alleviation of regional concentrations of poverty. In terms of labor market outcomes, however, geographically distinct labor policies are likely to be an extremely indirect method of improving social welfare. The relative inefficacy of regional labor policies can be inferred from the stability of regional wage patterns over a period of time in which the federal government was gradually unifying the regionally differentiated structure of minimum wages. the improvement of work conditions, pay, promotion opportunities, and mobility should be pursued through programs which encourage all firms, regardless of to adopt technologies and organizational strategies that take location. advantage of the motivational impact of high-wages. Such policies may be direct, such as enforcing minimum wage laws, or indirect, strengthening the labor movement.8 The regional aspects of a national industrial policy must take into account not only the encouragement of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>For example, until the early 1980s a majority of the workers in one large textile firm worked without official work card status and its associated benefits, at wages below the legal minimum, and for workdays which exceeded the legal maximum. The pressure of the textile workers union, taking advantage of slackened labor repression in this decade, was able to force the firm to regularize work conditions and improve wages (author's interviews in Recife, 1989).

regional growth (which is insufficient in itself, see Jatobá) and the implantation of high wage sectors, but also the advantages of sectoral and occupational diversity which make up the complex of higher productivity and pay. Finally the issue of differential access to education deserves greater attention than can be developed here.

The implications for public policy then are to deemphasize the spatial aspects of labor policy and stress instead the sectoral, occupational, and educational aspects of segmentation and restricted opportunities. Divisions of the labor market which are created by the complex interaction of sectors, occupations, work card status and region, need to be the focus of any study of opportunity for Brazilian workers. Regional comparisons of this complex should help elucidate its workings and reveal further possibilities for public policy.

## V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABLAS, Luíz Augusto de Queiroz and Vera Lúcia Fava. <u>Dinâmica Espacial</u> do <u>Desenvolvimento Brasileiro, Volume II.</u> São Paulo: IPE-USP, 1985).
- ALMEIDA, Manuel Bosca, "Estimação do Estoque de Capital no Nordeste e Sudeste do Brasil 1970," <u>Revista Econômica do Nordeste</u>, Vol. 12, No. 2, abril/junho 1981.
- BAER, Werner. "Regional Inequality and Economic Growth in Brazil," <u>Economic Development and Cultural Change</u>, Vol. 12, No. 3 (April 1964). pp. 268-285.
- BEHRMAN, Jere R. and Nancy Birdsall, "The Quality of Schooling: Quantity Alone is Misleading," American Economic Review, 73:5, December 1983.
- DABOS, Marcelo and George Psacharapoulos, "An Analysis of the Sources of Earnings Variation Among Brazilian Males," mimeo, September 1987.
- DUNFORD, M. "Integration and Unequal Development: The Case of Southern Italy, 1951-1973," in Allen J. Scott and Michael Storper, eds. <u>Production, Work, Territory: The Geographical Anatomy of Capitalism</u>. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1986.
- GOMES, Gustavo Maia, Carlos Osório, José Ferreira Irmão. <u>Recessão e</u>

  <u>Desemprego nas Regiões Brasileiras</u>. (Recife: PIMES, February 1985).
- GUIMARÃES NETO, Leonardo, and Aldemir do Vale Souza, "A Dinâmica do Mercado de Trabalho Urbano no Nordeste," in Inaía Maria Moreira de Carvalho e Teresa Maria Frota Haguette, eds. <u>Trabalho e Condições de Vida no Nordeste Brasileiro</u>. São Paulo-Brasília: Editora Hucitec/CNPq, 1984.
- JATOBÁ, Jorge. "The Labour Market in a Recession-Hit Region: The North-East of Brazil." <u>International Labour Review</u>, Vol. 125, No. 2 (March-April 1986). pp. 227-241.
- LUQUE, Carlos Antonio and Jose Paulo Zeetano Chahad, "Formação de Salários no Brasil: Uma Contribuição ao Debate," <u>Estudos Econômicos</u> 15(1):37-46, Jan/Abr 1985.
- MACEDO, Roberto B.M. "A Critical Review of the Relation Between the Post-1964 Wage Policy and the Worsening of Brazil's Size Income Distribution in the Sixties," <u>Explorations in Economic Research</u>, Vol. 4, 1974. pp. 117-140.
- ----, "Wage Differentials Between State and Private Enterprise in Brazil," mimeo, presented at XII International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, Boston, October 1986.
- MATHUR, Ashok, "Regional Development and Income Disparities in India: A Sectoral Analysis," <u>Economic Development and Cultural Change</u>, 31:3, April 1982. pp. 475-506.
- MEDEIROS, José Adelino de Souza. Alcance e Limitações da Teoria do Capital

- Humano: Diferenças de Ganhos no Brasil em 1973. São Paulo: IPE/USP, 1982.
- MENEGHETTI NETO, Alfredo, "O Efeito da Variável Distância na Migracão Interna Brasileira: Algumas Considerações," in XVI Encontro Nacional de Economia, Belo Horizonte, Dezembro 1988. Volume IV, Porto Alegre, RS: Gráfica e Editora NBS, Ltda. 1988.
- MORLEY, Samuel, Milton Barbosa, and Maria Christina C. de Souza. "Evidence on the Internal Labor Market during a Process of Rapid Growth," <u>Journal of Development Economics</u>, 6 (1979), pp. 261-286.
- PAES DE BARROS, Ricardo, "On the Empirical Content of the Formal-Informal Labor Market Segmentation Hypothesis" mimeo, INPES-IPEA, Rio de Janeiro, April 1988.
- PFEFFERMAN, Guy and Richard Webb. "Poverty and Income Distribution in Brazil,"

  Review of Income and Wealth, Ser. 29:2 (July 1983). pp. 101-124.
- ROCHA, Sonia, "Linhas de Pobreza Para as Regiões Metropolitanas na Primeira Metade da Década de 80," <u>XVI Encontro Nacional de Economia, Belo Horizonte, Dezembro 1988</u>. Volume IV, Porto Alegre, RS: Gráfica e Editora NBS, Ltda. 1988.
- SAHLING, Leonard G. and Sharon P. Smith, "Regional Wage Differentials: Has the South Risen Again?" <u>The Review of Economics and Statistics</u>, LXV:1, February 1983. pp. 131-143.
- SAVEDOFF, William D. "Temporal Stability of Regional Wage Differentials in Brazil", Rio de Janeiro: INPES-IPEA, mimeo, October 1989.
- SCHMITZ, Hubert. <u>Technology and Employment Practices in Developing Countries</u>. Kent, U.K.: Croom Helm, 1985.
- SEDLACEK, Guilherme, Ricardo Paes de Barros e Simone Varandas, "Um Análise da Mobilidade no Mercado de Trabalho Brasileiro: Perspectivas de Segmentação," XVI Encontro Nacional de Economia, Belo Horizonte, Dezembro 1988. Volume IV, Porto Alegre, RS: Gráfica e Editora NBS, Ltda. 1988.
- SOUZA, Paulo Renato and Paulo Eduardo Baltar, "The Minimum Wage and Wage Rates in Brazil," <u>Brazilian Economic Studies</u>, No. 7, Rio de Janeiro: INPES/IPEA, 1983.
- STORPER, Michael. "Who Benefits from Industrial Decentralization? Social Power in the Labor Market, Income Distribution, and Spatial Policy in Brazil," Regional Studies, 18(2), 1984. pp. 143-164.
- THOMAS, Vinod, "Differences in Income, Nutrition and Poverty within Brazil," Washington, DC: World Bank Staff Paper, 1982.
- Development, 15:2, February 1987.
- WILLIAMSON, Jeffrey G. "Regional Inequality and the Process of National Development: A Description of Patterns." <u>Economic Development and Cultural Change</u> (Chicago), XIII, No. 4, Part II, July 1965.

# Appendix C

Table C.1
Variables Used in Regressions

| Vartable      | Definition                       | Remarks                               |
|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| W             | Nominal Hourly Wage              | = Monthly Income/(4*Hours)            |
| ESTUDO        | Years of Education               |                                       |
| ESTUDSQ       | Years of Education squared       |                                       |
| EX            | Years of Job Experience          | = age - (ESTUDO + 6)                  |
| EXSQ          | Years of Job Experience squared  |                                       |
| ESTEXP        | Interaction term                 | = EX * ESTUDO                         |
| PRECO         | Comparative Cost of Living Index | = LOG (Pi/Pj)                         |
| SEXO          | Sex                              | 1 if Male; O if Female                |
| CHEFE         | Household Status                 | 1 if head of household; 0 otherwise.  |
| CARTA         | Work Card Status                 | 1 if have a signed work; 0 otherwise. |
| 0000-0009     | Occupation Dummies               | See Table C.3                         |
| RAM10-RAM63   | Sectoral Dummies                 | See Table C.3                         |
| METRO1-METRO9 | Regional Dummies                 | See Table C.3                         |
| MESTUDO       | Interaction term                 | = METROi * ESTUDO                     |
| MESTUDSQ      | Interaction term                 | = METRO1 * ESTUDSQ                    |
| MEX           | Interaction term                 | = METRO; * EX                         |
| MEXSQ         | Interaction term                 | = METROi * EXSQ                       |
| MESTEXP       | Interaction term                 | = METRO1 * ESTEXP                     |
| MSEXO         | Interaction term                 | = METRO1 * SEXO                       |
| MCHEFE        | Interaction term                 | = METROi * CHEFE                      |
| MCARTA        | Interaction term                 | = METRO1 * CARTA                      |
| MOCCi         | Interaction term                 | = METRO: * OCC:                       |
| MRAM i        | Interaction term                 | = METROI * RAMi                       |
|               |                                  |                                       |

Table C.2
Regressions and Included Variables

| Variable | Basic | No Price<br>Adjust-<br>ment |     | Estimate<br>Price<br>Elasticit | HC<br>Y | PC  | CARTA | occ | RAMO | REGION | FHC  | FPC  | FCARTA | FOCC | FRAMO |
|----------|-------|-----------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|---------|-----|-------|-----|------|--------|------|------|--------|------|-------|
|          | (1)   | (2)                         | (3) | (4)                            | (5)     | (6) | (7)   | (8) | (9)  | (10)   | (11) | (12) | (13)   | (14) | (15)  |
| W        | х     | x                           | x   | x                              | x       | x   | x     | x   | x    | x      | x    | x    | X      | x    | х     |
| PRECO    | R     |                             | R   | x                              | R       | R   | R     | R   | R    | R      | R    | R    | R      | R    | R     |
| HC       | x     | X                           | X   | x                              | X       |     |       |     |      |        |      | X    | X      | X    | X     |
| PC       | X     | x                           | X   | X                              |         | X   |       |     |      |        | X    |      | X      | X    | X     |
| CARTA    | x     | X                           | X   | X                              |         |     | X     |     |      |        | X    | X    |        | X    | X     |
| OCC      | X     | X                           | X   | X                              |         |     |       | X   |      |        |      | X    | X      |      | X     |
| RAMO     | X     | X                           | x   | X                              |         |     |       |     | X    |        |      | X    | X      | X    |       |
| METROPO  | X     | Х                           | X   | X                              |         |     |       |     |      | X      |      | X    | X      | X    | X     |
| MHC      |       |                             | X   |                                |         |     |       |     |      |        |      |      |        |      |       |
| MPC      |       |                             | X   |                                |         |     |       |     |      |        |      |      |        |      |       |
| MCARTA   |       |                             | X   |                                |         |     |       |     |      |        |      |      |        |      |       |
| MOCC     |       |                             | X   |                                |         |     |       |     |      |        |      |      |        |      |       |
| MRAMO    |       |                             | x   |                                |         |     |       |     |      |        |      |      |        |      |       |

Note: X=used in regression; R=used in regression with restricted coefficient.

Table C.3

# Categories for Dummy Variables

| Sectoral Categories for 1977-1979     |
|---------------------------------------|
| RAM2 Manufacturing                    |
| RAM3 Construction                     |
| RAM4 Other Industrial                 |
| RAM5 Commercial and Marketing         |
| RAM6 Services                         |
| RAM7 Transportation and Communication |
| RAM8 Social Services                  |
| RAM10 Other                           |
|                                       |
|                                       |

# Occupational Categories for 19779 Occupational Categories for 1977-1979

| OCC1 Technical, Scientific, and Relig | OCCO Administrative     |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| OCC2 Administrative                   | OCC1 Clerical           |
| OCC4 Manufacturing and Civil Construc | OCC2 Technical          |
| OCC5 Commercial Activities            | OCC3 Professional       |
| OCC6 Transportation and Communication | OCC4 Supervisory        |
| OCC7 Personal Service                 | OCC5 Blue Collar        |
| OCC8 Other                            | OCC6 Transportation and |
|                                       | <b>Communications</b>   |
|                                       | OCC7 Retail Services    |
|                                       | OCC8 Personal Services  |
|                                       | OCC9 Miscellaneous      |

# Sectoral Categories for 1981-1987

| RAM10 | Non-Metallic Process.   | RAM34 | Civil Construction    |
|-------|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| RAM11 | Metalurgical Manuf.     | RAM35 | Public Utilities      |
| RAM12 | Mechanical Manuf.       | RAM36 | Retail Sales          |
| RAM13 | Elect. & Comm. Manuf.   | RAM37 | Wholesale Commerce    |
| RAM14 | Transport Manuf.        | RAM38 | Insurance & Finance   |
| RAM15 | Wood Manuf.             | RAM39 | Real Estate & Diverse |
| RAM16 | Furniture               | RAM41 | Transportation        |
| RAM17 | Paper & Cardboard       | RAM42 | Communications        |
| RAM18 | Rubber                  | RAM52 | Restaurants & Hotels  |
| RAM19 | Leather                 | RAM53 | Repair Services       |
| RAM20 | Chem. & Petro.          | RAM54 | Personal Services     |
| RAM21 | Pharmac. & Vetrinar.    | RAM55 | Domestic Services     |
| RAM22 | Perfume, Soaps & Candle | RAM56 | Misc. Services        |
| RAM23 | Plastics                | RAM57 | Professional Services |
| RAM24 | Textile                 | RAM58 | Aux. Econ. Services   |
| RAM25 | Clothing                | RAM61 | Community Service     |
| RAM26 | Footwear                | RAM62 | Priv. Medical Service |
| RAM27 | Severages               | RAM63 | Private Education     |
| RAM28 | Tobacco                 |       |                       |
| RAM29 | Editorial & Graphics    |       |                       |
|       |                         |       |                       |

# TEXTOS PARA DISCUSSÃO INTERNA EDITADOS A PARTIR DE 1988

- N.130-"A Sensibilidade das Medidas de Desigualdade à Padronização da Jornada de Trabalho", Ricardo Paes de Barros, Janeiro 1988, 28 p.
- N.131-"Influência das Paridades Cambiais sobre a Dívida Externa: O Caso Brasileiro - 1983/86", Fabio Giambiagi, Janeiro 1988, 23 p.
- N. 132-"O (Des) controle do Endividamento de Estados e Municípios Análise Crítica das Normas Vigentes e Propostas de Reforma", Fernando Rezende e José R. Afonso, Janeiro 1988, 75 p.
- N. 133-"O Efeito-Tanzi" e o Imposto de Renda da Pessoa Física: Um Caso de Indexação Imperfeita", Fabio Giambiagi, Março 1988, 17 p.
- N·134-"Estimação e Resultados do MOPSE Modelo para Projeções do Setor Externo", Sandra M. Polónia Rios, Regis Bonelli, Eustáquio J. Reis, Março 1988, 86 p.
- Nº135-"Investimento em Capital Fixo na Economia Brasileira: Estimativas Trimestrais para o Período 1975/87", Armando Castelar Pinheiro e Virene Matesco, Março 1988, 23 p.
- N.136-"Os Investimentos Governamentais na Infra-Estrutura Social: O Caso do FINSOCIAL", Bernhard Beiner, Abril 1988, 27 p.
- N.137-"Testes de Exogeneidade da Moeda para a Economia Brasileira", Pedro L.

  Valls Pereira e João Luiz Mascolo, Maio 1988, 22 p.
- Nº138-"A Receita Fiscal no Brasil: 1982/87 Análise do Comportamento da Arrecadação Global e da sua Composição", Fabio Giambiagi, Maio 1988, 18p.
- N.139-"O Brasil e a Atual Rodada de Negociações do GATT", José Tavares de Araujo Jr, Maio 1988, 21 p.
- N. 140-"Produtividade e Vantagens Comparativas Dinâmicas na Indústria

- Brasileira: 1970/83", Helson C. Braga e Ernani Hickmann, Junho 1988, 23p.
- Nº141-"Dívidas e Déficits: Projeções para o Médio Prazo", E. J. Reis, R. Bonelli e S. M. Polónia Rios, Junho 1988, 45 p.
- Nº142-"Importação de Tecnologia e Esforço Tecnológico da Indústria Brasileira:

  Uma Análise de seus Fatores Determinantes", Helson C. Braga e Larry N.

  Willmore, Junho 1988, 32 p.
- N.143-"Estimativas de Preços Econômicos no Brasil", Ronaldo Serôa da Motta, Junho 1988, 18 p.
- N.144-"Migrações Interestaduais no Brasil, 1950/80", Manoel Augusto Costa, Junho 1988, 55 p.
- Nº145-"Distribuição de Renda: Evolução no Último Quarto de Século", Regis Bonelli e Guilherme Sedlacek, Junho 1988, 23 p.
- N.146-"Cenários Demográficos Regionais até 2005", Manoel Augusto Costa, Junho 1988, 38 p.
- Nº147-"Demanda Derivada de Energia no Transporte de Passageiro", Newton de Castro, Julho 1988, 41 p.
- N.148-"Mobilidade entre Classes de Renda no Brasil", Manoel Augusto Costa, Julho 1988, 50 p.
- Nº149-"Uma Análise Comparativa de Alguns Resultados do Suplemento Previdência da PNAD-83 e Dados da DATAPREV", Kaizô Iwakami Beltrão e Francisco Eduardo Barreto de Oliveira, Julho 1988, 36 p.
- Nº150-"Os Conceitos de Custo da Dívida Mobiliária Federal e Déficit Operacional do Setor Público: Uma Crítica", Fabio Giambiagi, Julho 1988, 18 p.
- N. 151-"Linkages and Economic Development: the Case of Brazil Reconsidered",
  Benedict J. Clements e José W. Rossi, Agosto 1988, 22 p.

- N.152-"On the Empirical Content of the Formal-Informal Labor Market Segmentation Hypothesis", Ricardo Paes de Barros, Agosto 1988, 50 p.
- N. 153- "Estabelecimento e Comparação de Linhas de Pobreza para o Brasil", Sonia Rocha, Setembro 1988, 41 p.
- N.º154-"Trend, Seasonality and Seasonal Adjustment", A.C. Harvey e Pedro L. Valls Pereira, Setembro 1988, 50 p.
- N.º155-"Decomposição dos Efeitos de Intensidade Energética no Setor Industrial Brasileiro", Ronaldo Serôa da Motta e João Lizardo de Araújo, Outubro 1988, 22 p.
- N. 156-"As Desigualdades Inter-Regionais de Desenvolvimento Econômico no Brasil", Thompson Almeida Andrade, Outubro 1988, 29 p.
- Nº157-"Produtividade Total dos Fatores de Produção na Indústria Brasileira: Mensuração e Decomposição de sua Taxa de Crescimento", Helson C. Braga e José W. Rossi, Novembro 1988, 36 p.
- N. 158-"Notas Sobre a Relação entre a Inflação, o 13. Salário e o Déficit Público", Fabio Giambiagi, Dezembro 1988, 14 p.
- N. 159-"Alta Inflação e Fronteira de Estabilidade: Um Modelo para a Análise de Trajetórias Explosivas da Inflação", Fabio Giambiagi, Dezembro 1988, 32 p.
- Nº160-"Indexação e Reajuste Salarial: Uma Alternativa para Lidar com o Problema da Defasagem", Fabio Giambiagi, Dezembro 1988, 17 p.
- N.º161-"Previsão do Nível e Ciclo da Produção Industrial", Ricardo Markwald, Ajax R. B. Moreira e Pedro L. Valls Pereira, Dezembro 1988, 43 p.
- N. 162-"Desempenho Tecnológico da Indústria Brasileira: Uma Análise Exploratória", Helson C. Braga e Virene Matesco, Fevereiro 1989, 37 p.
- N. 163-"Relação Capital-Produto Incremental: Estimativas para o Período

- 1948/1987", Armando Castelar Pinheiro e Virene Matesco, Março 1989, 53 p.
- N.º164-"Família e Distribuição de Renda: O Impacto da Participação das Esposas no Mercado de Trabalho", Ricardo Paes de Barros e Rosane S. Pinto de Mendonça, Março 1989, 29 p.
- N.º165-"A Dinâmica da Dívida Externa: Algumas Simulações para o Brasil", José W. Rossi, Maio 1989, 20 p.
- Nº166-"Incidência de Pobreza nas Regiões Metropolitanas na Primeira Metade da Década de 80", Sonia Rocha, Agosto 1989, 29 p.
- N.º167-"Cálculo do Valor de Pico dos Salários num Contexto de Alongamento do Período de Reajuste", Fabio Giambiagi, Agosto 1989, 16 p.
- N.º168-"Comportamento dos Agregados e Multiplicadores Monetários no Brasil", José W. Rossi, Agosto 1989, 20 p.
- N. 169- "Financiamento do Déficit Público e Inflação: Um Modelo para o Caso Brasileiro", Fabio Giambiagi e Pedro Luiz Valls Pereira, Agosto 1989, 35 p.
- Nº170-"Inflação e Ativos Financeiros no Brasil: Uma Aplicação da Técnica de Auto-Regressões Vetoriais", Elcyon Caiado Rocha Lima, Agosto 1989, 38p.
- N. 171- "Efeitos da Nova Constituição e das Propostas de Nova Legislação na Seguridade Social", Francisco Oliveira e Kaizô I. Beltrão, Agosto 1989, 54 p.
- N.172-"Size and Functional Income Distribution in Brazil: Some Puzzles", Benedict J. Clements, Agosto 1989, 15 p.
- Nº173-"Segmentação e Mobilidade no Mercado de Trabalho Brasileiro: Uma Análise da Área Metropolitana de São Paulo", Guilherme Luis Sedlacek, Ricardo Paes de Barros e Simone Varandas, Agosto 1989, 20 p.
- N. 174-"Crescimento Econômico: Financiamento e Redistribuição", Ajax B.

Moreira, Outubro 1989, 64 p.

N.175-"Temporal Stability of Regional Wage Differentials in Brazil", William D. Savedoff, Outubro 1989, 17 p.

Ĵ

O INPES edita ainda as seguintes publicações: Pesquisa e Planejamento Econômico; Literatura Econômica; Coleção Relatórios de Pesquisa; Série Monográfica; Série PNPE; Série Estudos de Política Industrial e Comércio Exterior (EPICO); Relatório Interno; Boletim Conjuntural; Série Estudos sobre Economia do Setor Público (ESEP); Série Fac-Símile; Informe Técnico INPES e Carta de Conjuntura.

# Ipea - Institute for Applied Economic Research

# **PUBLISHING DEPARTMENT**

#### Coordination

Cláudio Passos de Oliveira

## Supervision

Everson da Silva Moura Reginaldo da Silva Domingos

# Typesetting

Bernar José Vieira Cristiano Ferreira de Araújo Daniella Silva Nogueira Danilo Leite de Macedo Tavares Diego André Souza Santos Jeovah Herculano Szervinsk Junior Leonardo Hideki Higa

# Cover design

Luís Cláudio Cardoso da Silva

# Graphic design

Renato Rodrigues Buenos

The manuscripts in languages other than Portuguese published herein have not been proofread.

### **Ipea Bookstore**

SBS — Quadra 1 — Bloco J — Ed. BNDES, Térreo 70076-900 — Brasília — DF

Brazil

Tel.: + 55 (61) 3315 5336 E-mail: livraria@ipea.gov.br

### **Ipea's mission**

Enhance public policies that are essential to Brazilian development by producing and disseminating knowledge and by advising the state in its strategic decisions.





