

Kakwani, Nanak; Neri, Marcelo; Son, Hyun H.

**Working Paper**

## Linkages between pro-poor growth, social programmes and labour market: The recent Brazilian experience

WIDER Research Paper, No. 2009/26

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

United Nations University (UNU), World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER)

*Suggested Citation:* Kakwani, Nanak; Neri, Marcelo; Son, Hyun H. (2009) : Linkages between pro-poor growth, social programmes and labour market: The recent Brazilian experience, WIDER Research Paper, No. 2009/26, ISBN 978-92-9230-195-8, The United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER), Helsinki

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/45140>

**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.*



UNITED NATIONS  
UNIVERSITY

**UNU-WIDER**

World Institute for Development  
Economics Research

Research Paper No. 2009/26

# **Linkages between Pro-Poor Growth, Social Programmes and Labour Market: The Recent Brazilian Experience**

Nanak Kakwani,<sup>1</sup> Marcelo Neri,<sup>2</sup>  
and Hyun H. Son<sup>3</sup>

April 2009

## **Abstract**

This paper analyses the relationship between growth patterns, poverty, and inequality in Brazil during its globalization process, focusing on the role played by the labour market and social programmes. Methodologically, the paper makes two contributions to the literature. One is the proposal of a new measure of pro-poor growth, which links growth rates in mean income and in income inequality. The other contribution is a decomposition methodology that explores linkages between three dimensions: growth patterns, labour market performances, and social policies. The proposed methodologies are then applied to the Brazilian National Household Survey covering the period 1995–2004.

Keywords: inequality, poverty, growth, pro-poor growth, labour market, social policy

JEL classification: D31, I32, N36, O15, J21, I38

Copyright © UNU-WIDER 2009

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Sydney, Australia; Email: n.kakwani@unsw.edu.au;

<sup>2</sup> FGV, Centre for Social Policies, IBRE and EPGE, Brazil; Email: mcneri@fgv.br; <sup>3</sup> Asian Development Bank, Economic and Research Department, Email: hhson@adb.org.

This is a revised version of a paper originally prepared for the UNU-WIDER project conference on The Impact of Globalization on the Poor in Latin America, directed by Professors Machiko Nissanke and Erik Thorbecke. The conference was organized in Rio de Janeiro, in collaboration with Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.

UNU-WIDER gratefully acknowledges the financial contribution of the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to this project, and the contributions from the governments of Denmark (Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Norway (Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Sweden (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency—Sida) and the United Kingdom (Department for International Development) to the Institute's overall research programme and activities.

ISSN 1810-2611

ISBN 978-92-9230-195-8

## **Acknowledgement**

The authors would like to thank two anonymous referees for their comments which helped to improve the paper.

Tables and figures appear at the end of this paper.

*The World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) was established by the United Nations University (UNU) as its first research and training centre and started work in Helsinki, Finland in 1985. The Institute undertakes applied research and policy analysis on structural changes affecting the developing and transitional economies, provides a forum for the advocacy of policies leading to robust, equitable and environmentally sustainable growth, and promotes capacity strengthening and training in the field of economic and social policy making. Work is carried out by staff researchers and visiting scholars in Helsinki and through networks of collaborating scholars and institutions around the world.*

*[www.wider.unu.edu](http://www.wider.unu.edu)*

*[publications@wider.unu.edu](mailto:publications@wider.unu.edu)*

UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER)  
Katajanokanlaituri 6 B, 00160 Helsinki, Finland

Typescript prepared by Lisa Winkler at UNU-WIDER

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s). Publication does not imply endorsement by the Institute or the United Nations University, nor by the programme/project sponsors, of any of the views expressed.

## 1 Introduction

Globalization bears both optimistic and pessimistic views about its effects on the economy. According to a trade model in economics, lower tariffs and transportation costs should push each country to specialize in producing the goods that the country has a comparative advantage in. In principle, globalization should hence lead to an increase in the relative demand for skilled labour in rich industrialized countries, and an increase in the demand for the unskilled labour in poor developing countries. In contrast, a pessimistic view about the effects of globalization stems from that it could be a source of increased inequality. While integration with world markets can make a significant contribution to the productivity increase and thus economic growth, it may be detrimental to equity. Low wages and restricted workers' rights could be important factors to attract foreign investment and gain greater access to the world market, which overall tend to benefit capital owners. At the same time, globalization could engender more inequality among workers. This can occur if only a small proportion of the people who have skills benefit from increased economic integration and the rest are left behind. From empirical perspectives on the effects of globalization, the available evidence is mixed. The Asian experience over the past two decades suggests that globalization has a positive and dramatic impact on both growth and poverty reduction. Yet there has been an increase in inequality as observed in China and India. Moreover, several studies also suggest that Latin American countries have experienced an increase in wage inequality after their economic liberalization. This warrants a closer look at the merits of the relationship between globalization, growth, poverty, and inequality.

The Brazilian experience has been quite peculiar in the sense that structural reforms, and in particular trade liberalization, started comparatively late, only a few years ago. Whereas other countries in Latin America started opening their economies in the early or mid-1980s, the same process started in Brazil only in the early 1990s. As is generally claimed, there is a strong association between growth and poverty reduction in Brazil. Whether growth translates into significant poverty reduction depends upon numerous factors such as education, unemployment, minimum wages, social programmes, etc. One of the most important factors influenced by all others is the degree of inequality in the country. High inequality in the country would have prevented the economy from growing faster. It is imperative to emphasize that a combination of economic growth and income distribution would lead to a more rapid and effective solution to poverty reduction. Studies have found that poverty is more responsive to growth when the distribution of income and assets is more equal. In this context, a more equal society will grow faster. Brazil has been notoriously known as one of the countries with the highest income inequality in the world (Li et al., 1998; Psacharopoulos, 1991). After its steep rise in the 1960s, Brazilian income inequality has been high and stable between 1970 and 2000 (Langoni, 1973; Bacha and Taylor, 1978; Hoffman, 1989; Bonelli and Sedlacek, 1989, Barros and Camargo, 1992; Ramos, 1993; Barros et al., 2000). In recent years, however, inequality has been on the decline with a pace comparable to the rise observed in the 1960s. This change reflects a combination of labour market improvements seen by low skilled workers, including increases in educational attainment and the adoption of increasingly

targeted official income policies. But what are the share of these factors on the observed trends?

This paper analyses the relationship between growth patterns, poverty and inequality in Brazil during its globalization process, focusing on the role played by the labour market and social programmes. From a methodological point of view, the paper makes two contributions to the literature. One contribution is the proposal of a new measure of pro-poor growth, which links growth rates in mean income and in income inequality. The other contribution is a decomposition methodology that explores linkages between three dimensions: growth patterns, labour market performances, and social policies. The proposed methodologies are then applied to the Brazilian National Household Survey (PNAD) covering the period 1995–2004.

This paper is organized in the following manner. Section 2 is devoted to the derivation of pro-poor growth rate that adjusts for inequality. Section 3 outlines empirical aspects of calculating the pro-poor growth rate using household surveys. Section 4 develops a decomposition methodology to link pro-poor growth with labour market characteristics, while Section 5 describes trends in growth, inequality, and poverty in Brazil. Sections 6 and 7 present the empirical results for pro-poor growth rates and the decomposition method applied to labour market ingredients, respectively. Based on a Shapley decomposition, Section 8 looks at the contribution of main components to growth patterns. Similarly, Section 9 investigates the contributions of different non-labour income sources to growth. Section 10 concludes the study.

## 2 Pro-poor growth rate

Suppose  $x$  is the real income of an individual, which is a random variable with density function  $f(x)$ , then the real mean income of the population is defined as<sup>1</sup>

$$\mu = \int_0^{\infty} xf(x)dx \quad (1)$$

A country's performance in average standard of living can be measured by the growth rate  $\gamma$  given by

$$\gamma = \Delta \text{Ln}(\mu) \quad (2)$$

Economic growth has an impact on each individual in a different manner. Following Kakwani and Pernia (2000), growth is defined as pro-poor (or anti-poor) if the poor benefit proportionally more (or less) than the non-poor, i.e., growth results in a

---

<sup>1</sup> The real income is the nominal income adjusted for prices. The prices can vary across regions and over time. The determination of real income will depend on both regional price indices and consumer prices indices, which vary over time.

redistribution of income in favour of the poor. When there is a negative growth rate, growth is defined as pro-poor (anti-poor) if the loss from growth is proportionally less (more) for the poor than for the non-poor. This is a relative concept of pro-poor (anti-poor) growth because growth leads to a reduction (or increase) in relative inequality.<sup>2</sup>

The pattern of growth can be described by two factors: (i) the growth rate in mean income defined by  $\gamma$  and (ii) how inequality changes over time. To measure the pattern of growth, we need to specify a social welfare function, which gives a greater weight to utility enjoyed by the poor compared to utility enjoyed by the non-poor.<sup>3</sup> Suppose  $u(x)$  is the utility function, which is increasing in  $x$  and concave, then we can define a general class of social welfare function as

$$W = \int_0^{\infty} u(x)w(x)f(x)dx \quad (3)$$

where  $w(x)$  is the weight given to the utility of the individual with income  $x$ . The main problem with this social welfare function is that it is not invariant to the positive linear transformation of the utility function. Following Atkinson's (1970) idea of equally distributed equivalent level of income, we can get a money-metric social welfare function denoted by  $x^*$  from (3) as

$$W = u(x^*) = \int_0^{\infty} u(x)w(x)f(x)dx \quad (4)$$

where  $x^*$  is the equally distributed equivalent level of income which, if given to every individual in the society, results in the same social welfare level as the actual distribution of income. Note that if  $w(x) = 1$  for all  $x$ , then  $x^*$  in (4) is identical to the money-metric social welfare proposed by Atkinson (1970).

To make pro-poor growth operational, we need to specify  $u(x)$  and  $w(x)$ . The most popular form of the utility function is the logarithmic utility function which, given by  $u(x) = \log(x)$ , is increasing and concave in  $x$ . In this study, we adopt the logarithmic

---

<sup>2</sup> Pro-poor growth can also be defined in a stronger absolute sense: growth is pro-poor if the poor enjoy greater absolute benefits than the non-poor. When growth is negative, growth is absolute pro-poor if the absolute loss from growth is less for the poor than for the non-poor. Absolute pro-poor (anti-poor) growth reduces (increases) absolute inequality. See Grosse et al. (2008) and Kakwani and Son (2008) for a detailed discussion of absolute pro-poor growth, see. In this paper, our focus will be on relative pro-poor growth.

<sup>3</sup> One can also measure the pattern of growth by means of poverty measures instead of a social welfare function. Kakwani and Son (2008) have used the entire class of additive decomposable poverty measures to describe the pattern of growth. Ravallion and Chen (2003) focused on a particular member of this class, i.e., the Watts poverty measure. Thus, the proposed measure of pro-poor growth does not require a poverty line; it is a distribution-weighted growth measure where increases (decreases) in inequality involve loss (gain) in growth rate.

utility function not only because of its popularity, but also because of its attractive features such as the decomposability of growth rate in terms of some labour force characteristics (see next Section). Atkinson (1970) specified  $u(x)$  by an entire class of homothetic functions, which provide flexibility to choose any value of inequality aversion parameter. By choosing a logarithmic function, we have chosen the inequality aversion parameter to be equal to 1.

The inequality aversion parameter determines how much weight should be given to the poor relative to the non-poor; the higher the inequality aversion parameter, the greater is the weight given to the poor relative to the non-poor. Since Brazil has persistently suffered high degree of inequality, it is our opinion that we should choose the inequality aversion parameter to be higher than what is implied by the logarithmic utility function. We can achieve this objective by choosing  $w(x)$ , which is a decreasing function of  $x$  so that the total weight given to all individuals add up to unity, which implies

$$\int_0^{\infty} w(x)f(x)dx = 1 \quad (5)$$

According to Sen (1974), the weighting function  $w(x)$  can capture the relative deprivation suffered by the poor relative to the non-poor in society. Following him, a simple way to capture relative deprivation is to assume that an individual's deprivation depends on the number of persons who are better off than him/her in society. Such a weighting scheme is given by

$$w(x) = 2[1 - F(x)] \quad (6)$$

where  $F(x)$  is the distribution function. This function implies that the relative deprivation suffered by an individual with income  $x$  is proportional to the proportion of individuals who are richer than this individual. It can be verified that  $w(x)$  in (6) is a decreasing function of  $x$  and satisfies equation (5).<sup>4</sup>

Substituting  $u(x) = \log(x)$  and  $w(x)$  from (6) in (4) gives the social welfare function

$$\log(x^*) = 2 \int_0^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] \log(x) f(x) dx \quad (7)$$

which provides the basis for the empirical analysis presented in this paper. If we substitute  $u(x)=x$  in (7), we would obtain a social welfare function developed by Sen (1974)

$$W = \mu(1 - G) \quad (8)$$

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that this weighting scheme is also implicit in the Gini index, which is the most popular measure of inequality.

where  $G$  is the Gini index. This social welfare function has been criticized on the ground that it is not strictly quasi-concave.<sup>5</sup> It can be demonstrated that our proposed social welfare function in (7) is indeed strictly quasi-concave. This is not the only reason for using the proposed social welfare function. Sen's social welfare function cannot be used to directly link the growth pattern with the changes in labour force characteristics, which is an important contribution of this paper.<sup>6</sup>

It will be useful to write (7) as

$$\log(x^*) = \log(\mu) - \log(I) \quad (9)$$

where

$$\log(I) = 2 \int_0^{\infty} [1 - F(x)] [\log(\mu) - \log(x)] f(x) dx \quad (10)$$

where  $I$  is a new measure of inequality. Taking the difference in (9) gives

$$\gamma^* = \gamma - g \quad (11)$$

where  $\gamma^* = \Delta \log(x^*)$  is the growth rate of money-metric social welfare  $x^*$ ,  $\gamma = \Delta \log(\mu)$  is the growth rate of mean income  $\mu$  and  $g = \Delta \log(I)$  is the growth rate of inequality as measured by  $I$ . This equation describes a growth pattern which provides the linkage between growth rates in the mean income and income inequality.

$\gamma^*$  is the proposed measure of the pro-poor growth rate. If  $g$  is positive, then growth is accompanied by an increase in inequality. In this case, we have  $\gamma^* < \gamma$  and thus, there is a loss of growth rate due to the increase in inequality. If  $g$  is negative, this implies that growth is accompanied by a decrease in inequality, in which case,  $\gamma^* > \gamma$ , which suggests that there is a gain in growth rate due to the decrease in inequality. Growth is defined as pro-poor (or anti-poor) if there is a gain (or loss) in growth rate. Thus, a change in inequality is captured by the gain and loss in growth rate.

It is interesting to note that the proposed pro-poor growth rate  $\gamma^*$  for Atkinson's (1970) money-metric social welfare (when inequality aversion parameter is equal to 1) is obtained as

---

<sup>5</sup> See Dasgupta et al. (1973) and Rothschild and Stiglitz (1973).

<sup>6</sup> The idea of calculating growth rates of money metric-social welfare is not new. Klasen (1994) has analysed US post-war economic performance based on growth rates calculated from Sen's (1974) and Dagum's (1990) social welfare functions. Kakwani (1981) and Gruen and Klasen (2008) have used Sen's (1974) social welfare function to compare welfare across countries. In this study we could not utilize Sen's social welfare function because it did not provide a linkage of pattern of growth with the changes in labour force characteristics. Our proposed social welfare function has basic characteristics of both Sen's and Atkinson's social welfare functions.



$$\gamma^* = \int_0^{\infty} g(x) f(x) dx \quad (12)$$

where  $g(x) = \Delta \log(x)$  is the growth rate enjoyed by a person with income  $x$ . This equation implies that the growth rate of every person receives the same weight. This is in fact the Ahluwalia and Chenery's (1974) equal weight index. Note that the growth rate of mean income  $\gamma$  gives exactly the same weight to a dollar increase in income of every recipient but  $\gamma^*$  in (12) gives exactly the same weight to a 1 per cent increase in income of everyone. Thus, the Ahluwalia and Chenery index gives greater weight to the increases in income of poorer persons than those of richer persons.<sup>7</sup>

The idea of equal proportional weight is interesting but given the persistent high inequality in Brazil, we may wish to give greater weight to growth rates of poorer persons than those of richer persons. Our proposed growth rate  $\gamma^*$  in (11) meets this requirement: the weight given to growth rates declines monotonically with the income level.

### 3 Calculating pro-poor growth rate from household surveys

This study utilizes the *Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicilios* (PNAD, the Brazilian Annual National Household Survey) from 1995 to 2004. Each household survey contains a variable called the weighting coefficient (WTA), which is the number of population households represented by each sample household. The sum of the WTAs for all sample households provides the total number of households in the country. A population weight variable (POP) can be constructed by multiplying the weighting coefficient (WTA) by the household size. The sum total of the (POP) variable for all sample households provides an estimate of the total population in the country. The total population estimate for Brazil was calculated as equal to 148.11 million for 1995, which increased to 173.71 million in 2004.

Using the (POP) variable, one can easily calculate the relative frequency that is associated with every sample household. Suppose  $f_{jt}$  is the relative frequency associated with the  $j$ th household at year  $t$ . If  $x_{jt}$  is the per capita real income of the  $j$ th household at year  $t$ , then the mean income of all individuals in the country at year  $t$  can be estimated as

$$\mu_t = \sum_{j=1}^n f_{jt} x_{jt} \quad (13)$$

which was estimated for every year between 1995 and 2004. We then estimate the growth rate of the mean income at year  $t$  as

---

<sup>7</sup> See Klasen (1994) for a discussion of this point.

$$\gamma_t = \Delta \log(\mu_t) \quad (14)$$

To compute the social welfare function defined in (7), we need an estimate of the probability distribution function  $F(x)$ . An unbiased estimate of  $F(x)$  for the  $j$ th household at year  $t$  is given by<sup>8</sup>

$$p_{jt} = \sum_{i=1}^j f_{it} - f_{jt} / 2 \quad (15)$$

when households are arranged in ascending order of their per capita real income  $x_{it}$ . Substituting (15) into (7) gives a consistent estimate of money-metric social welfare  $x_t^*$  as given by

$$\log(x_t^*) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^n f_{jt} (1 - p_{jt}) \log(x_{jt}) \quad (16)$$

which gives an estimate of the pro-poor growth rate at year  $t$  as

$$\gamma_t^* = \Delta \log(x_t^*) \quad (17)$$

Growth will be pro-poor (or anti-poor) at year  $t$  if  $\gamma_t^*$  is greater (or less) than  $\gamma_t$ .

#### 4 Linking pro-poor growth with labour force characteristics

The PNAD provides labour force characteristics of individuals. From the individual information, we can calculate the following variables at the household level:

- Per capita real labour income ( $y_l$ )
- Per capita non-labour income ( $y_{nl}$ )
- Per capita employed persons in the household ( $e$ )
- Per capita labour force participation rate ( $\ell$ )
- Per capita hours of work in the labour market ( $h$ )
- Per capita years of schooling in the household ( $s$ )

Using these variables, we calculate the following variables of interest:<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> This equation makes a continuity correction, which is estimated by obtaining an unbiased estimate of  $F(x)$ .

<sup>9</sup> Productivity is defined here as labour earning per hour of work. This is a restricted definition and is valid only under the assumption that workers are always and everywhere paid their marginal

- Employment rate:  $e_r = e / \ell$
- Hours worked per employed person:  $h_e = h / e$
- Productivity:  $\xi = y_l / h$

The linkage between the growth rate of per capita labour income and growth rates of the four labour force characteristics (which include employment, hours of work per employed person, labour force participation rate, and productivity) is provided through the following identity

$$\ln(y_l) = \ln(e_r) + \ln(h_e) + \ln(\ell) + \ln(\xi) \quad (18)$$

Using this definition, it is easy to show that growth rate in per capita labour income is related to growth rates of the four labour force characteristics in an additive fashion

$$\gamma(y_l) = \gamma(e_r) + \gamma(h_e) + \gamma(\ell) + \gamma(\xi) \quad (19)$$

The first factor is the employment rate. If this factor is positive, this suggests that the employment rate has improved in the economy, contributing positively to economic growth. A similar interpretation can be given to the other factors. The last factor is the contribution of change in productivity to the growth rate of per capita labour income.

Again using the identity (18) in (16), it is easy to show that the pro-poor growth rate of per capita labour income is also related with pro-poor growth rates of the same four labour market characteristics in an additive fashion as<sup>10</sup>

$$\gamma^*(y_l) = \gamma^*(e_r) + \gamma^*(h_e) + \gamma^*(\ell) + \gamma^*(\xi) \quad (20)$$

Subtracting (19) from (20) gives the decomposition of the growth rate of inequality in total income in terms of four factors as

$$g^*(y_l) = g^*(e_r) + g^*(h_e) + g^*(\ell) + g^*(\xi) \quad (21)$$

The growth rate of labour income is pro-poor (or anti-poor) if  $g^*(y_l)$  is greater (or less) than 0. This equation provides the contributions of various labour force characteristics to a gain (or loss) of growth rate due to changes in the pattern of per capita labour income.<sup>11</sup> If, for instance,  $g^*(e_r)$  is positive (or negative), it means that

---

product. Although this assumption is not strictly valid, the workers with higher productivity tend to have higher hourly wage rates. Thus, the hourly earnings can be used as proxy for productivity. Moreover, since our purpose is to evaluate the standards of living of households, this restricted definition is more relevant because it is directly related to households' standard of living.

<sup>10</sup> Note that the pro-poorness of labour income is measured with respect to the total per capita income.

<sup>11</sup> A gain in growth rate implies a decrease in inequality and a loss in growth rate indicates an increase in inequality.

employment generated in the economy contributes to a decrease (or increase) in inequality in per capita income. A similar interpretation applies to the other factors.

Schooling is a major factor that has an impact on productivity. It is generally true that the higher the level of schooling an individual possesses, the greater is his/her productivity (or labour earnings per hour). Thus, an increase in years of schooling should lead to an increase in productivity. But the relationship between schooling and productivity is not that simple. Changes in years of schooling are also accompanied by changes in returns from schooling. The returns from schooling also vary from one household to another depending on a host of factors such as age, location, occupation, and so on. Growth rates of returns are also not uniform across households.

Productivity of the  $j$ th household denoted by  $\xi^j$  can be written as

$$\xi^j = y_l^j / h^j \quad (22)$$

where  $y_l^j$  is the per capita labour income of the  $j$ th household and  $h^j$  is the per capita hours of work in the labour market provided by the  $j$ th household. Suppose  $\bar{r}$  is the average hourly return from per year of schooling of all the working population and  $\bar{r}^j$  is the average return (per hour) from per year of schooling of the  $j$ th household. Then the productivity of the  $j$ th household can be written as

$$\xi^j = s^j \bar{r} (\bar{r}^j / \bar{r}) \quad (23)$$

where

$$\bar{r}^j = \xi^j / s^j \quad (24)$$

Taking the logarithm in both sides of equation (23), we obtain

$$\log(\xi^j) = \log(s^j) + \log(\bar{r}) + \log(\bar{r}^j / \bar{r}) \quad (25)$$

which on utilizing the averages of the variables and taking first differences gives

$$\gamma(\xi) = \gamma(s) + \gamma(\bar{r}) \quad (26)$$

which shows that the growth rate in the mean productivity can be decomposed into two components. The first component is the growth rate of mean years of schooling, and the second is the growth rate of average returns from per year of schooling.<sup>12</sup>

Applying the identity (25) in (16), it can be easily shown that the pro-poor growth rate of productivity is related to three factors in an additive fashion as

---

<sup>12</sup> Changes in relative rates of returns from schooling do not affect the growth rate of productivity but will have an impact on the pro-poor growth rate of productivity through changes in the distribution.

$$\gamma^*(\xi) = \gamma^*(s) + \gamma^*(\bar{r}) + \gamma^*(\bar{r}^j / \bar{r}) \quad (27)$$

Subtracting (26) from (27) gives the decomposition of the growth rate of inequality in productivity in terms of three factors

$$g^*(\xi) = g^*(s) + g^*(\bar{r}) + g^*(\bar{r}^j / \bar{r}) \quad (28)$$

The first term on the right hand side of (28) relates to how growth in years of schooling is distributed among the poor and the non-poor. The schooling will be pro-poor (or anti-poor) if  $g^*(s)$  is greater (or less) than zero. The second term in (28) will always be zero, because  $\bar{r}$  is the same for all households. The third term measures the impact of the redistribution of the rates of returns among households. If  $g^*(\bar{r}^j / \bar{r})$  is greater (or less) than 0, changes in the rates of returns from schooling favour poor (or non-poor) households more than non-poor (or poor) households. This decomposition is useful in understanding the impact of schooling on growth and inequality.

## 5 Macroeconomic and poverty trends

### 5.1 Macroeconomic background

Brazil experienced some of the world's highest inflation rates over the period from 1960 to 1995. From at least the beginning of the 1980s, curbing inflation became the focus of public policy in Brazil. Successive macroeconomic packages and three major stabilization efforts have been attempted since then: the Cruzado Plan in 1986, the Collor Plan in 1990, and the Real Plan in 1994. The Real Plan was based on an 'exchange-rate-based stabilization' model that led to consumption booms instead of recessions. But the need to support an overvalued exchange rate for stabilization purposes increased the fragility of the Brazilian economy, making it vulnerable to external shocks such as the Mexican (1995), Asian (1997), and Russian (1998) crises.

The 1999 Brazilian devaluation crisis triggered important changes in macroeconomic policy that can be still observed today, including (1) the adoption of floating exchange rates; (2) the adoption of inflation targets; and (3) the implementation of the Fiscal Responsibility Law, which is binding on all government levels and state enterprises alike but has increased the size of the tax burden by about 10 percentage points of GDP from 1995 onward, reaching around 37 per cent at the end of 2008. One also has to bear in mind that there were very high real interest rates and an expansion of public expenditures that contributed both to the rise in Brazil's public debt, which reached more than 50 per cent of GDP, and also to the slow growth trend assumed. During the 2002 elections, Brazil faced another crisis, which was controlled by the new government in the following year. This was done by means of a so-called confidence shock, which meant keeping the country's previous directions for macroeconomic policy. Following a mild recession in 2003, a boom in the global economy and improved internal fundamentals isolated the Brazilian economy from adverse external shocks.

## 5.2 Pro-poor growth and poverty trends

For this study, we have chosen per capita real income as a welfare indicator. Per capita real income is defined as per capita nominal income adjusted for prices, which vary across regions and over time. This is achieved by dividing the per capita nominal income by the per capita poverty line expressed as a percentage. The poverty line used in this paper takes into account regional costs of living (Ferreira et al., 2003; Neri, 2001).

Table 1 presents growth rates of per capita real income and per capita money metric social welfare. The results reveal that the trend in per capita real income has been declining at an annual rate of 0.63 per cent over 1995–2004. Hence, the actual growth rate of per capita real income has been almost stagnant. This unimpressive performance in per capita real income worsened even further in the second period 2001–04, when per capita real income fell at an annual rate of 1.35 per cent.

This pessimistic picture, however, tends to disappear if growth is evaluated in terms of social welfare, which makes an adjustment for inequality, (called the pro-poor growth rate in the table.) This is a more relevant concept for evaluating a country's performance in relation to its standard of living. In the first period (1995–2001), the trend in the pro-poor growth rate, although positive, was only 0.10 per cent, which cannot be regarded as a good performance, but the trend in the growth rate in the second period (2001–04) increased to 3.07 per cent, which is an exceptionally good performance.

The last column of Table 1 is obtained by subtracting the actual growth rate from the pro-poor growth rate. Gains in growth rates imply a decline in inequality, while losses in growth rates imply an increase in inequality. Substantial gains in growth rates are quite noticeable in the second period, 2001–04. There were gains in growth rates equivalent to 4.42 per cent per annum because of falling inequality in the 2000s. By contrast, the gains were merely 0.40 per cent per year in the first period, 1995–2001. Thus, in the second period, the poor were able to benefit proportionally much more from growth than in the first period. This growth pattern has led to an unprecedented reduction in inequality in Brazil (which is evident from Figure 1).

Having examined the trends in growth and inequality, it is interesting to analyse the trends in poverty over 1995–2004. Poverty estimates for the headcount ratio, the poverty gap ratio and the severity of poverty are presented in Table 2. The results show a significant reduction in poverty between 1995 and 1998.

However, the percentage of poor increased from 27.83 per cent in 1998 to 28.81 per cent in 1999, which could be due to the impact of the Asian crisis upon the Brazilian economy. Since 1999, poverty had been on the decline. Note that the real minimum wage had increased to its highest point during the period 2000–01, 9.1 per cent. It appears that raising the minimum wage is an important measure that reduces poverty in Brazil as a whole. It should be highlighted, however, that the positive impact of a higher minimum wage rate can be reduced with a rising unemployment rate, due to higher costs. In Brazil, the annual growth rate of the minimum wage has been increasing over time and the unemployment rate has been on the rise as well. The

unemployment rate recently reached almost 10 per cent in 2001 (WDI, 2004). This indicates that the positive impact of the increasing minimum wage on poverty reduction could have been mitigated by the rising unemployment rate in the 1990s.

All in all, the Brazilian experience exhibits an interesting pattern between growth in per capita real income and poverty: while per capita real income declined over the period, poverty also fell. This is an interesting case that does not support *a priori* the notion that a positive (or negative) growth leads to a decrease (or increase) in poverty. More importantly, the negative growth during the period, 1995–2004, was pro-poor in the sense that the poor made positive gains in their incomes, despite the fact that average incomes declined. Thus, there was a sharp decline in inequality over the period which offset the adverse effect of the negative growth on poverty.

## 6 Patterns of pro-poor growth

Per capita total income can be derived from both labour and non-labour income sources. Table 3 shows growth rates of per capita labour income during 1995–2004. Consistent with the growth rate in per capita total income, earnings from the labour market did not perform well over the period. Per capita real labour income declined at an annual rate of 1.49 per cent between 1995 and 2004. The second period was worse, when the growth rate in labour income became -2.05 per cent per annum. However, the per capita growth rate in social welfare became positive, with an annual rate of 0.97 per cent in the second period. Thus, there was gain of 3.02 per cent in growth rate, which is attributed to a decline in inequality. This indicates that in the 2000s, the labour market conditions improved for the poor relative to the non-poor. Figure 2 shows that labour income had benefited the poor proportionally more than the non-poor in the latest period, 2003–04, in particular. It will be interesting to find out which factors of the labour market—such as employment and productivity, among others—played a major role in explaining this pro-poor growth pattern in this period. This task is taken in the next section.

The changes in non-labour income are in sharp contrast with those in labour income. The story of non-labour income can be told with the help of Table 4. Per capita non-labour income grew at an annual rate of 2.64 per cent between 1995 and 2004, the growth rate being much slower in the second period.

In view of the pro-poor growth, the non-labour income performed even better than the actual growth. Interestingly, when the non-labour income is adjusted for inequality, the growth rate becomes much higher for the second period than for the first period. This is suggested by the fact that the annual pro-poor growth rates are 5.20 and 9.14 per cent for 1995–2001 and 2001–04, respectively. Hence, the growth in non-labour income was much more pro-poor in the period of 2001–04. More importantly, the high pro-pooriness of non-labour income is the factor that underpins the fall in inequality during the second period. It can be seen clearly from Figure 3 that the gap between the pro-poor growth rate and the actual growth rate widened in the second period compared to the first period.

In summary, growth in total income is much more pro-poor in the second period than in the first. This is due mainly to the non-labour income that benefited the poor proportionally more than the non-poor. Compared to the non-labour income, the pro-poorness of the labour income was rather small over the period. Figure 4 sums up these findings.

## **7 Linkages between labour market and pro-poor growth<sup>13</sup>**

Using the decomposition presented in the paper, this section attempts to explain the pro-poor growth in Brazil in terms of the four labour market characteristics, which include the labour force participation rate, the employment rate, hours of work per employed person, and productivity. The impact of labour productivity is further explained by years of schooling and average and relative rates of returns. The decomposition results are presented in Tables 5–7.

The per capita labour income declined at an annual rate of 1.49 per cent in the entire period from 1995 to 2004. The employment rate and hours of work contributed to a decline in growth rate by 0.34 and 0.25 per cent, respectively. The decline in productivity was the major factor that contributed to a decline of growth rate of 1.63 per cent. Despite the weak labour market, the labour force participation rate increased at an annual rate of 0.73 per cent, which made a positive contribution to growth of the same magnitude.

It is also evident that the work force in Brazil is getting more educated. The years of schooling of the labour force increased at an annual rate of 2.99 per cent during the 1995–2004 period, which contributed to an increase in productivity at the same rate (2.99 per cent). The expansion of education has been accompanied by a decline in the average rates of return from schooling at an annual rate of 4.62 per cent. This suggests that the demand in the labour market has been sluggish and that growth in wage rates has not kept up with the supply of workers with more years of schooling.

A similar story emerges when one looks at the sub periods: 1995–2001 and 2001–04. However, the story changes if one looks at the changes that occurred during 2003–04, when the per capita labour income increased by 3.28 per cent. Again, productivity was the major factor contributing to the growth, but in this case, it contributed a positive rate of 1.86 per cent. The labour force participation rate increased by 1.06 per cent, while the employment rate increased by 0.79 per cent. This implies that the per capita employment rate (i.e., the sum of the labour force participation rate and the employment rate) increased by 1.85 per cent. These observations show that the labour market turned around very strongly in the 2003–04 period. The rate of return from schooling declined at a much slower rate of only 2.63 per cent, despite the fact that the years of schooling of the work force increased at a faster rate of 4.49 per cent.

---

<sup>13</sup> Barros and Camargo (1992) and Barros et al. (2004) develop an alternative decomposition methodology also applied to Brazilian data. Amadeo et al. (1993) and Amadeo and Camargo (1997) discuss the characteristics of Brazilian labour markets.



Table 6 presents the growth rates of money-metric social welfare. The growth rate of per capita social welfare was -0.97 per cent in the first period (1995–2001), but increased to 0.97 in the second period (2001–02). The factors contributing positively to growth in the second period are labour force participation rate, employment rate, and productivity. The productivity growth rate of 0.56 per cent is further decomposed into three factors: (i) years of schooling, which contributed to an increase in the growth rate of productivity by 6.47 percentage points; (ii) average rate of return, which contributed to a decline in productivity by 6.71 percentage points; and (iii) relative rate of return, which contributed to an increase in the growth rate of productivity by 0.81 percentage points.

Different households enjoy different rates of return from per year of schooling. These differences may be caused by a host of variables including age and gender of earners in the household, number of earners in the household, sectors of employment by workers in the household, educational levels of working members, and so on. Thus, relative rates of returns will also change due to a multitude of factors. The changes in relative rates of return will not affect the growth rate of the mean labour income, but they will affect the social welfare, which is sensitive to changes in relative distribution. The empirical results show that the changes in relative rates of return have contributed to the increase in the growth rate of social welfare by 0.81 percentage points. This is a small contribution compared to the decline in welfare that is caused by the average rate of return from schooling.

Table 7 presents gains (and losses) of growth rates due to pro-poor (and anti-poor) growth. The labour income became highly pro-poor in the 2001–04 period, contributing to gains in the growth rate of 3.02 per cent. In 2003–04, the gain in growth rate increased to 12.97 per cent, which indicates a large reduction in inequality. Thus, the Brazilian labour market became highly pro-poor in 2003–04. Productivity was the most important factor contributing to gains in the growth rate of 8.9 per cent. Schooling contributed to gains in the growth rate of about 3 percentage points. The relative rates of returns from schooling became highly favourable to the poor, contributing to gains in the growth rate of 5.85 percentage points.

Apart from productivity, the other labour market characteristics such as the labour force participation rate, the employment rate, and work hours per employed person also contributed to a large reduction in inequality during 2001–04.

## **8 Contribution of labour and non-labour incomes to pro-poor growth**

The previous section explained the growth rate in labour income in terms of labour market characteristics. This section attempts to explain the contributions of both labour and non-labour incomes to the pro-poor growth rate of per capita income. As pointed out earlier, for the 1995–2004 period, the average growth rate of the total income was -0.63 per cent per annum, while labour income grew at an average rate of -1.49 per cent, and non-labour income grew at an average rate of 2.64 per annum. However, in order to see the contribution of different income sources to total income—as we have done for the labour market components—it is not sufficient to

gauge the growth rates of different component ratios; it is also necessary to take into account the relative weights of each income source in total income. This point also applies to pro-poor growth and to the inequality aspects of social welfare. The interaction between the high non-linearity of these last two concepts and the additive nature of income sources create some difficulties. As a result, the Shapley decomposition was used to obtain each income source contribution to pro-poor growth. In general, the contribution of a given source to the total growth of a particular social welfare concept is positively related to its initial weight and to its relative rate of growth in the same period. Table 8 presents the rates of growth and the contributions of the labour and non-labour income components to the growth rate of total income.

In 1995, labour income amounted to 82.1 per cent of total income, while the remaining 17.9 per cent referred to non-labour. However, the main sources of growth, and in particular pro-poor growth sources, relied on the latter. As shown in Table 8, the fall of total income of -0.63 per cent per year in the overall 1995–2004 period can be decomposed into the adverse labour income contribution of -1.17 per cent per year and the contribution of non-labour income of 0.54 per cent per year.

In turn, differences in pro-poor average annual growth rates are somewhat smaller as can be seen from Table 8: total social welfare increased by 0.73 per cent; labour income declined by 0.73 per cent and non-labour income increased by 6.30 per cent. The weight of labour income in social welfare in the initial period 1995 was 83.9 per cent, which is even higher than in the case of average total incomes. Its contribution to total social welfare growth in the whole period was -0.60 per cent per annum, i.e., about half of its contribution to average income growth. Conversely, non-labour income's share of the social welfare growth was 1.33 per cent per year, making it an important factor in determining the positive social welfare trend assumed in the 1995–2004 period.

Focusing on individual periods, the contribution of labour income to average annual growth changed from -1.02 per cent in 1995–2001 to -1.59 per cent in 2001–04. The track record of labour income's contribution to pro-poor growth is better than its contribution to growth per se: -0.74 per cent in 1995–2001 and 0.61 per cent in 2001–04. Likewise, non-labour's income share of pro-poor growth also surpasses its effects on average income growth in both periods. Note that from 1995 to 2001, non-labour's income impact on pro-poor growth rose from 0.84 per cent per year to 2.46 per cent per year in the 2001–04 period.

Both labour and non-labour incomes have contributed to a decline in total inequality. During the 1995–2001 period, it was the labour income that had a higher contribution to the inequality reduction: 0.28 and 0.12 per cent due to the labour and non-labour income, respectively. In total, the reduction in inequality amounts to a gain in growth rate by only 0.40 per cent. In the second period (2001–04), the gain in growth rate due to a fall in inequality was 4.42 per cent, which is substantially greater than the corresponding figure for the first period (1995–2001). Of the gain of 4.42 per cent, 2.20 per cent was contributed by the labour income and 2.22 per cent by the non-labour income. Thus, the contribution of non-labour income to the inequality reduction was slightly higher than that of labour income, despite the fact that the share

of labour in total income was much higher than that of non-labour income. This suggests that the non-labour income has been more pro-poor than the labour income in the second period.

## **9 Decomposing the contribution of non-labour incomes**

This section aims to assess the contribution of different types of non-labour income sources to the total growth of different welfare concepts, through a decomposition scheme of these income sources impacts.

Special attention is paid to incomes mostly directly affected by social policies, such as social security benefits and other non-labour income sources that include cash transfers from social programmes and capital income—which turns out to be underestimated in PNAD data. The remaining sources of non-labour income such as rents and private transfers (remittances, donations, child maintenance support, etc.) are part of what is called non-social income.

Table 9 presents trends in growth rates by non-labour income components. The results reveal that while social security has contributed to a rise in inequality during the 1995–2004 period, the others—including other non-labour income and non-social income—have been attributed to a fall in inequality during the same period. Interestingly, in the 2001–04 period, all three non-labour income components made a positive contribution to the reduction in inequality.

Table 10 explains the net contributions of each non-labour income component to growth patterns and inequality reduction. The results are obtained from the Shapley decomposition method. According to the table, other non-labour income has been the dominant net contributor to a reduction in inequality over the decade 1995–2004. Its net contribution is particularly high in the latter period 2001–04. While non-social income appears to play a smaller role in reducing inequality, the net impact of social security has been quite important. During the first period (1995–2001), the net effect of social security resulted in an increase in inequality. Its net contribution on inequality was greater than the net contributions by the other two components. Nevertheless, the sum of the net contributions by the other two sources had offset the net contribution by social security. As a result, inequality of the non-labour income in the first period showed a slight fall of 0.12 per cent.

### **9.1 Non-social income**

Non-social income fell at an average rate of -2.43 per cent per year in the 1995–2004 period, but it had a sharper decrease in the second period (-3.69 per cent) than the rate of -1.23 per cent per year observed in the first period (Table 10). In spite of the negative growth, non-social income contributed to a fall in inequality over the decade. Its effect on the inequality reduction had been much greater in the first period as compared to the second period; 5.64 per cent (in 1995–2001) against 1.72 per cent (in 2001–04).

Nevertheless, the net contribution of non-social income to overall growth performance was rather small given its growth rates. As shown in Table 10, the net effect of non-social income on inequality reduction was just 0.11 per cent between 1995–2004; its magnitude fell to 0.07 per cent in the 2001–04 period from 0.16 per cent in the 1995–2001 period.

## **9.2 Social security benefits**

Social security is the main component of social income in Brazil, second only to labour earnings among all income sources collected by PNAD. In 2004, it amounted to 19.55 per cent of all income sources and 92.5 per cent of social income. Social security benefits information includes a contributory Pay-as-you-go system and non-contributory benefits, both of which are subject to discretionary income policies from the government. The average growth rate of per capita social security benefits was 3.25 per cent per year from 1995 to 2004 (Table 9). The average growth rate of social security in the first period was much higher than in the second period, 4.69 per cent against 0.86 per cent. However, rapid growth in social security has resulted in an increase in inequality in Brazil over the 1995–2004 period. Its adverse impact amounted to an increase of inequality of 2.13 per cent in the first period. Yet the impact of social security income on inequality was reversed when its growth slowed down: it led to a reduction in inequality of 3.04 per cent in the second period. A similar story emerges from the results reported in Table 10.

Given the dominance of the public transfer aspect in this income aggregate, it is useful to observe the ratio of pro-poor growth to total growth contribution. This can be interpreted as an elasticity that shows how many public resources (measured by their share of total income) are translated into social welfare, a type of cost-benefit analysis. The corresponding elasticity of pro-poor growth with respect to total growth (i.e., its fiscal cost), both explained by social security, rose from 0.45 in the 1995–2001 period to 2.82 in 2001–04, demonstrating a marked improvement in the ability of social security benefits in targeting the poorest segments of Brazilian society.<sup>14</sup> After 1998, the government adopted the new policy of setting higher adjustment rates to lower social security benefits. In the entire 1995–2004 period, this elasticity amounted to 0.74. This elasticity allows comparing to what extent different types of public transfers reach the poor.

## **9.3 Other non-labour income**

Other non-labour income sources include very different types of incomes, ranging from cash transfer programmes such as the Bolsa-Família to capital income such as

---

<sup>14</sup> One possibility is to divide the information on social security benefits into two regimes: one with benefits equal to one minimum wage, the constitutional floor, and the rest. Neri (1998, 2001) followed this approach and showed that around 60 per cent of social security benefits amounted to one minimum wage, while 80 per cent of social security income accrued to benefits above this level. Each additional Real spent adjusting for the social security benefits floor resulted in 4.5 times more poverty reduction than a uniform adjustment for all benefits.

flows derived from interest rates paid on government debt. The pro-poor aspects of these items are expected to be very different, despite the fact that both are not only subject to public policy choices but are mostly mediated by the State<sup>15</sup> as well. Interest income is largely underestimated by PNAD data, hence this income concept is largely explained by public cash transfer programmes such as *Bolsa-Família*.

According to Table 9, the other sources of non-labour income aggregate have grown at an annual rate of 5.77 per cent in the whole period from 1995 to 2004, presenting very diverse patterns across sub-periods. They increased, on average, 0.73 per cent in the first period 1995–2001, but this growth accelerated considerably in the 2001–04 period to 13.26 per cent, reflecting the expansion of the conditional cash transfer programmes.

Table 9 also assesses the impact of other non-labour income source on inequality reduction. This income source has attributed to gain in growth rate of 24.17 per cent per year in the 1995–2004 period. This is due to a huge reduction in inequality, which can be explained by the fact that cash transfers were targeted to the poorest sectors of the population. The magnitude of inequality reduction of this income component reduced to some extent in the subsequent period as is indicated by falling the magnitude of gain in growth rate from 24.77 per cent in the 1995–2001 period to 21.95 per cent in the 2001–04 period. This suggests that the impact of cash transfers became slightly less pro-poor in the second period.

As we have seen, to measure the contribution of the expansion of cash transfer programmes from 2001 onwards, it is not sufficient to gauge its relatively high growth rates. Instead, its relative weight among different non-labour income sources must also be considered. In Table 10, the net contribution of other non-labour income to total growth per year during the 1995–2004, 1995–2001, and 2001–04 periods was 0.06, 0.01, and 0.16, respectively. This means that the role of cash transfers to explain income growth is quite small. But by the same token, the impacts of other income sources on the fiscal budget deficit were also relatively mild.

According to Table 10, the net contribution of other non-labour income source to inequality reduction outweighs the contributions made by the other two income components. In the overall 1995–2004 period, it was responsible for 0.82 per cent of the fall in inequality. Similarly, its net contribution was 0.37 per cent of the fall in inequality in the 1995–2001 period, and then increased to 1.84 per cent of the inequality fall. This indicates that other non-labour income sources constitute a key determinant of the reduction in inequality in Brazil over the period.

The elasticity of the contribution to pro-poor growth of a particular income transfer with respect to its contribution to total growth is useful to guide policies aimed at the poorest groups in the Brazilian society. The corresponding other non-labour income sources elasticity was 14.66 during the 1995–2004 period, which is much higher than the one found for social security benefits. Each percentage point in the share of government transfers in this item bought 19.8 times more pro-poor growth in other

---

<sup>15</sup> The public debt is the main source of interest gains earned by Brazilian households.

non-labour income than in social security benefits, this result is consistent with the evaluation of conditional cash transfers done in Brazil and elsewhere (Lindert et al., 2005; Barros, 2005; Hoffman, 2005; Soares, 2006; Bourguignon et al., 2003; Skoufias et al., 2001; Coady and Skoufias, 2004; Suplicy, 2002).<sup>16</sup>

In sum, other non-labour income sources have played a dominant role in achieving the pro-poor pattern of growth in Brazil, while having a minor contribution to total growth and to the Brazilian fiscal accounts. It seems that government cash transfers programmes are so well targeted that even with relatively small costs they had a large impact on the poor people's living conditions.

## 10 Conclusions

This paper makes two important contributions to the literature. One contribution is its proposal for a new measure of pro-poor growth. This new measure provides the linkage between growth rates in the mean income and income inequality. In this sense, growth is defined as pro-poor (or anti-poor) if there is a gain (or loss) in growth rate due to a decrease (or increase) in inequality. The other contribution is to develop a decomposition methodology exploring linkages between three dimensions; growth patterns, labour market performances, and social policies. Through this decomposition, the growth in per capita labour income is explained in terms of four components: the employment rate, hours of work in the labour market, the labour force participation rate, and productivity. Using the Shapely decomposition methodology, the paper first assesses the relative contributions of labour and non-labour incomes to pro-poor pattern of growth in per capita income. The non-labour income consists of social and non-social incomes so the paper demonstrates how the Shapely decomposition can be utilized to capture the contributions of social security income and governments targeted cash transfers on the pro-poor patterns of growth.

For empirical analysis, the study has used the Brazilian National Household Survey (PNAD) from 1995 to 2004. The paper has analysed the evolution of Brazilian social indicators based on per capita income exploring links with adverse labour market performance and social policy changes, in particular the expansion of targeted cash transfers and devising more pro-poor social security benefits. The description of these social indicators depends on two main dimensions: (i) who was affected by shocks perceived in the labour market and changes observed in social policies? In particular, to what extent did these innovations affect the poorest segments of the Brazilian society more?; and (ii) to what extent did the crisis affect labour income vs. other income sources such as official cash transfers, social security benefits, or private incomes?

---

<sup>16</sup> The cash transfer elasticity of pro-poor growth decreased from 38 in the 1995–2001 period to 12.5 per cent in 2001–04, showing a loss in the pro-pooriness of cash transfers but in the last period it is still 4.43 per cent higher than the value the elasticity found for social security benefits.

The general answer to these questions is that the labour earnings of the upper segments of Brazilian society were the epicentre of the economic crisis. Although per capita income fell during the 1995–2004 period, it cannot be referred to as a ‘poverty crisis’. While labour markets were quite adversely affected, incomes derived from social security and other government transfers played a crucial role in cushioning the consequences of macro shocks observed, specifically among the poorest segments of the Brazilian society.

Globalization can make a significant contribution to productivity increase and hence economic growth, but it also makes economies more vulnerable to external shocks. The Brazilian experience presented in the paper shows that government social policies can play an important role in protecting the poor from external shocks which otherwise can have a devastating impact on the living conditions of the poor.

### **Annex: pesquisa nacional de amostras a domicilio–PNAD**

We describe here PNAD characteristics, the deflation procedures used and compare PNAD per capita incomes with GDP per capita trends. PNAD is an annual household survey performed in the third quarter that interviews 100,000 households every year. It has been conducted by the Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística –IBGE since 1967. This survey has extensive information on personal and occupational characteristics of individuals. The PNAD has detailed information on the possession of durable goods and on housing conditions since it first started. It underwent a major revision between 1990 and 1992 increasing the number of the questionnaire from 60 to 130 questions. The new questionnaire, available from 1992 onwards, has information on the value spent in rent and ten separate questions on income sources were included and kept constant in the questionnaire. In Sections 8 and 9 of income decomposition we have labelled these items as follows: (i) labour income, i.e., main labour income and other labour income. The non-labour components are arranged in three additional groups: (ii) social security income, which includes main retirement benefit, other retirement benefits, main pension, and other pensions; (iii) Non-social income, which includes private transfers and rents. (iv) Other non-labour incomes, this is the residual that includes mainly public transfers associated with conditional cash transfers (Bolsa Familia, Bolsa Escola etc.), unemployment insurance but also financial incomes that are underestimated.

Here we have used the Consumer Price Index in the deflation procedures adopted. Although there are year to year differences between PNAD per capita incomes and GDP growth rates, the trends in the 1995 to 2006 period are basically the same; 1,16 per cent for the former and 1,00 per cent for the latter. We decided to restrict the analysis to the post 1994 period in order to avoid the imprecision associated with the deflation process during the sharp inflationary transitions often observed before this period. The problem is not only that the choice of a specific price index involves arbitrary decisions that affect the average level of real incomes. Fluctuations in inflation also introduce problems in the measurement of inequality firstly, because nominal incomes are received at different time periods. Secondly, since real incomes are not all spent at payments dates, it involves the incidence of inflation tax paid on

cash holdings specifically by the poor who do not have access to indexed financial accounts, yet this effect is not captured in standard household surveys. Finally, and most importantly, when nominal income adjustments are not synchronized, inequality of monthly earnings (an indicator traditionally used in Brazil) is biased upward in an inflationary spiral.<sup>17</sup> In sum, the advantage of using the post 1994 period is to avoid any questionnaire changes, second is to avoid sharp inflationary movements and currency changes. We have also shown that PNAD per capita incomes and GDP per capita present the same long run trends.

## References

- Ahluwalia, M., and Chenery, H. (1974). 'The economic framework'. In H. Chenery (ed.), *Redistribution with Growth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amadeo, E., Camargo, J., and Barros, R. (1993). 'Ajuste estrutural e flexibilidade do mercado de trabalho no Brasil'. In *Perspectiva da Economia Brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Amadeo, E., and Camargo, J. (1997). 'Brazil: regulation and flexibility in the labor market'. In S. Edwards and N. Lustig (eds), *Labor Markets in Latin America*. The Brookings Institution: Washington, DC.
- Atkinson, A. B. (1970). 'On the measurement of inequality'. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2: 244–63.
- Bacha, E., and Taylor, L. (1978). 'Brazilian income distribution in the sixties: "facts", model results and controversy'. *Journal of Development Studies*, 14 (3): 271–97.
- Barros, R. (2005). 'Transferir renda é a receita que deu certo'. *Estado de São Paulo*, 4 de dezembro de 2005: J4.
- Barros, R., and Camargo, J. (1992). 'Causas da pobreza no Brasil: porca miséria!'. *Economia Brasileira em Perspectivas da Economia Brasileira*, 1: 525–44.
- Barros, R., and Mendonça, R. (1992). 'A evolução do bem-estar e da desigualdade no Brasil desde 1960'. Texto para Discussão 286. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Barros, R., Henriques, R., and Mendonça, R. (2000). 'A estabilidade inaceitável: pobreza e desigualdade no Brasil'. In R. Henriques (ed.), *Desigualdade e Pobreza no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Barros, R., Carvalho, M., Franco, S., and Mendonça, R. (2004). 'Acesso ao trabalho e produtividade no Brasil: implicações para crescimento, pobreza e desigualdade'. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.

---

<sup>17</sup> Camargo and Neri (2001) showed using panel data that the post-stabilization fall in inequality measures on a monthly basis is up to 4 times higher than on a four-month mean earnings basis and the difference is exactly due to the reduction on the temporal variation of each individual incomes. Inflation stabilization brought more income stability than income equity according to this decomposition.



- Bonelli, R., and Sedlacek, G. L. (1989). 'Distribuição de renda: evolução no último quarto de século'. In G. L. Sedlacek and R. Paes de Barros (eds), *Mercado de trabalho e distribuição de renda: uma coletânea. Série Monográfica 35*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Bourguignon, F., Ferreira, F. H. G., and Leite, P. (2003). 'Ex-ante evaluation of conditional cash transfer programmes: the case of bolsa escola'. In F. Bourguignon, and L. Silva (eds), *Evaluating the poverty and distributional impact of economic policies (techniques and tools)*. World Bank: Washington DC.
- Camargo, J., and Neri, M. (2001). 'Salário mínimo, "efeito-farol" e pobreza'. *Brazilian Journal of Political Economy*, 21 (2): 68–90.
- Coady, D., and Skoufias, E. (2004). 'On the targeting and redistributive efficiencies of alternative transfer instruments'. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 50 (1): 11–27.
- Dagum, C. (1990). *A model of net wealth distribution specified for. Negative, null and positive wealth. A case of study: Italy*. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer Verlag.
- Dasgupta, P., Sen, A. K., and Starrett, D. (1973). 'Notes on the measurement of inequality'. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 6, 180–87.
- Ferreira, F. H. G., Lanjouw, P., and Neri, M. (2003). 'A robust poverty profile for Brazil using multiple data sources'. *Revista Brasileira de Economia*, 57 (1): 59–92.
- Grosse, M., Harttgen, K., and Klasen, S. (2008). 'Measuring pro-poor growth in non-income dimensions'. *World Development*, 36 (3): 1021–47.
- Gruen, C., and Klasen, S. (2008). 'Growth, inequality and welfare: comparison across space and time'. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 60, 212–36.
- Hoffman, R. (1989). 'A evolução da distribuição de renda no Brasil, entre pessoas e entre famílias, 1979/86'. In G. Sedlacek and R. Barros (eds), *Mercado de trabalho e distribuição de renda: uma coletânea*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA/INPES.
- Hoffman, R. (2005). 'As transferências não são a causa principal da redução da desigualdade'. *Econômica*, 7 (2): 335–41.
- Kakwani, N. (1981). 'Welfare measures: an international comparison'. *Journal of Development Economics*, 8, 21–45.
- Kakwani, N., and Pernia, E. (2000). 'What is pro-poor growth?'. *Asian Development Review*, 16 (1): 1–22.
- Kakwani, N., and Son, H. H. (2008). 'Poverty equivalent growth rate'. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 54 (4): 643–55.
- Klasen, S. (1994). 'Growth and well-being: introducing distribution-weighted growth rates to reevaluate U.S. post-war economic performance'. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 40 (3): 251–71.
- Langoni, C. (1973). *Distribuição de renda e desenvolvimento econômico no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Expressão e Cultura.

- Li, H., Squire, L., and Zou, H. (1998). 'Explaining international and inter-temporal variations in income inequality'. *Economic Journal*, 108, 26–43.
- Lindert, K., Skoufias, E., and Shapiro, J. (2005). *Redistributing income to the poor and the rich: public transfers in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Neri, M. (1998). 'Análise de sensibilidade da relação custo fiscal/benefício social de modalidades de reajuste dos benefícios previdenciários'. Boletim Conjuntural 42. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Neri, M. (2001). 'Aspectos fiscais e sociais de modalidades alternativas de reajuste de aposentadorias e pensões públicas'. In coleção previdência social: previdência, assistência social e combate à pobreza . *Série Debates*, 3, 113–21.
- Psacharopoulos, S. (1991) *The economic impact of education: lessons for policy makers*. San Francisco: The International Centre for Growth Publication, ICS Press.
- Ramos, L. (1993). *A distribuição de rendimentos no Brasil: 1976/85*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Ravallion, M., and Chen, S. (2003). 'Measuring pro-poor growth'. *Economics Letters*, 78, 93–99.
- Rothschild, M., and Stiglitz, J. (1973). 'Some further results on the measurement of inequality'. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 6, 188–204.
- Sen, A. (1974). 'Informational bases of alternative welfare approaches: aggregation and income distribution'. *Journal of Public Economics*, 4, 387–403.
- Skoufias, E., Davis, B., and de la Vega, S. (2001). 'Targeting the poor in Mexico: an evaluation of the selection of households into PROGRESA'. *World Development*, 29 (1): 1769–84.
- Soares, S. (2006). 'Distribuição de Renda no Brasil de 1976 a 2004 com ênfase no período entre 2001 e 2004'. IPEA working paper. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA.
- Suplicy, E. (2002). *Renda de cidadania: a saída é pela porta*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- World Development Indicators (2004). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Table 1

## Growth rates of per capita real income and social welfare

Period	Actual growth rate	Pro-poor growth rate	Gain(+)/loss(-) of growth
1995–96	1.59	-5.95	-7.54
1996–97	0.65	4.42	3.77
1997–98	0.97	5.07	4.10
1998–99	-5.15	-2.53	2.63
1999–2001	0.76	-2.17	-2.94
2001–02	0.11	8.98	8.87
2002–03	-6.12	-9.64	-3.52
2003–04	3.56	14.11	10.55
1995–2004	-0.63	0.73	1.36
1995–2001	-0.30	0.10	0.40
2001–04	-1.35	3.07	4.42

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 2

## Poverty estimates

Period	Headcount ratio	Poverty gap ratio	Severity of poverty
1995	29.37	12.80	7.69
1996	29.23	13.31	8.26
1997	29.24	13.00	7.98
1998	27.83	12.28	7.40
1999	28.81	12.58	7.53
2001	28.28	12.75	7.84
2002	27.39	11.78	6.95
2003	28.19	12.32	7.51
2004	26.04	10.87	6.36
Annual growth rates			
1995–2001	-0.68	-0.54	-0.50
2001–04	-2.20	-4.32	-5.52
1995–2004	-1.00	-1.46	-1.76

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 3

## Growth rates of per capita labour income

Period	Actual growth rate	Pro-poor growth rate	Gain(+)/loss(-) of growth
1995–96	1.16	-7.21	-8.37
1996–97	0.33	3.71	3.38
1997–98	-1.66	3.97	5.63
1998–99	-6.23	-3.38	2.84
1999–2001	0.39	-3.54	-3.93
2001–02	-0.58	7.24	7.82
2002–03	-7.15	-15.20	-8.05
2003–04	3.28	16.24	12.97
1995–2004	-1.49	-0.73	0.76
1995–2001	-1.30	-0.97	0.32
2001–04	-2.05	0.97	3.02

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 4

## Growth rates of per capita non-labour income

Period	Actual growth rate	Pro-poor growth rate	Gain(+)/loss(-) of growth
1995–96	3.56	0.95	-2.61
1996–97	2.10	7.63	5.53
1997–98	11.77	11.66	-0.11
1998–99	-1.13	1.01	2.14
1999–2001	2.09	3.42	1.33
2001–02	2.51	14.53	12.02
2002–03	-2.69	5.06	7.76
2003–04	4.48	9.18	4.71
1995–2004	2.64	6.30	3.66
1995–2001	3.69	5.20	1.51
2001–04	1.02	9.14	8.12

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 5  
Explaining growth rates of per capita real income

Explanatory factors	1995–2004	1995–2001	2001–04	2003–04
Labour force participation rate	0.73	0.48	1.27	1.06
Employment rate	-0.34	-0.66	0.07	0.79
Hours of work per person employed	-0.25	-0.07	-0.72	-0.43
Productivity	-1.63	-1.05	-2.67	1.86
— Years of schooling	2.99	2.34	4.04	4.49
— Average rate of returns per year of schooling	-4.62	-3.38	-6.71	-2.63
— Relative rate of returns per year of schooling	-0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00
Total labour income	-1.49	-1.30	-2.05	3.28

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 6  
Explaining pro-poor growth rate of money-metric social welfare

Explanatory factors	1995–2004	1995–2001	2001–04	2003–04
Labour force participation rate	0.41	0.19	1.24	2.69
Employment rate	-0.68	-1.14	0.17	2.35
Hours of work per person employed	-0.41	-0.21	-1.01	0.44
Productivity	-0.05	0.18	0.56	10.76
— Years of schooling	3.95	2.80	6.47	7.54
— Average rate of returns per year of schooling	-4.62	-3.38	-6.71	-2.63
— Relative rate of returns per year of schooling	0.61	0.77	0.81	5.85
Total labour income	-0.73	-0.97	0.97	16.24

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 7  
Explaining gains and losses in growth rates

Explanatory factors	1995–2004	1995–2001	2001–04	2003–04
Labour force participation rate	-0.32	-0.29	-0.03	1.63
Employment rate	-0.34	-0.48	0.11	1.56
Hours of work per person employed	-0.17	-0.14	-0.29	0.87
Productivity	1.58	1.23	3.23	8.90
— Years of schooling	0.97	0.46	2.43	3.05
— Average rate of returns per year of schooling	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
— Relative rate of returns per year of schooling	0.61	0.77	0.81	5.85
Labour income	0.76	0.32	3.02	12.97

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 8  
Growth rates and contributions to growth rates by income components

Period	Growth rates			Contributions to growth rates		
	Labour income	Non-labour income	Total income	Labour Income	Non-labour income	Total income
Actual growth						
1995–2004	-1.49	2.64	-0.63	-1.17	0.54	-0.63
1995–2001	-1.30	3.69	-0.30	-1.02	0.72	-0.30
2001–04	-2.05	1.02	-1.35	-1.59	0.24	-1.35
Pro-poor growth						
1995–2004	-0.73	6.30	0.73	-0.60	1.33	0.73
1995–2001	-0.97	5.20	0.10	-0.74	0.84	0.10
2001–04	0.97	9.14	3.07	0.61	2.46	3.07
Inequality						
1995–2004	0.76	3.66	1.36	0.57	0.79	1.36
1995–2001	0.32	1.51	0.40	0.28	0.12	0.40
2001–04	3.02	8.12	4.42	2.20	2.22	4.42

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Table 9

## Growth rates by non-labour components

Period	Labour income	Non-labour income			Total income
		Social security	Other non-labour	Non-social income	
Actual growth					
1995–2004	-1.49	3.25	5.77	-2.43	-0.63
1995–2001	-1.30	4.69	0.73	-1.23	-0.30
2001–04	-2.05	0.86	13.26	-3.69	-1.35
Pro-poor growth					
1995–2004	-0.73	3.12	29.94	1.43	0.73
1995–2001	-0.97	2.56	25.50	4.41	0.10
2001–04	0.97	3.90	35.21	-1.97	3.07
Inequality					
1995–2004	0.76	-0.13	24.17	3.86	1.36
1995–2001	0.32	-2.13	24.77	5.64	0.40
2001–04	3.02	3.04	21.94	1.72	4.42

Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.


Table 10

Explaining contributions of growth rates by non-labour income components  
(based on Shapely decomposition)

Period	Labour income	Non-labour income			Total income
		Social security	Other non-labour	Non-social income	
Actual growth					
1995–2004	-1.17	0.54	0.06	-0.07	-0.63
1995–2001	-1.02	0.75	0.01	-0.04	-0.30
2001–04	-1.59	0.17	0.16	-0.10	-1.35
Pro-poor growth					
1995–2004	-0.60	0.40	0.88	0.04	0.73
1995–2001	-0.74	0.34	0.38	0.12	0.10
2001–04	0.61	0.48	2.00	-0.03	3.07
Inequality					
1995–2004	0.57	-0.14	0.82	0.11	1.36
1995–2001	0.28	-0.41	0.37	0.16	0.40
2001–04	2.20	0.31	1.84	0.07	4.42


Source: Authors' calculation based on PNAD.

Figure 1  
Growth rates of per capita real income and social welfare



Source: Compiled by authors.


Figure 2  
Actual and pro-poor growth rates of per capita labour income



Source: Compiled by authors.




Figure 3  
Actual and pro-poor growth rates of per capita non-labour income



Source: Compiled by authors.

Figure 4  
Gains and losses of growth rates



Source: Compiled by authors.