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Abstract

This article gathers analyses that involve dynamic aspects of welfare, inequality and poverty in Brazil in the periods of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009 from the perspective of the per capita consumption. By means of the data of the Brazilian Family Expenditure Survey (POF), from the construction of the consumption aggregates, the evolution of the consumption structures in the period mentioned above are evaluated, according to the location of families in the Major Brazilian Regions and in the urban and rural areas. For this purpose, the study incorporates the value of services related to existing durable goods in the households in each edition of the survey. The study resorts to graphical and dominance analyses as well as to the calculation of functions that allow measuring and separating the effects of growth and redistribution over social welfare. The role of the consumption structure in changes made to the levels of welfare and poverty is evaluated according to static and dynamic decompositions. The main results indicate that the Durable goods strongly contributed for the growth of consumption and social welfare but they were also a limiting factor for the inequality reduction. In relation to poverty, we observed that in all the geographic areas that were studied poverty in 2008-2009 was lower than in 2002-2003 for the different measures and poverty lines that were used in this study.
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1. Introduction

The complexity and multidimensionality of poverty and inequality make the definition of an appropriate indicator, which captures the welfare of people and families, one of the essential issues for studying and dimensioning these themes. The purpose of this work is to contribute with the analyses of these topics by constructing an aggregate of family consumption based on data of the Brazilian Family Expenditure Survey (Pesquisa de Orçamentos Familiares - POF) carried out in 2002-2003 and 2008-2009, following the literature and recent advances, in order to allow measuring and analyzing the welfare, the poverty, the inequality of families with emphasis on their dynamic aspects.

Oliveira et al (2016), as recommended by Hentschel and Lanjow (1996), Slesnick (2001), Lanjow and Lanjow (2001), Deaton and Zaidi (2002), ILO-ICLS-17 (2003), Haughton and Khandker (2009), Lanjow (2009), Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi (2009) and OCDE (2013), constructed a consumption aggregate based on the POF 2008-2009, selected non sporadic expenses, which in general represent welfare gains, calculate the value of services related to durable goods by the use cost, the value of food costs when necessary and applied spatial deflators. As a result, they checked which of the suggested consumption aggregates reflects the choices of the families in multiple dimensions and allows the analysis of the socioeconomic welfare from POF data.

POF is a household survey conducted by IBGE that provides information about the consumption pattern of the Brazilian families. By standardizing the calculation of the consumption aggregate in the two editions of the survey (POF 2002-2003 and POF 2008-2009), we enabled the monitoring of the evolution of welfare among the Brazilian families during a period of high economic growth and expansion of consumption. The POF editions carried out in 2002-2003 and 2008-2009, since they are the only ones that include all the national territory, enable the comparison at the geographic level and of the consumption structure from the expense items.

In this work, we followed the construction of the consumption aggregate for the period of 2008-2009 adopted in Oliveira et al (2016), we was also applied to data of the POF edition carried out in 2002-2003 enabling an analysis of consumption evolution, welfare, inequality and poverty between 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. As emphasized in Ferreira (2010), a great deal of attention has been given to dynamic aspects of welfare, which show how the distinct growth rates of consumption (or income) of the poorer and the richer determine the values of inequality, poverty and the mean consumption (or income) over time. The author suggested that studying this triangular relationship growth-poverty-inequality only under the macroeconomic perspective limits the analyses, considering the three vertexes of the triangle are moved by the dynamic interaction of individual incomes at the microeconomic level. The same argument can be used for consumption.

The period analyzed in this work was marked by important aspects of the internal and external economic scenarios that worth mentioning. In Brazil, the years between 2002 and 2009 were

---

2The first edition of the POF was in 1987-1988 and the main purpose was to update the consumption matrix for the calculation of product considerations related to the index of national price and National Bills. Thus, a limited set of products was searched only for the metropolitan regions of the country, and the same happened with the second edition carried out in 1995-1996. Only in the POF edition carried out in 2002-2003 the purpose of the survey was expanded and the geographic coverage started considering all the national territory.
marked by a sharp economic growth, with real increase around 25% in the GDP, tax incentive for production and acquisition of durable goods, such as electronics and vehicles, declining interest rates (44%) and expansion of credit supply. This period was called “consumption boom” in the country. In the international context, it is worth mentioning that at the outbreak of the subprime crisis, in 2008, initiated in the United States but with global effects, the POF had just started and the effects of the crisis may have been captured by the survey.

The impact of this economic growth on the reduction of poverty and inequality in this period has already been analyzed in several works, especially under an income perspective. The main source of these studies was the National Household Sample Survey (Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios - PNAD), sample household survey of annual frequency conducted by IBGE. Barros et al (2007) showed a decrease in the Brazilian inequality that took place between 2001 and 2005. The authors investigated non-labor incomes to find out which one played a more relevant role on the decrease of inequality. The public transfers, in special, the retirements and the pensions caused the greater impact, while the effect of cash transfers social programs, Benefício de Prestação Continuada (BPC) and Bolsa Família, on the reduction of inequality was practically all a reflection of coverage expansion of such programs.

Neri (2011), on the other hand, analyzed the transition of the poorest social classes to the middle class, the so-called class C, between 2001 and 2009. During this period, the per capita income of the 10% poorer population in Brazil rose 69%, while the 10% richer rose only 13%. Between 2003 and 2009, the classes “AB” and “C” increased their population to 6.6 million and 29 million, respectively. In contrast, there was a reduction in the number of people who belong to the poorer classes “D”, 2.5 million, and “E”, 20.5 million. Also, there was a decrease in the inequality of income considering the evolution of the Gini index in the same period from 0.58 in 2003 to 0.55 in 2009. IPEA (2012) conducted another study that analyzed this Brazilian socioeconomic period, which highlighted that the downward trend of poverty during the first decade of the year 2000 was not interrupted by the financial crisis in 2008. The population whose household income per capita is below the poverty line dropped 11.4 p.p. between 2003 and 2008, while from 2008 until 2009 the reduction was of only 0.6 p.p.

Hoffmann (2010) also studied the evolution of the distribution of the Brazilian household income per capita, but he used the POFs carried out in 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. Since the capture of income in the POF is more detailed than in the PNAD, by including information related to the production value to self-consumption and asset variation, the author investigates if the reduction in inequality as observed by PNAD is also obtained by POF for this period. He found a decrease in inequality measured by the Gini index from 0.59 in 2002-2003 to 0.56 in 2008-2009.

Despite the contribution of these studies over the evolution of income and welfare of the Brazilian population during this period, only a few works evaluated the evolution under the consumption perspective itself, or even the expense perspective. One example of these studies is Campolina and Gaiger (2013) who elaborated a study based on the evolution of expenditure.

\]
\[3\text{Interest rate - SELIC (Special System of Settlement and Custody). Brazilian Central Bank http://www.bcb.gov.br/Pec/Copom/Port/taxaSelic.asp.}
\]
\[4\text{See also Barros et al (2006a;2006b); Ferreira et al (2006); Soares (2006).}
\]
\[5\text{See Gaiger Silveira et al (2007).}
\]
The authors used the history of the POFs carried out in the periods from 1987-1988 until 2008-2009 to study the changes in the Brazilian consumer market starting from the hypothesis of homogenization of demand profiles and expansion of credit. Considering a descriptive analysis, they evaluated the behavior of the participation of expense groups in the survey according to the social classes in all the Brazilian territory (2003-2009) and according to the metropolitan areas in the period from 1988 until 2009 since they have the same geographic coverage. They showed the increase in participation between 2003 and 2009 of the 70% poorer over the total value of the household monetary budget was of 0.4 p.p., accounting for 31.2%, while the 10% richer maintained their participation. In spite of the increase of 2 p.p. in the participation of half the poorer population in health, education and personal services expenses, it was with expenses related to the acquisition of electronics that the 70% poorer population had a significant increase in participation (38% in 2003 versus 42% in 2009).

This work proposes the evaluation of how the impact of the growth in consumption and its structure reflect upon the welfare, the poverty and the decrease in inequality among the Brazilian families, especially under the dynamic aspect. By including the period 2002-2003 in the analyses, this works expands what was done by Oliveira et al (2016) that analyzed the effects of welfare, inequality, poverty and vulnerability of families from the consumption aggregate only for the period of 2008-2009. Considering the consumption aggregates that were constructed, we notice the growth of consumption along the distribution, calculate the usual inequality and welfare as well as use analytical\(^5\) (Rao, 1969; Shorrocks, 1982; Jenkins, 1995) and counterfactual (Shorrocks, 2012) decompositions for a dynamic analysis of consumption and its components. These components were defined as: i) Food; ii) Durable goods; iii) Housing; iv) Education, health, and transportation; and v) Other goods.

In addition to this introduction, this work has another five sections. The first one deals with the construction of consumption aggregates from information obtained from the POFs in the periods 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. Next, we make a descriptive analysis of the mean consumption per capita behavior and its components, according to Brazil, Major Regions and Urban and Rural Areas. In section three, we evaluate the effect of the consumption variation over the welfare and the inequality by static and dynamic decompositions. Similarly, in section four, we present static and dynamic counterfactual decompositions that show the impact of the consumption behavior and its components over poverty. Finally, in the last section, we make the final comments with some conclusions about the results that were presented and suggestions of improvements and further development in this study.

2. Consumption Aggregate

The construction of the consumption aggregate is the first and essential step of this work, since it is a complex exercise that requires a detailed and precise breakdown of the expenses that should be included or not with the purpose of comparing the levels of welfare and the correct ordination/hierarchy of different families. This breakdown is oriented by the applied literature and the theoretical hypothesis about the contribution of different goods and services to welfare, as well as the necessary adaptations to Brazilian culture and habits.

The Brazilian Family Expenditure Survey (Pesquisa de Orçamentos Familiares - POF) used as source of information is a sample survey conducted by IBGE, collected during twelve months, which investigates the topics expenses, income and asset variation of families, basic aspects for the analysis of household income, and some factors related to the subjective evaluation of the living conditions. The POF is organized in seven questionnaires that are subdivided in frames, where each one of them refers to a type of expense, income or survey topic. The survey editions of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009 created a database with information related to 3.860 and 4.728 records of distinct items, respectively, (products, goods, services, etc), which had to be identified, reconciled and classified one by one for the construction of the consumption aggregates.

The construction of the consumption aggregates used here followed the same methodology used in Oliveira et al (2016) that, by using the recommendations of Hentschel and Lanjow (1996), Slesnick (2001), Lanjow and Lanjow (2001), Deaton and Zaidi (2002), ILO-ICLS-17 (2003), Haughton and Khandker (2009), Lanjow (2009), Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi (2009) and OCDE (2013), selected expense items that enabled the comparison between the welfare levels of families, classifying them in five groups: i) Food; ii) Durable goods; iii) Housing; iv) Education, health and transportation; and v) Other goods. In order to define which expense items should compose the consumption aggregate, the following criteria were adopted: i) The expense item should not be of sporadic acquisition; ii) The acquisition should be for the consumption unity itself, that is, the acquisition of the good will increase the welfare of the consumption unit under analysis and not that of another unit; iii) The item contributed for the comparison of welfare among different families and their correct ordination. Besides, it was necessary to treat the following information: imputation of the value of the food that is consumed for the families that did not have these expenses in the reference period and; the calculation of the service value for the use cost of household durable goods (that differs from the acquisition cost). The last step of the construction of consumption aggregates consisted of correcting the values obtained by the use of price deflators.

In order to construct the two consumption aggregates, in such a way that it is possible to compare them, some small adjustments had to be made regarding the consumption aggregate that was created in Oliveira et al (2016), especially in what concerns the spatial deflators. Next, we will briefly explain the steps of the treatment given to items of each expense group analyzed in the consumption aggregates in both periods.

### 2.1. Food Expenditure

All the food expenditure was included in the aggregate. However, there was a need to treat this information considering that 3.8%, in 2003, and 5.8%, in 2008, of the consumption units that were interviewed in the survey did not have food expenditure. This behavior does not cause surprise, because the POF uses a short reference period (7 days) to capture the acquisition of food.

---

*Consumption Unit: in the Brazilian Family Expenditure Survey, the concept of Consumption Unit comprises a single resident or group of residents who share the source of food, which can be approximated to the idea of household units or family. For further details, see IBGE (2008).*
food. Thus, since it is a very short interval, it is common that some families did not have food expenditure, and it does not mean they did not consume this type of goods during the period of seven days.

Therefore, considering this null food expenditure can change the levels of social welfare, inequality and poverty of families, an imputation was made in the null food expenditure by using the Propensity Score Method (Rosenbaum e Rubin, 1983). This method compares the estimated probabilities of the units to present zero food expenditure in two groups called control and treatment. The treatment group was composed of units that did not declare food consumption and the control group was composed of the units with food consumption different from zero. For each unit of the treatment group, we search the control group for a donor unit of food consumption. The probability of the donor should be as close as possible of the probability estimated for the unit of the treatment group. In appendix 1, we present the variables that explain the logit model that was applied and the density function of the per capita consumption with and without food expenditure imputed for the POF editions carried out in 2002-2003 and in 2008-2009.

2.2. Durable Goods

The inclusion of durable goods in the consumption aggregate was one of the main contributions made in Oliveira et al (2016). According to the authors, the possession of durable goods is an important indicator of welfare of the consumption units, but there is a difficulty in using it because most acquisition prices of these goods are elevated and they can impact the comparison among families that already have such goods and the remaining ones that were acquiring them only in the reference period of the survey. By considering only the calculated service value by the use cost of each durable good and not the acquisition value, this problem was solved. For further details, see Oliveira et al (2016).

As in Oliveira et al (2016), only the items of durable goods that are part of the “Inventory of durable goods of the main residence” (frame 14) were included in the consumption aggregates. This selection is necessary because, to calculate the value of services by the use cost, we need information of the acquisition date of goods and they are only captured in frame 14 of the POF. The list of inventory goods is related to technology and the frequency of acquisition according to the period of each survey, and there are some small differences between the POF inventory of 2002-2003 and the POF inventory of 2008-2009. Since technology is in intense evolution, mainly in what concerns electronics, many goods of high frequency of acquisition in a survey fell into disuse in the following survey or were no longer indications of welfare, such as VCR, floor polisher, recorder, cassette player and laser read-head of disc player. On the other hand, other goods that were not yet created or that were not commonly acquired became popular during the period between the surveys and were included in the inventory of the consumption units such as, for example, the electric oven and the food processor. In appendix 2, we list the two inventories of the corresponding surveys so as to show the items used in the composition of durable goods.
2.3. Housing
In the housing group, we included the following expense types: rent, utility services, home refurbishment, furniture and household articles, electronics and electronic fixing and cleaning material.

2.4. Education, health and transportation
Despite the distinct nature, education, health and transportation expenses were grouped because they deserve differentiated treatment and evaluation. Some items of these components can be interpreted as “regrettable needs”\(^7\) and reveal little about the choices/preferences of consumers or even about their rank/hierarchy of family welfare.

According to Oliveira et al (2016), based on Lanjow (2009) and Deaton and Zaidi (2002), the health and education expenses could be included in the aggregate if their elasticity\(^8\) related to the total expenses was greater than one. Thus, the total education expenses and the health expenses related to healthcare and dental insurance contracts were included (POF’s block 42). The elasticity values found for education and health were, respectively, 1.42 and 0.87 in 2002-2003 and 1.28 and 0.92 in 2008-2009.

Now, regarding the transportation expenditures, we decided to exclude the expenses with mass transportation (bus, subway, train, ferryboat, alternative means of transportation and their connections), since the high values are associated with a longer distance between the residence and the workplace, and these areas are usually peripheral, as suggested in Nordhaus and Tobin (1972) and Sen, Stiglitz and Fitoussi, (2009). The other expenses related to private transportation, such as own car (fuel, parking, toll and car wash), taxi, plane and car rental were included because, to a certain extent, these expenses reflect choices and individual preferences.

The travel expenses of POF’s block 41 had a distinct treatment when compared with the one adopted by Oliveira et (2016), because the POF edition carried out in 2002-2003 does not inform the reason of the trip. As a result, it is not possible to distinguish the leisure trip from the other ones. In order to compare both surveys, we included all the information related to travel expenses registered in POF’s block 41 in the editions carried out in 2002-2003 and 2008-2009.

2.5. Other goods
This group aggregates expenses related to clothing, culture and leisure, personal services (manicure, pedicure, barber, hairdresser etc.), hygiene and personal care, smoking habits and other miscellaneous expenditures. Among the miscellaneous expenditures, were considered

---

\(^7\) A “regrettable necessity” involves acquisitions under differentiated circumstances, which make it more difficult to measure the welfare based on consumption/expense: (1) It can involve undesirable conditions (in many cases of short term) that negatively impact the welfare of families/individuals and lead to an increase in expenses only to mitigate such impacts; (2) It can also involve expenses that, for some people, have a purely instrumental nature, making them difficult to avoid and necessary only as a means to acquire a “second item or objective”. Including the expenses in these items, without a proper treatment of the loss of welfare involved, would lead to an inappropriate measurement of the “long term” welfare, indicating, for example, that a person who spent a lot of money on medication when he/she was sick is better than someone who did not have this expense. Oliveira et al (2016), Lanjow and Lanjow (2001) suggested a similar approach to avoid the impact of measurement mistakes on the behavior of the consumption aggregate and the remaining results, especially the measurement of poverty.

\(^8\) The concept of elasticity associates the percentage change in \(y\) with a given variation in \(x\). It is possible estimate the elasticity of expenses with a specific item related to the total expense by the following model: \(\ln y_i = \alpha + \beta \ln x_i + \mu_i\), where \(y_i\) is the expense with the item in question, \(x_i\) is the total expense for a given observation \(i\). The coefficient \(\beta\) measures the elasticity of \(y\) in relation to \(x\). Lanjow and Lanjow (2001) suggested a similar approach to avoid the impact of measurement mistakes on the behavior of the consumption aggregate and the remaining results, especially the measurement of poverty.
expenses with other properties, parties, communications and professional services, such as registry, lawyer and brokers.

The expenses with wedding, wedding dress and funeral and the rare and expensive acquisitions were not included in the aggregate, according to orientation provided by Deaton and Zaidi (2002) and Haughton and Khandker (2009), Lanjow (2009).

Frequent expenses with public services (such as light, water, sewage, condominium, parking, etc) related to other properties of the consumption unit and used for self benefit (beach house, for example) were included, while expenses with taxes, social contributions, pensions, subsidies, donations to other families and private pension were excluded. Banking expenses were included in the consumption aggregate, except for banking services with interests of overdraft and credit card.

2.6. Price Deflator

In order to compare the consumption pattern among different geographic contexts, it is necessary to apply a spatial deflator, which corrects differences between prices. According to Oliveira et al (2016), the deflators were created for the following twenty geographic contexts: Metropolitan Regions (Belém, Fortaleza, Recife, Salvador, Belo Horizonte, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Curitiba and Porto Alegre); and Federal District (Brasília); Non-metropolitan Urban Area and Rural Area of each one of the five Major Brazilian regions).

For the calculation of the spatial deflator based on the POF 2002-2003, we created a basket with only the common items among the 20 geographic contexts. Likewise, we created a second basket for the calculation of the spatial deflator based on the POF 2008-2009. As a result, only some food items that is not usually consumed was not found in the two baskets. The list of these products is available in appendix 3. The non-food items of the spatial deflation are utility services and/or essential services and are present in the two baskets. However, we should keep in mind the possibility of having changes in the weight of products and, consequently, in the composition of the baskets in the POF editions.

Table 1: Participation of expense groups that compose the consumption basket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunication</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sewage</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eletric power</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As observed in table 1, the structure of the expense groups within the selected consumption basket was not changed, that is, the importance of these expenses in the family budget remained balanced in the period between the two surveys. The selection of items of the food group did not present relevant changes as well, so that for the calculation of price indexes per geographic contexts, we have a homogeneous basket for both periods of time.
In this work, we compare the two consumption aggregates in distinct periods of time then, besides the spatial correction of prices, it is also necessary to correct them in relation to time.

### 2.6.1. Spatial Price Deflator

In Oliveira et al. (2016), we used a Paasche price index as spatial deflator for the consumption aggregate with data of the POF 2008-2009, following a suggestion made by Deaton and Zaidi (2002). According to the authors, the calculation of other methods of price index, such as the ones created by Laspeyres and Fischer, had a similar behavior to that of Paasche, then the choice of the price index would not be decisive for the obtained results. However, when we replicate the same methodology with the Paasche index to the aggregate that was constructed from the POF 2002-2003, the estimated quantities for the communication item were very high in some geographic areas, which led the Paasche index not to have the same structure of the remaining indexes.

The solution found for this problem was the replacement of the Paasche price index adopted in the spatial deflation in Oliveira et al. (2016) by an adapted version of the Laspeyres price index. The decision for this substitution is due to the nature of the calculation of indexes, because the Laspeyres index sets a consumption basket of a reference region, in this case the metropolitan region of São Paulo (RMSP), and compares the prices of each geographic context analyzed in relation to this basket. Defining the RMSP as base, the problems caused by the estimated quantities of the communication item are eliminated. The adapted version of the Laspeyres index applied to the aggregates constructed for the years of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009 was based on Ferreira, Neri and Lanjow (2000) and World Bank (2007), where they used the participation of the housing expense of each geographic area over the region of reference, apart from the remaining calculation of the traditional Laspeyres index. In this work, we applied this ratio for the communication expenses.

In order to standardize the consumption baskets of families, the consumption units that are in the income range that covers from the second to the fifth decile were selected, as well as expenses of the categories of gas, communication, water and sewage, electric power, housing and food. After selecting these expenses, the adapted Laspeyres index was applied, which consists of the relation between the acquisition cost of the consumption basket of the region of reference (RMSP) and the acquisition cost of the same consumption basket in the remaining geographic contexts. However, the portion related to communication expenses has a separate calculation. Thus, the ratio of the total communication expenses of the geographic context was used over the total communication expenses of the region of reference. The equation (1) presents the adapted Laspeyres index used in the aggregates, for each context.

\[
L_{adptj} = \left( 1 - S_B \right) \frac{\sum_i P_{ij} \bar{Q}_{iB}}{\sum_i P_{iB} \bar{Q}_{iB}} \bigg|_{i \neq \text{communication}} + S_B \frac{V_j \bar{V}_{\text{communication},j}}{\bar{V}_{\text{communication},B}}
\]

Where \( P_{ij} \) = price of product or service \( i \) in the geographic context \( j \); \( \bar{Q}_{iB} \) = amount of product or service \( i \) in the basic geographic context (Metropolitan Region of São Paulo); \( P_{iB} \) = price of product or service \( i \) in the basic geographic context; \( S_B \) = fraction of expense with communication in total expense of basic geographic context; \( V_j \) = total “communication” expenses of geographic context \( j \).

After the calculation of the adapted Laspeyres index for each consumption basket of the corresponding years of research (see appendix 4), it would be possible to use the spatial deflator.
generated in 2008-2009 to correct the prices in both editions of the survey or use the deflator generated in 2002-2003. However, we chose to use the mean of the index numbers that were obtained.

2.6.2. Time Price Deflator

The database of the POF 2002-2003 was provided with all the products and services using the prices of January, 2003, and the POF 2008-2009 used prices of January, 2009. As a result, to match the prices of the two consumption aggregates and make them comparable over time, we need to change the values of the aggregate of 2002-2003 to prices of January, 2009.

In order to have the time deflator of the consumption aggregate of 2002-2003, we used the National Extended Consumer Price Index (Índice de Preços ao Consumidor Amplo - IPCA), calculated by IBGE, the same index that is already applied to the POF. We chose to adjust the prices of each expense group with their corresponding index, since we are dealing with consumption information.

Table 2: Time deflators, according to the expense groups of the consumption aggregate and their corresponding compatibility with IPCA groups and subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Groups of Consumption Aggregate</th>
<th>Group / Subgroup IPCA Code</th>
<th>Group / Subgroup IPCA</th>
<th>Deflator (jan/2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Alimentação e bebidas</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable Goods</td>
<td>3201 Eletrodomésticos e equipamentos</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5102 Veículo próprio</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare, education and transportation</td>
<td>5 Transpor tes</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6003 Plano de saúde</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Educação</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2 Habitação</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Comunicação</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods</td>
<td>2 Habitação</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Vestuário</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6102 Óculos e lentes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6301 Higiene pessoal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7101 Serviços pessoais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 Recreação, Fumo e Filmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8103 Papelaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Comunicação</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In table 2, the IPCA categories are listed and their corresponding indexes are used to deflate the categories of the consumption aggregate of 2002-2003. In the case of the Other goods category, we created a weighted grouped index from the weight of each corresponding group in the price index. That is, the deflator of the Other good category of the consumption aggregate results of the ratio of the sum of products with monthly weighted variation of prices by the weight of each corresponding group over the total weight of items that compose this category, according to equation (2).

\[
(2) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\text{monthly variation of prices}_i) (\text{weight}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{weight}_i}
\]

where \(i = \text{IPCA group, subgroup or item; } n = \text{total number of IPCA group, subgroup or item that compose the Other category of frame 1 (n=8).} \)
The time deflator is the last step of the elaboration of consumption aggregates. Thus, we can start the analysis of the per capita consumption performance of Brazil in the periods that range from 2002-2003 until 2008-2009 presented in the following sections.

3. Growth of consumption, inequality and their effects on Welfare

In this section, we analyze the growth of consumption in the period between the two releases of the studied POFs, as well as their effects on welfare. Also, we analyze the evolution of the consumption components.

3.1. The evolution of the mean per capita consumption in the period that ranges from 2002-2003 until 2008-2009

After the calculations described in the previous section, we can observe the consumption behavior. First, we analyze the evolution of consumption between the periods of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009 by the mean per capita and the participation rate of components, according to the location of families in the Major Regions and in the urban and rural areas. The participation of per capita consumption components is also measured according to their deciles.

As observed in table 3, the mean per capita consumption grew in all the geographic areas that were analyzed between the periods of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. In Brazil, it grew 17.5%, from R$544 to R$639. Regarding the geographic areas, there was an increase in all the Major Regions, and the South (22.5%) and North (22%) regions presented the highest variations. Comparing the urban and rural areas, the second one registered an increase around 30%, a lot bigger than the rate observed in the urban areas, of approximately 16%.

Table 3: Mean per capita of consumption components according to geographic areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Regions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Areas</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


When we evaluate the consumption components, we notice all the categories registered an increase, but it did not happen in a homogeneous way. The Durable goods component had an increase of 83.7% in the period while the remaining components grew in average 11.2%. This distinction in the durable goods category was registered in all the major regions, both in urban and rural areas. Such result was expected and complies with the incentive policy carried out by the government for the renewal of the line of household appliances that present sustainable power consumption and also with the pro-cyclical growth policy via automotive industry. Regions that usually present difficulty in accessing technology, due to distance or social issues, such as the rural areas and the Northeast region were the ones that presented the greatest growth, 103.2% and 98.5%, respectively. The rural area also registered significant increases of consumption in the groups of health, education and transportation (50.8%), other goods (38.8%) and housing (26.9%).
Table 4: Participation rate of consumption components, according to geographic areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Regarding the composition of the consumption aggregate (table 4), we notice the structure of the consumption pattern did not change despite the strong growth of durable goods, from 8.6% to 13.5% of participation, between 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. The component that was responsible for most expenses of the Brazilian consumption units remains housing, followed by food. This relation remains despite the increase of 4.9 p.p. in the participation of durable goods, because the remaining consumption components had small reductions in their participations. Food was the component that suffered the greatest loss in the period, around 1.7 p.p..

Table 5: Participation rates of the consumption components by decile of per capita consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 5, we check the composition of the consumption categories behaved according to the deciles of per capita consumption. The food component was the only one that registered a drop in participation in all the deciles of distribution, while the durable goods had the opposite result, increasing their participation. It is worth mentioning that the greatest decrease in the participation of food took place in the lowest deciles, and the Durable goods group had the highest increases in participation among the classes with the greatest consumption. The housing component only presents an increase in participation in the two first deciles of distribution, while the participation of Education, health and transportation reduced only in the two last deciles. It is worth mentioning that the components with greater participation in all deciles are food and housing in both periods. In the food expenditure exceeded the housing expenditure only in the two first deciles. However, in 2008-2009, this relationship reversed in these deciles and housing had the greatest participation in all the distribution.
3.2. The incidence of growth over the consumption distribution in Brazil

This subsection analyzes how the distribution of the Per capita Consumption (PCC) evolved between the POF 2002-2003 and 2008-2009, their impacts over growth (mean), inequality and social welfare.

The Pen’s Parade, Figure 1-a, shows the values of the PCC from the 1st to the 95th percentile of distribution, enabling to easily see the inequality in the PCC values of several percentiles of the population. Also, we can observe the PCC values of 2008-2009 are always higher than the PCC values of 2002-2003, demonstrating a growth in consumption from the 1st to the 95th percentile of the population. For example, the PCC of the 90th percentile was (approximately) R$1200 in 2002-2003 and R$1400 in 2008-2009. With the support of the Growth Incidence Curve (GIC), Figure 1-b, we notice the Pen’s Parade evolved. That is, it shows the growth rate of PCC for each percentile, and we can better observe the incidence of growth. As we can see, the consumption growth in the period is not widespread because there is no increase in the last percentile of distribution. Since the PCC did not increase in the higher percentile, the GIC has a negative part and it not possible to state the welfare of each individual/family increased. For a better evaluation of social welfare, we take a function that values both increments in PCC and progressive transfers (Pigou-Dalton)\(^9\).

According to Figure 1-b, for approximately 90% of the population the PCC grew above the mean (17%), being above 20% in many cases. From the 85th percentile on, the growth rates decrease, falling below the mean after the 90th percentile. This growth pattern brings consequences for both the social welfare and the inequality and poverty, as we will see in the following sections.

While the Pen’s Parade basically describes the consumption increments along the distribution, the Generalized Lorenz Curve (GLC) considers how gains or losses that occurred impact the social welfare, for a society that values consumption increments and progressive transfer. In each percentile of distribution, the GLC shows how the population share contributes (in R$) to the observed mean value\(^10\).

\(^9\)Progressive transfer of Pigou-Dalton occurs when the consumption (income) is transferred from a richer person to a poorer person, without changing the original rank of people in the consumption aggregate (income). See Chakravarty (2009), Sen and Foster (1997).

\(^10\)After ordering the population by the PCC, you can define the coordinates of the Generalized Lorenz Curve as GLC(p) = \(\Sigma c_i/N\), where N is the total population and \(\Sigma c_i\) is the accumulated total of per capita consumption until percentile p. GLC(p) can also be written according to the partial mean p: GLC(p) = (\(\Sigma c_i/N_p\))/(\(\Sigma c_i/N\)) \(\times\) p, where \(N_p\) is
The Figure 2-a below show the GLC of 2008-2009 is always greater than the GLC of 2002-2003. In this case, we can state: the social welfare is greater in 2008-2009 for a broad class of functions (strictly S-concave and increase functions)\(^{11}\) that value not only the consumption increments but also progressive transfers.

![Figure 2: (a) Generalized Lorenz Curves (b) Partial means growth decomposition by consumption components](image)


Now in Figure 2-b we describe how the increments of GLC are decomposed by increments in each consumption component. The curves presented result of the ratio between the changes in the generalized concentration curve of each component \((k)\) of consumption \((\text{GCC}_k)\)\(^{12}\) and the changes in GLC.

As shown in Table 5, the housing items and the other goods were responsible for the greatest consumption increments in the tenth percentile but, if we look at Figure 2-b, we can identify how these variations contribute for the growth of the mean PCC of different population groups. As a result, we have that for the first 10% of the population a little more than 40% of the GLC increase results of the housing item, around 27% of the other goods and around 8% of the food item.

In percentile 60, we have an important result: the components housing and durable goods contribute with the same participation for the growth of GLC, around 25%. After that point (P60), the durable goods become the component that contributes more to the growth of GLC. Considering 100% of the population, we clearly notice the big distinction of the durable goods item in relation to the others. Alone, this component was responsible for over 40% of the growth

---

\(^{11}\)The function \(W(X_n)\) is strictly S-concave when \(W(X_n.A_{n×n}) > W(X_n)\) for any \(X_n\) belonging to the domain and any matrix \((A_{n×n})\) whose elements \(a_{ij}\) are all non-negative, having 1 as the total of each line and the total of each column (Chakravarty, 2009).

\(^{12}\)After ordering the population by the PCC, you can define the coordinates of the generalized concentration curve of component \(k\) for the group \(p\) of the population, such as: \(\text{GCC}_k(p) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} c_{k,i}/N\), where \(N\) is the total population and \(\sum_{i=1}^{p} c_{k,i}\) is the accumulated total of consumption (per capita) in component \(k\) until percentile \(p\). Notice that the GLC results of the sum of the generalized concentration curves, that is \(\text{GLC}(p) = \sum_k \text{GCC}_k(p)\), where \(\sum_k\) represents the sum of consumption components. Besides, remember the GLC(p) can be interpreted as the product of the “partial mean p” and the percentile \(p\) itself, as explained in a previous comment. Similarly, \(\text{GCC}_k(p)\) can be written as a function of the “partial mean p of component k”: \(\text{GCC}_k(p) = (\sum_{i=1}^{p} c_{k,i}/N_p).(N_p/N)=(\mu_k).p\), where \(N_p\) is the accumulated total of the population until the percentile \(p\).
of the mean PCC, the housing component was the second more important with participation close to 25%. The others contribute with little more than 10% each.

### 3.3. Effects of the growth in consumption and inequality on welfare

In order to measure the impact of consumption over the welfare of the Brazilian families, social welfare functions were adopted \(^{13}\), and they can be affected by both the growth and the redistribution that occurred in the periods of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. Such functions, in abbreviated form, summarize the information contained in the social welfare functions in two parameters, the mean PCC (that indicates the "size of the pie") and the inequality (that indicates how the "pie" is shared). These abbreviated functions are represented in this article by the Sen mean (associated with the Gini index) and the geometric mean (associated with the Atkinson index, with parameter equal to 1). The expressions of the Sen mean \(W_{\text{Sen}}(c)\) and the geometric mean \(W_{\text{Geo}}(c)\), are represented below \(^{14}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) \quad W_{\text{SEN}}(c) &= \frac{\sum \sum \min(c_i, c_j)}{N^2} = \mu(c) [1 - I_{\text{GINI}}(c)] \\
(b) \quad W_{\text{GEO}}(c) &= (\prod c_i)^{1/N} = \mu(c) [1 - I_{\text{ATK}}(c)]
\end{align*}
\]

where: \(c_i = \text{consumption of individual } i; \) \(c_j = \text{consumption of individual } j, \) \(N = \text{total population, } I_{\text{Gini}}(c) = \text{Gini index}; I_{\text{Atk}}(c) = \text{Atkinson's inequality index}; \mu(c) = \text{mean per capita consumption.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>POF</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>Urban Areas</th>
<th>Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>µ(c)</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dif. (%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_{\text{atk}}(c) \times 100)</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dif. (%)</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_{\text{gin}}(c) \times 100)</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dif. (%)</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W_{\text{Sen}}(c) = W_{\mu}(c) \cdot [1 - I_{\text{atk}}(c)])</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dif. (%)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W_{\text{Geo}}(c) = W_{\mu}(c) \cdot [1 - I_{\text{gin}}(c)])</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dif. (%)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Growth effect (%) =**

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta \ln(W_{\mu}(c)) / \Delta \ln(W_{\text{Sen}}(c)) = 93% &\quad \text{Total} \\
\Delta \ln(W_{\mu}(c)) / \Delta \ln(W_{\text{Geo}}(c)) = 95% &\quad \text{Total}
\end{align*}
\]

Table 6 shows the values of the mean \(W_{\text{Sen}}(c), W_{\text{Geo}}(c), \mu(c),\) as well as inequality indexes \(I_{\text{gin}}(c)\) and \(I_{\text{atk}}(c)\) in the POF 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. Two points call attention. The first point is the growth of 17% in the \(\mu(c)\), already detailed in the previous section. The second point is the "relative stability" of inequality in Brazil between the two editions of the survey. To Brazil, we see that \(I_{\text{Gini}}(c)\) diminishes 0.7, from 50.2 to 49.5 while \(I_{\text{Atk}}(c)\) diminishes 0.6, from 36.0 to 35.4.

---

\(^{13}\)We assume the social welfare functions are homogeneous of degree 1 (or there is a monotonous transformation that makes it homogeneous of degree 1).

\(^{14}\)More details on these welfare functions and these inequality indexes can be found in Sen and Foster (1997), Lambert (2001), Duclos and Araar (2006) and Chakravarty (2009).
Two exceptions are the South region and rural areas where the variations are greater. The greatest reductions in inequality are in the South region - where $I_{\text{Gini}}(c)$ changes from 45.4 to 43.3 and $I_{\text{Atk}}(c)$ changes from 30.3 to 28.1. In the rural areas, the both indexes indicate an increase in inequality in the period.

Considering the observed subtle reduction of inequality and the growth of consumption, we can conclude that the growth of consumption was the main reason for the evolution of the social welfare, registered both in $W_{\text{Sen}}(c)$ and $W_{\text{Geo}}(c)$. The two last lines of Table 6 show the contribution of the changes of $\mu(c)$ to the changes of $W_{\text{Sen}}(c)$ and $W_{\text{Geo}}(c)$, using the logarithmic scale. To Brazil as a whole, we see the growth explains 93% or 95% of the increase in social welfare depending on the adopted measure, $W_{\text{Sen}}(c)$ or $W_{\text{Geo}}(c)$. In the South region, the role of growth was a little smaller, contributing with around 84% or 87% of changes of $W_{\text{Sen}}(c)$ or $W_{\text{Geo}}(c)$, the remaining (16% or 13%) is explained by the reduction of inequalities. In the rural areas, the growth was followed by the increase of inequalities, reducing the gains of welfare.

As seen before (Figure 2-b), 40% of the increase of $\mu(c)$ in Brazil is explained by the durable goods, around 25% is explained by housing and the remaining by the other components. In this sense, the durable goods contribute in a significant way for the increase of social welfare but it does not explain the modest reductions of inequality that were reported. In order to have an overview of how the consumption components influenced inequality and welfare, it is necessary to evaluate the evolution of their concentration over the period, according to the approach that will be present in the next subsection.

4. Inequality Decomposition

In order to understand which consumption components were the most important for the small reduction of inequality that was observed, several decompositions exercises will be made in this section. First, we analyze the consumption components according to the deficit share of the Lorenz curves and the concentration curves. In the two following subsections, we describe the exercises of static and dynamic decompositions made and the analyses of the results of such decompositions.

4.1. Graphic Decomposition

In this subsection, we graphically analyze which factors contributed to the small reduction of inequality, preventing a greater growth of welfare among the families.

Figure 3 shows the behavior of the Lorenz curve (L) of the PCC and the Concentration Curves (C) of their components $^{15}$ using as reference the distance of the curves from the straight line of perfect equality (straight line of 45°)$^{16}$. Thus, the areas below these curves indicate inequality and consumption concentration. The dotted lines show the results of the POF edition carried out in 2008-2009, the remaining show the results of the POF edition carried out in 2002-2003. We notice that for the components Education, Health and Transportation and Other Goods the

$^{15}$The coordinates of the Lorenz curve can be obtained by dividing the values of the coordinates of the generalized Lorenz curve by the mean: $L(p)=\text{GLC}(p)\mu$, where $\mu$ is the mean PCC and GLC$(p)$ is defined in a previous comment. The coordinates of the Concentration Curves are obtained in a similar way: $C(p)=\text{GCC}_k(p)\mu_k$, where $\mu_k$ indicates the mean value of component k and GCC$_k$(p) is defined in a previous note. More details on these curves are found in Chakravarty (2009), Sen and Foster (1997), Lambert (2001), Duclos and Araar (2006).

$^{16}$In this case, the differences $[p - L(p)]$ for the Lorenz curves and $[p - C(p)]$ for the concentration curves.
curves of 2008-2009 are always below the curves of 2002-2003. That indicates these components became less concentrated, contributing to the reduction of inequalities. The opposite happens with the durable goods, which became more concentrated and, to a certain extent, reduced the speed of the reduction of inequality.

4.2. Static Decomposition

In this subsection, the exercises of analytical and counterfactual decomposition used to measure the contribution of growth and of each consumption component to inequality.

In order to numerically evaluate the contribution of the five consumption components to inequality, we make use of four static decompositions, where two of them are considered analytical and the other two counterfactual. The analytical decompositions are based on Rao (1969), Lerman and Yitzhaki (1985), Shorrocks (1982), Jenkins (1995), Soares (2006) and Hoffmann (2006) and counterfactual decompositions are based on Shapley’s value (1953), Shorrocks ([1999]2013), Barros et al (2006), Duclos and Araar (2006) and Azevedo et al (2013).

Analytical Decomposition

The calculation of the analytical decomposition of the *per capita* consumption CV follows Shorrocks (1982)\(^{17}\), where for each component k (k=1,...5) are calculated the weight in total consumption \(S_k\), the correlation with the PCC \(\rho_k\) and the coefficient of variation \(CV_k\). Thus, for the CV, the relative contribution of component k is given through \(R_{CV,k} = S_k \rho_k CV_k / CV\) and the absolute contribution is given by \(A_{CV,k} = S_k \rho_k CV_k\), and the sum of the relative contributions are one, \(\sum R_{CV,k} = 1\).

\(^{17}\)Shorrocks suggests the relative contribution of component k is given through the ratio \(R_k = \text{cov}(PCC_k, PCC) / \text{var}(PCC)\), where PCC\(_k\) is the per capita consumption of component k, regardless of the inequality measure used. Notice that this expression is equivalent to the expression used in the CV decomposition. Jenkins (1995), Ferreira et al (2006) and Brewer and Wren-Lewis (2012) use the same principle to decompose the generalized entropy \(I_{\text{Gini}} = CV / 2\).
On the other hand, the calculation of the Gini analytical decomposition was based on Rao (1969) and Lerman and Yitzhaki (1985). In this method, we calculate for each component \( k \) their weight in total consumption \( (S_k) \), their Gini correlation \( Gini(r_k) \), their Gini index \( (I_{Gini,k}) \), as well as their concentration coefficient \( (\theta_k) \). As a result, to Gini, the relative contribution of component \( k \) is given by \( R_{Gini,k} = \frac{S_k r_k I_{Gini,k}}{I_{Gini}} \) and the absolute contribution is given by \( A_{Gini,k} = \frac{S_k \theta_k}{I_{Gini}} \), where \( A_{Gini,k} = R_{Gini,k} I_{Gini} \) and \( \sum_k R_{Gini,k} = 1 \).

The main advantage of these methods is that they describe inequality from three characteristics of their components: weight, inequality and association with PCC. The greatest disadvantage is in the fact these analytical decompositions do not correspond directly to a counterfactual exercise (Jenkins, 1995). For this reason, inequality was also analyzed through counterfactual decompositions.

**Counterfactual Decomposition**

For the counterfactual decompositions, we followed Shorrocks ([1999]2013) e Duclos e Araar (2006) that describe the use of the Shapley\(^{19}\) value in the decomposition of inequality measures. Next, two exercises are presented, which follow similar routines, with the first having the five PCC components replaced by their means and the second having the components replaced by zero.

In the first exercise, called Shapley-Gini(mean), we take an initial sequence of five steps. In each step, one of the components of consumption \( (k) \) is replaced by their mean. The variation of the inequality index given by \( A_{mean,k}^t = \Delta_{mean,k}^t I_{Gini} \) is calculated and kept as an estimated contribution for this component. In the end of this initial sequence, we have five estimated contributions, one for each component. Later, we make another sequence of five steps where the components are replaced in a new order. Again, the variation of the inequality index is calculated and kept in each one of the steps, obtaining \( A_{mean,k}^t \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, 5 \). The exercise proceeds until all the \( T \) sequences (of possible replacements in five steps) are covered. In the end, we consider the mean of all the estimated contributions of component \( k \) as the absolute contribution, which is given by \( A_{mean,k} = \frac{\sum A_{mean,k}^t}{T} \), \( t=1,\ldots,T \). The relative contribution of component \( k \) is given by the ratio of the absolute contribution over the Gini index, expressed by \( R_{mean,k} = \frac{A_{mean,k}}{I_{Gini}} \).

The second exercise, called Shapley-Gini(zero), is similar but the components are replaced by zero. Comparably, we can define the estimated contribution of component \( k \) in the sequence \( t \) as \( A_{zero,k}^t = \Delta_{zero,k}^t I_{Gini} \). Thus, the absolute contribution and the relative contribution of component \( k \) are given, respectively, by \( A_{zero,k} = \sum A_{zero,k}^t / T \) e \( R_{zero,k} = A_{zero,k} / I_{Gini} \).

The results of these two decompositions, using the consumption aggregates of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009, are presented in table 7.

\(^{18}\) The Gini correlation can be define as \( r_k = \frac{\text{cov}(\text{PCC}_k, F_{PCC})}{\text{cov}(\text{PCC}_k, F_{PCC,k})} \), where \( F_{PCC} \) and \( F_{PCC,k} \) are the accumulated distribution functions of the PCC and of their component \( k \).

\(^{19}\) In the original formulation, the Shapley value is a solution of cooperative games used to designate the gains the different players obtain when they engage in coalitions, Shapley (1953). Shorrocks ([1999] 2013) show the Shapley value can be applied to the decompositions of poverty and inequality.
Table 7: Inequality decomposition by consumption components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequality Decomposition</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Durable goods</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Education, health, transport</th>
<th>Others goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>2.321</td>
<td>1.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV₂ × CV</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini Correlation (r₁)</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration Index (B₁)</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini (Zero) (Mean)</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Share (S₀)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7 shows how each consumption component contributed for the inequality level observed in the POF 2002–2003 and 2008–2009, according to the four decompositions described above. We can observe the similarity of results between the two analytical decompositions, Analytical: CV and Gini, and the counterfactual decomposition that replaces the components by their mean, Shapley-Gini(mean). For these three decompositions, in 2002–2003, housing contributed with approximately 33% to 36% of the observed inequality and Education, health and transportation contributed with approximately 23% to 25%. The high contribution of Housing results, to a great extent, of its weight on consumption (34%). The contribution of Education, health and transportation results of the inequality and concentration on the consumption of the own component. Anyway, these two components are the ones that contributed more to inequality in 2002–2003. However, the component Durable goods has the smaller contribution (from 6% to 9%) due to the smaller weight on consumption (9%) in 2002-2003.

When we analyze the same three decompositions in 2008–2009, we notice that the contributions of Housing (31% to 36%) and Education, health and transportation (21% to 24%) decreased, while the contribution of Durable goods (11% to 15%) increased, indicating a certain change in the inequality structure in this period. Nevertheless, Housing and Education, health and transportation remained the components with the bigger contribution to inequality, while Durable goods is the component with the smaller contribution.
The counterfactual decomposition that replaces the components by zero, called Shapley-Gini(zero), also indicates an increase in the contribution of Durable goods (from 23% to 25%) and a reduction in the contributions of Housing (from 40% to 38%) and Education, health and transportation (from 18% to 16%) between the two editions of the survey.

4.3. Inequality Change Decomposition

The last procedures adopted in relation to inequality aim at decomposing its evolution. For this purpose, six exercises were made, two of them, Gini(Hoffmann-Soares) and one Shapley-Gini(new), are dynamic aspects and the remaining four simply use the information already calculated of static decompositions above. The last four exercises are made, basically, from the variations of the absolute contributions of each component (ΔA_{CV,k}, ΔA_{Gini,k}, ΔA_{mean,k} ou ΔA_{zero,k}) and the variations of the inequality indexes (ΔCV ou ΔI_{Gini}). Next, the ratios of the variation of each component over the variation of inequality are calculated (ΔA_{CV}/ΔCV, ΔA_{Gini}/ΔI_{Gini}, ΔA_{mean}/ΔI_{Gini} ou ΔA_{zero,k}/ΔI_{Gini}). The result is an estimate of the relative contribution of each component for the evolution of inequality.

The two dynamic decompositions follow different approaches. Shapley-Gini (new) is based on a new counterfactual exercise where the consumption components of 2002-2003 are replaced by the consumption components of 2008-2009, as suggested by Barros et al (2006) and Azevedo et al (2013). The Shapley value was used and, as the previous “static” exercises, we calculated the estimated contribution of component k in sequence t as A'_{new,k}ΔI_{Gini}. Thus, the absolute and the relative contributions of component k are given, respectively, by A_{new,k} = ∑_{t=1}^{T} A'_{new,k,t} and R_{new,k} = A_{new,k}/ΔI_{Gini}.

Notice that in this decomposition there is no concern or interest in calculating the contribution of the component for the inequality level, but only the contribution to the change (or to the evolution) of the Gini index.

The second dynamic decomposition follows Hoffmann (2006) and Soares (2006). These authors calculate the absolute contribution of a component k as the result of two effects. The "composition effect" given by (5) and the "concentration effect" expressed by (6):

(5) W_k = ΔS_k \left( \theta_k^* - I_{Gini}^* \right), \text{ onde } \theta_k^* = \frac{(\theta_{k,a}^* + \theta_{k,b}^*)}{2}, \text{ onde } I_{Gini}^* = \frac{(I_{Gini,a} + I_{Gini,b})}{2}, a = 2002_2003, b=2008_2009

(6) U_k = Δ\theta_k S_k^*, \text{ onde } S_k^* = \frac{(S_{k,a} + S_{k,b})}{2}

As a result, the absolute contribution of component k is given by: A_{wu,k} = W_k + U_k and the relative contribution of k is given by the ratio of the absolute contribution over the variation of the Gini index, that is, R_{wu,k} = A_{wu,k}/ΔI_{Gini}.

The results obtained from these new exercises can be seen in the table below
Table 8: Inequality Change Decomposition by Consumption Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Δ Inequality Decomposition</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Durable goods</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Education, health, transport</th>
<th>Others goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>ΔS₀</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV (ρ₀ x CV₀)</td>
<td>ΔS₀</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-284%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>171%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analytical**

| CV                         | ΔS₀  | -0.017        | 0.049   | -0.015                        | -0.007      | -0.010| 0.000 |
| CV (ρ₀ x CV₀)              | ΔS₀  | -0.010        | 0.103   | 0.026                         | -0.015      | -0.121|      |
| Absolute Contribution     |      | -0.015        | 0.056   | -0.011                        | -0.016      | -0.034| -0.020|
| Relative Contribution     | 74%  | -284%         | 56%     | 81%                           | 171%        | 100%  |

**Shapley**

| Gini (Hoffmann-Soares)     | Wᵢ = ΔSᵢ (θᵢ *=Iₜᵢ *=Iₜᵢ )* | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.000 | -0.001 | 0.000 | 0.002 |
| Gini (Mean)                | Uᵢ = δ₀ᵢ S₀ *                   | -0.001| 0.004 | -0.001| -0.004 | -0.007| -0.008|
| Absolute Contribution     | -21% | -77%          | 13%     | 86%                           | 98%         | 100%  |
| Relative Contribution     | 110%| -442%         | 123%    | 141%                          | 168%        | 100%  |

| Gini (Zero)                | Wᵢ = ΔSᵢ (θᵢ *=Iₜᵢ *=Iₜᵢ )* | 0.006 | 0.008 | 0.003 | -0.012 | -0.011| -0.007|
| Gini (New)                 | Uᵢ = δ₀ᵢ S₀ *                   | -0.001| 0.006 | -0.005| -0.001 | -0.006| -0.007|
| Absolute Contribution     | -88% | -121%         | -51%    | 189%                          | 171%        | 100%  |
| Relative Contribution     | 14%  | -86%          | 71%     | 14%                           | 86%         | 100%  |

OBS:  Sᵢ *= (Sᵢ,a + Sᵢ,b)/2,  θᵢ *= (θᵢ,a +θᵢ,b)/2,  Iₜᵢ *= (Iₜᵢ,a + Iₜᵢ,b)/2,  a= 2002-2003 and b=2008-2009

Table 8 shows the result of these six processes, with the analytical being called: CV, Gini and Gini (Hoffmann-Soares); and the counterfactual based on Shapley’s value are called: Gini (mean), Gini (zero) and Gini (new). The relative contributions with negative values indicate the component contributed to the increase of inequality; similarly, the positive values contributed to its reduction. We can notice that for the CV and Gini decompositions only the durable goods component has negatively contributed to the reduction of inequality. That is, if the inequality associated with this component is eliminated, the drop in inequality would be of 284% and 448%, respectively, more than that observed. The component other goods had significant impact for the reduction of inequality, from 86% to 175%, depending on the decomposition method used.

In the Shapley-Gini(mean) decomposition, the consumption concentration of durable goods contributed, in absolute terms, with 0.029 points to the increase of Gini between 2002-2003 and 2008-2009, in relative terms the evolution of this concentration meant the component prevented inequality from dropping 442% more than the registered drop.

The dynamic decompositions Shapley-Gini (new) and Gini (Hoffmann-Soares) indicate that, if the inequality generated by the evolution of durable goods is eliminated, the Gini index would be reduced 86% and 77%, respectively, more than that has been observed. On the other hand, the component Other goods was the one that contributed more for the reduction of inequalities (86% and 98%).

5. Analysis of Poverty from the perspective of the consumption behavior and its components

In this section, we study the effects of the evolution of consumption over poverty using graphical and dominance analyses as well as counterfactual analyses based on Shapley’s value. For this
purpose, two previous exercises are necessary, as defined by Sen (1976, 1982): the identification exercise and the aggregation exercise.20

The Identification exercise is, in general, based on some poverty line (z) that sets a limit to the welfare indicator, in this case the PCC. The poor are the ones whose welfare indicator (PCC) is below the poverty line. The non-poor are the ones whose welfare (PCC) is greater or equal to this line.21 In this work, as in Oliveira et al (2016), we adopted two absolute lines based on the minimal wage. The calculation of the poverty line and the identification were made in two steps: i) selection of families with per capita income around half minimum wage (between R$202.50 and R$212.50) and a quarter of the minimum wage (between R$101.25 and R$106.25) in 2008; ii) calculation of the median per capita consumption of these two groups, which generated the lines R$ 207 and R$104. It is worth highlighting that this calculation process was made using the values of the consumption aggregate that was carried out in 2008-2009.

For the aggregation step of poverty analysis, let’s calculate the three poverty measures of the FGT family (Foster, Greer and Thorbecke, 1984) that are the indexes of main reference in literature for the subject. According to equation 7, we have:

$$(7) \text{FGT} (\alpha) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{z-c_i}{z} \right]^\alpha S_i$$

where z is the value of the poverty line, c_i is the value of the consumption of individual i and S_i is a dummy variable that equals 1 if the i-th individual is below the poverty line and 0, otherwise.

The poverty measures of the family FGT are functions of the poverty gap and the value of $\alpha$. The measures of incidence and intensity of poverty are not sensitive to the consumption inequality among the poor, that is, a progressive redistribution of consumption in the poor population is not captured by the measures FGT [$\alpha$=0] or FGT [$\alpha$=1]. Only the severity of poverty is sensitive to inequality among the poor, then the more heterogeneous the poor population, ceteris paribus, the greater the value of the FGT [$\alpha$=2] indicator. For this reason, we will focus our analyses in this index.

Figure 4-a shows the proportion of poor people in Brazil, in 2002-2003 and 2008-2009, for different poverty lines (R$1 ≤ z ≤ R$ 250). That helps viewing the sensitivity of the identification exercise showed on the inclination of the curves around the lines R$ 207 and R$ 104. We notice the curve of 2002-2003 is always more inclined (more sensitive) than the curve of 2008-2009, which indicates that in 2002-2003 the number of poor people grows more than in 2008-2009 as the value of the poverty line increases. Besides, we notice there is a decrease in the proportion of poor people in this period, no matter the line used. As a result, we can say the curve of 2008-2009 dominates the curve of 2002-2003. Then, the poverty measures of the FGT family, which are presented in this work, were all greater than in 2002-2003. For example, for the line R$104,

---

20 Besides the emphasis given to the identification and aggregation, the Sen studies showed the limitations of the poverty measures more commonly used at that time and stimulated an axiomatic approach where the indexes are created to meet certain properties/axioms and are evaluated by the adequacy of these axioms.

21 For more details on the different methodologies, definitions and interpretations of the absolute, relative and subjective lines, see Ravaillon (2001), Atkinson et al (2002) and Soares (2009).

22 More details can be found in Chakravarty (2009), Sen and Foster (1997), Lambert (2001), Duclos and Araar (2006).
the proportion of poor people (FGT(\(\alpha=0\))) is around 9% in 2002-2003 and around 6% in 2008-2009. In turn, for the line R$ 207, the portion of the poor population is close to 29% in 2002-2003 and close to 23% in 2008-2009.

The calculated gaps poverty curve (accumulated)\(^{23}\), Figure 4-b, shows another dominance relation that reflects the results of the Generalized Lorenz Curve. The gaps curve for the line R$207 of 2002-2003 is always above the curve of 2008-2009. That means the poverty measures with good properties and sensitive to consumption inequalities among the poor will be all greater in 2002-2003 than in 2008-2009.

The two dominance relations described above ensure poverty will be smaller in 2008-2009 for the indexes of the FGT family and many others such as, for example, the Watts and the Sen-Shorrocks-Thon indexes\(^{24}\).

5.1. Poverty Decomposition
The effects of the consumption evolution and its components over poverty was also measured from the static and dynamic decompositions. In the following subsections, we will describe the methods used in the decompositions and the results obtained.

5.1.1. Growth of per capita consumption, inequality and poverty reduction
The distribution of the per capita consumption can be described by its mean and the Lorenz curve, \(c(\mu, L)\). Thus, we can represent the poverty index as \(FGT(\alpha, \mu, L, z)\). That enables the separation of the impact of consumption growth from the impact of inequality on poverty by some counterfactual simulations and the Shapley value. In this case, the two elements of counterfactual simulation are \(\mu\) and \(L\), and the exercises consist of evaluating the index value when we change each one of these elements in two possible orders. Remember that the Shapley value is the mean of the obtained impacts. As a result, for constant \(\alpha\) and \(z\), the absolute impact of growth on poverty is given by:

\[^{23}\text{The absolute gaps are given by } G_i = \max\{z - c_i, 0\}, \text{ where } z \text{ is the poverty line and } c_i \text{ is the per capita consumption of individual } i.\]
\[^{24}\text{These are other indexes are found in Chakravarty (2009), Sen and Foster (1997), Lambert (2001) and Duclos and Araar (2006).}\]
\[
A_{FGT,\mu} = \frac{[FGT(\mu_1L_0) - FGT(\mu_0L_0) + FGT(\mu_1L_1) - FGT(\mu_0L_1)]}{2}
\]

Where \( \mu_0 \) = mean PCC of 2002-2003; \( \mu_1 \) = mean PCC of 2008-2009; \( L_0 \) = Lorenz curve of 2002-2003; \( L_1 \) = Lorenz curve of 2008-2009.

Comparably, the absolute impact of inequality on poverty is given by:

\[
A_{FGT,L} = \frac{[FGT(\mu_0L_1) - FGT(\mu_0L_0) + FGT(\mu_1L_1) - FGT(\mu_1L_0)]}{2}
\]

Since the Shapley value generates exact decompositions, the relative impact is obtained from the ratios:

\[
R_{FGT,\mu} = \frac{A_{FGT,\mu}}{A_{FGT,\mu} + A_{FGT,L}} = \frac{A_{FGT,\mu}}{FGT(\mu_1L_1) - FGT(\mu_0L_0)} = \frac{A_{FGT,\mu}}{\Delta FGT}
\]

\[
R_{FGT,L} = \frac{A_{FGT,L}}{A_{FGT,\mu} + A_{FGT,L}} = \frac{A_{FGT,L}}{FGT(\mu_1L_1) - FGT(\mu_1L_0)} = \frac{A_{FGT,L}}{\Delta FGT}
\]

### Table 9: Poverty decomposition by Brazil and Geographical Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty = FGT</th>
<th>POF Brazil</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Urban Areas</th>
<th>Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif.</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth effect</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif.</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth effect</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif.</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth effect</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9 shows the values of FGT(α=0), FGT(α=1) and FGT(α=2) of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009 to Brazil, major regions, urban and rural areas, as well as their variations and the contribution (or the effect) related to growth using the two poverty lines of reference (R$ 207 and R$ 104).

As expected, poverty reduced in Brazil for the three values of \( \alpha \) and for the two poverty lines. Moreover, that occurs in all the regions, in the urban and rural areas. The greater decreases occurred in the North and Northeast regions and in the rural areas. For FGT(α=2 and z=R$207), poverty dropped from 0.054 to 0.039 in Brazil. The reduction of poverty in the North and the Northeast regions was of 0.027 and 0.026, respectively. In the rural areas, poverty reduced from 0.107 to 0.079. For the FGT(α=2 and z=R$104) index, the reduction of poverty was also more...
significant for these regions. Brazil registered a drop of 0.004, the North and Northeast regions moved from 0.015 to 0.010, from 0.022 to 0.015, respectively, and in the rural areas, the reduction was of 0.009.

The Southeast region was the Major Region that registered the lower decrease in poverty for both poverty lines used in the FGT indexes.

As we can notice, in general, the effect of the consumption growth has values close to or greater than 100%, which indicate the reduction in poverty registered by FGT(α=2) for the two lines of poverty (z=R$207 and R$104) are explained by the growth and not for the variation of inequalities.

In the Midwest region, there was the lowest reduction in poverty due to the consumption growth since only 58% of the drop in FGT(α=2 and z=R$104) is explained by the increase of µ and the remaining (42%) by variations of L.

5.1.2. Poverty Decomposition by Consumption Components
The contribution of consumption components for the poverty levels observed and their evolution was measured from the counterfactual exercises and the decompositions based on Shapley value, similarly to the exercises made for inequality in section 3.2. The first exercise, called Shapley-FGT(zero) is based on Shorrocks ([1999]2013) and Duclos and Araar (2006). It is a static exercise that tries to identify how the consumption components determine the poverty levels observed. The calculation was made for the three values of α (0, 1 and 2) and for the two poverty lines adopted (R$207 and R$104). In this exercise, we initially consider the maximum value of poverty, when all the consumption components are zero (max FGT=1). Then, we consider the first sequence of five steps. In each step, one of the consumption components (k) is added. The variation of the poverty index, given through \( A_{\text{F,zero,k}} = \Delta^1_{\text{zero,k}} \text{FGT} \), is calculated and kept as an estimated contribution for this component. In the end of the first sequence, we have five estimated contributions, one for each component. Later, we make a second sequence also with five steps, where components are added in a new order. Again, the variation of the poverty index is calculated and kept in each one of the five steps, and we obtain \( A_{\text{F,zero,k}}^2 \), \( k = 1,\ldots,5 \). The exercise proceeds until all the possible \( T \) sequences of five steps are covered.

We consider the mean of the estimated contributions of component k as the absolute contribution, which is given by \( A_{\text{F,zero,k}} = \frac{\sum A_{\text{F,zero,k}}^t}{T} \), \( t=1,\ldots,T \). Negative values in \( A_{\text{F,zero,k}} \) indicate that the component k reduces poverty. When the component is eliminated, poverty increases by \([−A_{\text{F,zero,k}}]\). The relative contribution of component k is given by \( R_{\text{F,zero,k}} = \frac{A_{\text{F,zero,k}}}{\sum A_{\text{F,zero,k}}^t} \), \( k=1,\ldots,5 \) = \( A_{\text{F,zero,k}} / (\text{FGT}−1) \).

Table 10 shows the results of the Shapley-FGT(zero) decomposition for the several calculated indexes. Housing and food represent the greatest absolute contributions in 2002-2003 and 2008-2009 for all the adopted measures and lines. However, the relative contributions of these components were reduced in the period under analysis. For the FGT(α=2) index and the poverty line R$207, the relative contributions of housing and food changed from 31% to 30% and from 29% to 27% in 2008-2009, respectively. On the other hand, the relative contribution of durable
goods increased, changing from 10% to 13% in 2008-2009. For the FGT(\(\alpha=2\)) index and the poverty line R$104, we notice similar movements. These results suggest a change in the consumption of the poorest people, with the durable goods gaining importance in the determination of the observed poverty levels.

Table 10: Share and Shapley-FGT(zero) decompositions - absolute and relative contribution by consumption components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share and Decompositions: Absolute and Relative Contribution</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Durable goods</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Education, health, transport</th>
<th>Others goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FGT((\alpha=0))</strong></td>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FGT((\alpha=1))</strong></td>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.290</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FGT((\alpha=2))</strong></td>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.1.3. Poverty Change Decomposition**

In order to evaluate how the changes in the consumption structure impacted the evolution of poverty, two additional exercises were made. The first one used information of the static decompositions of the previous subsection. For this purpose, we consider the differences of the absolute contributions of each component \(k\) (given by \(\Delta A_{\text{FGT,zero,k}}\)) and the variations of poverty indexes (\(\Delta\text{FGT}\)). Then, we calculate the ratios of the variation of each component over the variation of the FGT (\(\Delta A_{\text{FGT,zero,k}}/\Delta\text{FGT}\)). As a result, we have estimates of the relative contributions of components in the evolution of poverty.

The second exercise, called Shapley-FGT(new), is a dynamic exercise based in counterfactuals already made, in a similar way to the work done in section 3.3, where the consumption components of 2002-2003 were replaced by consumption components of 2008-2009, as suggested by Barros et al (2006) and Azevedo et al (2013). The Shapley value was used and, in a similar way, we calculated the estimated contribution of component \(k\) in the sequence \(t\) as
\[ A_{F,\text{new},k} = \Delta A_{F,\text{new},k} \] FGT. Thus, the absolute and the relative contributions of component \( k \) are given through, respectively, by

\[
A_{F,\text{new},k} = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{A_{F,\text{new},k,t}}{T}, \quad \text{onde } t = 1, \ldots, T \quad \text{e} \quad R_{F,\text{new},k} = A_{F,\text{new},k}/\Delta FGT.
\]

It is worth highlighting that in the Shapley-FGT(new) exercise there is no concern or interest in calculating the contribution of the component to the poverty level, but only its contribution to the variation of the FGT index.

**Table 11: Poverty Change Decomposition — Absolute and Relative Contribution by Consumption Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decomposition (Poverty): Absolute and Relative Contribution</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Durable goods</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Education, health, transport</th>
<th>Others goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>-95%</td>
<td>181%</td>
<td>-59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>-201%</td>
<td>265%</td>
<td>-113%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGT(α=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Contribution</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Contribution</td>
<td>-488%</td>
<td>585%</td>
<td>-291%</td>
<td>217%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 11 shows the contributions of the different components for the drop in poverty in the counterfactuals. In the dynamic Shapley-FGT(new) exercise, housing is the PCC component with the greatest contribution to the drop of poverty, for all the measures and lines used. For the FGT(α=2) index, the contribution was of 40% (for the line R$207) and 47% (for the line R$104). The durable goods also contributed for the drop in poverty, but in a more discrete way when compared to housing and other goods. When we analyze the drop in the FGT(α=2) index, the contribution of the durable goods was of 21% (for the line R$207) and 32% (for the line R$104).

The results obtained with the Shapley-FGT(zero) exercise suggest a different scenario where the durable goods had an even greater contribution. The FGT(α=2) index was of 181% and 585% for the poverty lines R$207 and R$104, respectively. Thus, we can say that, when we analyze this decomposition, the component durable goods had an essential role for the reduction of poverty.
6. Concluding Remarks

This article had the purpose of evaluating how the impact of the consumption growth and its composition reflect on the welfare, the reduction of inequality and poverty among the Brazilian families, incorporating a dynamic aspect in the analysis. In order to do that, consumption aggregates were constructed with data of the POF editions carried out in 2002-2003 and 2008-2009, based on the methodology applied in Oliveira et al (2016).

To construct a consumption aggregate capable of reflecting the welfare of families, several complex steps of expenditure item selection and data treatment are necessary. In order to compare the POF editions of 2002-2003 and 2008-2009 it was necessary to make some changes in the procedures adopted in Oliveira et al (2016). Two types of price deflators were used. For the spatial correction of prices, we used a Laspeyres (adapted) price index to replace the Paasche index used in the article mentioned above. In relation to the time correction, we chose to use specific and more suitable deflators for the expense items that compose the consumption aggregate.

Other important step in the construction of the consumption aggregate was the use of the value of services related to durable goods that are incorporated according to the use cost and not the acquisition value. The inclusion of the durable goods is made from the survey inventory, which registers the history of acquisition of these goods by the families. Thus, the consumption aggregate starts capturing the evolution of the available services in the domicile, as well as the associated welfare.

The evaluation of the per capita consumption registered an increase of 17% between 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. Besides, there was also an increase in all the major regions, and in urban and rural areas, as well as in all the five components that were evaluated (Food, Durable goods, Housing, Education, health and transportation and Other goods) registered growth in the period. However, the component Durable Goods was the main focus, being responsible for around 40% of this growth, followed by Housing (25%).

In order to analyze the effects of the consumption growth on the social welfare, social welfare functions were adopted represented by the Sen mean (associated with the Gini index) and the geometric mean (associated with the Atkinson index) and they are sensitive to both growth and redistribution. The results show the main engine of the welfare growth was the consumption growth and not its redistribution, since the reduction of inequalities was modest. One exception was the South region, whose reduction of inequalities contributed with more than 10% for the welfare growth.

By the deficit share of the Lorenz and the concentration curves, we can evaluate how the consumption components influenced inequality and welfare. Thus, we noticed that Education, health and transportation and Other goods became less concentrated, contributing for the reduction of inequality. On the other hand, the concentration of Durable goods increased, reducing the speed of the drop in inequality.

These evidences were also showed by exercises of analytical and counterfactual decompositions based on the calculation of Shapley value. According to the results of Shapley-Gini(new) and Gini(Hoffmann-Soares) dynamic decompositions, if the inequality generated by the evolution of Durable goods is eliminated, the inequality reduction would be of 86% and 77%, respectively, greater than that observed. Both the static and the dynamic exercises showed the unequal growth of Durable goods limited the inequality reduction and changed its structure between the two editions of the POF.
In relation to the measurement of the growth impact of the mean PCC and the inequality over poverty, results showed there is a dominance relationship of the proportion curve of poor people in 2008-2009 compared with 2002-2003, demonstrating poverty in 2008-2009 was lower for the different lines of absolute poverty.

The exercises of counterfactual decomposition of poverty and the calculations made by Shapley value, indicated that in this period poverty decreased in Brazil for any value of $\alpha$ (0, 1 or 2) used and for the two poverty lines (R$207 and R$104) applied. The same result appeared for all the major regions and urban and rural areas. The North and Northeast regions and the rural areas were the places where the greatest reductions of poverty were registered.

The decomposition analysis of poverty per consumption component that was carried out by the Shapley-FGT(zero) exercise showed the housing and food components were the ones that registered the greatest absolute contributions to the poverty reduction, in the two periods analyzed, for all the values of $\alpha$, according to lines R$207$ and R$104$. Also, a change in the consumption structure of the poorest people was registered due to the increase of the relative contribution of the durable goods component in 2008-2009.

The results obtained by the Shapley-FGT(new) dynamic decomposition indicated housing was the component that contributed more in relative terms for the reduction of poverty for all the analyzed FGT measures and poverty lines. The relative contributions of this component varied from 32% to 47% depending on the analyzed index. Other component that deserves highlighting was durable goods, which measured by FGT($\alpha=2$) contributed with $21%$ (z=R$207$) and $32%$ (z=R$104$). However, this component registered an even more significant result by the Shapley-FGT(zero) decomposition, contributing with $181%$ (z=R$207$) and $585%$ (z=R$104$) for the FGT($\alpha=2$).

The main results found in this work showed that although the growth of the mean *per capita* consumption was headed by the strong increase of the durable goods component, it was also the main responsible for the limited reduction of inequality in the period between 2002-2003 and 2008-2009. Then we have the durable goods component being responsible for both the considerable increase of welfare among the Brazilian families and the generation of new inequalities, that limited the drop in the Gini index. In relation to the impact of the consumption growth over poverty, we observed poverty reduction in all the geographic areas studied regardless of the measure and the poverty line used. Considering the decompositions per consumption component, we showed housing and durable goods were the components that contributed more for the reduction of the registered poverty.

Possible extensions of this study are, among other exercises, to apply other decompositions should be made and they should be based on demographic and socioeconomic profiles and also in characteristics of domiciles with the purpose of improving the studies on welfare, inequality and poverty or even other topics.
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Appendix

Appendix 1: Imputation of food expenditures

(a) Explanatory variables of the model for the imputation of food expenditures POF 2002-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>Pr&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.6369</td>
<td>0.1838</td>
<td>12.0099</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is own</td>
<td>-0.1429</td>
<td>0.0474</td>
<td>9.0827</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household head holds health plan</td>
<td>-0.1659</td>
<td>0.0656</td>
<td>6.3928</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household head has 7 years or less of school completed</td>
<td>0.0959</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>3.5088</td>
<td>0.0610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse in the household</td>
<td>-0.3155</td>
<td>0.0593</td>
<td>28.2823</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bathroom in the household</td>
<td>0.1154</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td>3.9200</td>
<td>0.0477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family: male household head having children</td>
<td>-0.2300</td>
<td>0.1257</td>
<td>3.3486</td>
<td>0.0673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household head has 7 years or less of school completed</td>
<td>0.0959</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>3.5088</td>
<td>0.0610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse in the household</td>
<td>-0.3155</td>
<td>0.0593</td>
<td>28.2823</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bathroom in the household</td>
<td>0.1154</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td>3.9200</td>
<td>0.0477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family: male household head having children</td>
<td>-0.2300</td>
<td>0.1257</td>
<td>3.3486</td>
<td>0.0673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the North Region</td>
<td>-0.5580</td>
<td>0.0672</td>
<td>69.0322</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the Northeast Region</td>
<td>-0.5148</td>
<td>0.0551</td>
<td>87.4038</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the Southeast Region</td>
<td>-0.3112</td>
<td>0.0658</td>
<td>22.3653</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the South Region</td>
<td>-0.2753</td>
<td>0.0620</td>
<td>19.7350</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Explanatory variables of the model for the imputation of food expenditures POF 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Wald Chi-Square</th>
<th>Pr&gt;ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.3100</td>
<td>0.1544</td>
<td>4.0323</td>
<td>0.0446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household water is provided by the supply company</td>
<td>-0.0892</td>
<td>0.0480</td>
<td>3.4516</td>
<td>0.0632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is own</td>
<td>-0.2183</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
<td>23.3601</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is rented</td>
<td>-0.2156</td>
<td>0.0591</td>
<td>13.3072</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate household head</td>
<td>-0.2041</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td>25.9691</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household head holds health plan</td>
<td>-0.0591</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>1.7743</td>
<td>0.1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household head has 7 years or less of school completed</td>
<td>0.0916</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
<td>5.7865</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse in the household</td>
<td>-0.2696</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td>35.9538</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud and coated household</td>
<td>-0.1222</td>
<td>0.0509</td>
<td>5.7595</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bathroom in the household</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td>0.0711</td>
<td>6.3782</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family: husband-wife household having children</td>
<td>-0.1668</td>
<td>0.0467</td>
<td>12.7715</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family: male household head having children</td>
<td>-0.3779</td>
<td>0.1147</td>
<td>10.8559</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family: female household head having children</td>
<td>-0.3299</td>
<td>0.0552</td>
<td>35.7113</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the urban area</td>
<td>-0.1019</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>3.7523</td>
<td>0.0527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of household per room</td>
<td>-0.1548</td>
<td>0.0581</td>
<td>7.1000</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household head age</td>
<td>-0.0131</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>6.7160</td>
<td>0.0096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household head squared age</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>9.2377</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of children under 7 years old in the household</td>
<td>-0.0425</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
<td>2.5777</td>
<td>0.1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of children between 7 and 14 years old in the household</td>
<td>-0.0969</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
<td>14.7075</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of household members receiving some income</td>
<td>-0.4721</td>
<td>0.0776</td>
<td>36.9603</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly household income</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>6.3649</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the North Region</td>
<td>-0.7035</td>
<td>0.0578</td>
<td>147.8841</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the Northeast Region</td>
<td>-0.6756</td>
<td>0.0445</td>
<td>230.5557</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the Southeast Region</td>
<td>-0.3037</td>
<td>0.0421</td>
<td>51.9432</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the household is in the South Region</td>
<td>-0.3593</td>
<td>0.0511</td>
<td>49.4329</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1: Imputation of food expenditures

(c) *Per Capita Consumption Distribution 2002-2003 (log scale)*

![Graph showing per capita consumption distribution for 2002-2003 (log scale).]


(d) *Per Capita Consumption Distribution 2008-2009 (log scale)*

![Graph showing per capita consumption distribution for 2008-2009 (log scale).]

### Appendix 2: Main household durable goods inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14031</td>
<td>ANTENA PARABOLICA</td>
<td>14027</td>
<td>ANTENA PARABOLICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14020</td>
<td>AR-CONDICIONADO</td>
<td>14028</td>
<td>APARELHO DE DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14008</td>
<td>ASPIRADOR DE PO</td>
<td>14017</td>
<td>AR-CONDICIONADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14024</td>
<td>AUTOMÓVEL</td>
<td>14009</td>
<td>ASPIRADOR DE PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14005</td>
<td>BATEDEIRA DE BOLO</td>
<td>14021</td>
<td>AUTOMÓVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14025</td>
<td>BICICLETA</td>
<td>14030</td>
<td>BATEDEIRA DE BOLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14015</td>
<td>CONJUNTO DE SOM ACOPLADO</td>
<td>14022</td>
<td>BICICLETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14033</td>
<td>DVD</td>
<td>14005</td>
<td>CHuveiro eletrico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14009</td>
<td>ENCERADEIRA</td>
<td>14015</td>
<td>EQUIPAMENTO DE SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14010</td>
<td>FERRO ELETRICO</td>
<td>14011</td>
<td>FERRO ELETRICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14001</td>
<td>FOGAO</td>
<td>14020</td>
<td>FILTRO AGUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14030</td>
<td>FORNO DE MICROONDAS</td>
<td>14001</td>
<td>FOGAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14002</td>
<td>FREEZER</td>
<td>14026</td>
<td>FORNO DE MICROONDAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14003</td>
<td>GELADEIRA</td>
<td>14010</td>
<td>FORNO ELETRICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14016</td>
<td>GRAVADOR E TOCA-FITAS</td>
<td>14002</td>
<td>FREEZER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14006</td>
<td>LIQUIDIFICADOR</td>
<td>14003</td>
<td>GELADEIRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14022</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE COSTURA</td>
<td>14008</td>
<td>GRILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14004</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE LAVAR LOUCAS</td>
<td>14006</td>
<td>LIQUIDIFICADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14011</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE LAVAR ROUPAS</td>
<td>14019</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE COSTURA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14012</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE SECAR ROUPAS</td>
<td>14032</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE LAVAR LOUCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14027</td>
<td>MICROCOMPUTADOR</td>
<td>14012</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE LAVAR ROUPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14026</td>
<td>MOTOCICLETA</td>
<td>14029</td>
<td>MAQUINA DE SECAR ROUPAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14029</td>
<td>PURIFICADOR AGUA</td>
<td>14024</td>
<td>MICROCOMPUTADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14017</td>
<td>RADIO</td>
<td>14023</td>
<td>MOTOCICLETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14023</td>
<td>SECADOR DE CABELOS</td>
<td>14007</td>
<td>PROCESSADOR DE ALIMENTOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14013</td>
<td>TELEVISAO EM CORES</td>
<td>14025</td>
<td>PURIFICADOR AGUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14014</td>
<td>TELEVISAO EM PRETO E BRANCO</td>
<td>14016</td>
<td>RADIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14032</td>
<td>TOCA-DISCOS A LASER</td>
<td>14031</td>
<td>SECADOR DE CABELOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14007</td>
<td>TORRADADEIRA ELETRICA</td>
<td>14013</td>
<td>TELEVISAO EM CORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14021</td>
<td>VENTILADOR E/OU CIRCULADOR DE AR</td>
<td>14014</td>
<td>TELEVISAO EM PRETO E BRANCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14028</td>
<td>VIDEOCASSETE</td>
<td>14018</td>
<td>VENTILADOR E/OU CIRCULADOR DE AR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3: Food Items Consumption basket

(a) Food Items Consumption basket 2002-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POF CODE</th>
<th>Food Items Consumption basket 2002-2003</th>
<th>POF CODE</th>
<th>Food Items Consumption basket 2002-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Arroz não especificado</td>
<td>7105</td>
<td>Contrafilé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Arroz polido</td>
<td>7201</td>
<td>Acém</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>Milho em grão</td>
<td>7203</td>
<td>Carne moída</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>Milho verde em espiga</td>
<td>7204</td>
<td>Carne não especificada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Feijão-preto</td>
<td>7205</td>
<td>Costela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Feijão-rajado</td>
<td>7207</td>
<td>Músculo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299</td>
<td>Outras leguminosas</td>
<td>7304</td>
<td>Carne moída não especificada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103</td>
<td>Alface</td>
<td>7399</td>
<td>Outras carnes bovinas outras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109</td>
<td>Repolho</td>
<td>7503</td>
<td>Mortadela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>Abóbora</td>
<td>7506</td>
<td>Presunto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205</td>
<td>Cebola</td>
<td>7508</td>
<td>Salsicha comum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2206</td>
<td>Chuchu</td>
<td>7603</td>
<td>Linguíça</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2210</td>
<td>Pepino fresco</td>
<td>8103</td>
<td>Figado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2211</td>
<td>Pimentão</td>
<td>9118</td>
<td>Sardinha em conserva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2213</td>
<td>Tomate</td>
<td>10105</td>
<td>Frango abatido (inteiro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301</td>
<td>Alho</td>
<td>11102</td>
<td>Leite condensado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2305</td>
<td>Batata-doce</td>
<td>11104</td>
<td>Leite de vaca pasteurizado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2306</td>
<td>Batata-inglesa</td>
<td>11202</td>
<td>Queijo mozarela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307</td>
<td>Beterraba</td>
<td>11205</td>
<td>Queijo prato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2309</td>
<td>Cenoura</td>
<td>11301</td>
<td>Iogurte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3111</td>
<td>Banana-prata</td>
<td>11303</td>
<td>Manteiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3112</td>
<td>Outras bananas</td>
<td>12101</td>
<td>Açúcar cristal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3118</td>
<td>Laranja-pêra</td>
<td>12104</td>
<td>Açúcar refinado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120</td>
<td>Outras laranjas</td>
<td>12206</td>
<td>Doce de fruta em pasta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3122</td>
<td>Limão comum</td>
<td>12299</td>
<td>Outros doces e produtos de confetaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3125</td>
<td>Manga</td>
<td>12301</td>
<td>Chocolate em pó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3127</td>
<td>Melancia</td>
<td>13102</td>
<td>Sal refinado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3204</td>
<td>Maçã</td>
<td>13201</td>
<td>Caldo de carne em tablete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5101</td>
<td>Farinha de mandioca</td>
<td>13202</td>
<td>Caldo de galinha em tablete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5103</td>
<td>Farinha de trigo</td>
<td>13207</td>
<td>Maionese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5104</td>
<td>Farinha vitamnada</td>
<td>13208</td>
<td>Massa de tomate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5201</td>
<td>Amido de milho</td>
<td>13210</td>
<td>Tempero misto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5202</td>
<td>Creme de arroz</td>
<td>13299</td>
<td>Outros condimentos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5208</td>
<td>Fubá de milho</td>
<td>14106</td>
<td>Óleo de soja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5301</td>
<td>Macarrão com ovos</td>
<td>14202</td>
<td>Margarina vegetal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5302</td>
<td>Macarrão não especificado</td>
<td>15103</td>
<td>Cerveja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5303</td>
<td>Macarrão sem ovos</td>
<td>15202</td>
<td>Refrigerante de cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6108</td>
<td>Pão doce</td>
<td>15203</td>
<td>Refrigerante de guaraná</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6109</td>
<td>Pão francês</td>
<td>15204</td>
<td>Refrigerante de laranja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6201</td>
<td>Bolos</td>
<td>15209</td>
<td>Refrigerante não especificado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6301</td>
<td>Biscoito doce</td>
<td>15211</td>
<td>Suco de fruta em pó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6303</td>
<td>Biscoito salgado</td>
<td>15212</td>
<td>Suco de fruta envasado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7101</td>
<td>Alcatra</td>
<td>15301</td>
<td>Café moido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7103</td>
<td>Carne não especificada</td>
<td>16201</td>
<td>Mistura para bolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7104</td>
<td>Chã-de-dentro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 3: Food Items Consumption basket

(b) Food Items Consumption basket 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POF CODE</th>
<th>Food Items Consumption basket 2008-2009</th>
<th>POF CODE</th>
<th>Food Items Consumption basket 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Arroz não especificado e outros</td>
<td>7499</td>
<td>Outras Carnes suínas com osso e sem osso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Arroz polido</td>
<td>7503</td>
<td>Mortadela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>Milho em grão</td>
<td>7506</td>
<td>Presunto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Milho verde em conserva</td>
<td>7508</td>
<td>Salsicha comum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Feijão-preto</td>
<td>7511</td>
<td>Toucinho defumado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299</td>
<td>Outras Leguminosas</td>
<td>7599</td>
<td>Outras Carnes suínas outras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103</td>
<td>Alface</td>
<td>7603</td>
<td>Lingüiça</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105</td>
<td>Cheiro-verde</td>
<td>9118</td>
<td>Sardinha em conserva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>Couve</td>
<td>10102</td>
<td>Carne de frango não especificada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109</td>
<td>Repolho</td>
<td>10103</td>
<td>Coxa de frango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>Abóbora</td>
<td>10105</td>
<td>Frango abatido (inteiro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205</td>
<td>Cebola</td>
<td>10107</td>
<td>Miúdos de frango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2206</td>
<td>Chuchu</td>
<td>10108</td>
<td>Peito de frango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2211</td>
<td>Pimentão</td>
<td>10201</td>
<td>Ovo de galinha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2213</td>
<td>Tomate</td>
<td>11101</td>
<td>Creme de leite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301</td>
<td>Alho</td>
<td>11102</td>
<td>Leite condensado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2306</td>
<td>Batata-inglesa</td>
<td>11104</td>
<td>Leite de vaca pasteurizado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307</td>
<td>Beterraba</td>
<td>11106</td>
<td>Leite em pó integral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2309</td>
<td>Cenoura</td>
<td>11199</td>
<td>Outros Leite e creme de leite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2310</td>
<td>Batata não especificada e outras</td>
<td>11202</td>
<td>Queijo mozzarella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2312</td>
<td>Mandioca</td>
<td>11203</td>
<td>Queijo não especificado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3105</td>
<td>Banana-d’água</td>
<td>11205</td>
<td>Queijo prato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3112</td>
<td>Outras bananas</td>
<td>11301</td>
<td>Iogurte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3118</td>
<td>Laranja-pêra</td>
<td>11302</td>
<td>Leite fermentado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120</td>
<td>Outras laranjas</td>
<td>11303</td>
<td>Manteiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3124</td>
<td>Mamão</td>
<td>12101</td>
<td>Açúcar cristal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3125</td>
<td>Manga</td>
<td>12201</td>
<td>Bombom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3129</td>
<td>Tangerina</td>
<td>12208</td>
<td>Sorvete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3204</td>
<td>Maçã</td>
<td>12299</td>
<td>Outros Doces e produtos de confeitaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5101</td>
<td>Farinha de mandioca</td>
<td>12301</td>
<td>Chocolate em pó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5103</td>
<td>Farinha de trigo</td>
<td>13102</td>
<td>Sal refinado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5199</td>
<td>Outras Farinhas</td>
<td>13201</td>
<td>Caldo de carne em tablete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5201</td>
<td>Amido de milho</td>
<td>13202</td>
<td>Caldo de galinha em tablete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5208</td>
<td>Fubá de milho</td>
<td>13203</td>
<td>Outros caldos em tablete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5301</td>
<td>Macarrão com ovos</td>
<td>13207</td>
<td>Maionese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5302</td>
<td>Macarrão não especificado e outros</td>
<td>13208</td>
<td>Massa de tomate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6104</td>
<td>Pão de forma industrializado</td>
<td>13209</td>
<td>Molho de tomate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6108</td>
<td>Pão doce</td>
<td>13299</td>
<td>Outros Condimentos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6109</td>
<td>Pão francês</td>
<td>14101</td>
<td>Azeite de oliva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6110</td>
<td>Pão integral</td>
<td>14106</td>
<td>Óleo de soja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6201</td>
<td>Bolos</td>
<td>14202</td>
<td>Margarina vegetal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6301</td>
<td>Biscoito doce</td>
<td>15104</td>
<td>Vinho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6302</td>
<td>Biscoito não especificado e outros</td>
<td>15201</td>
<td>Água mineral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6303</td>
<td>Biscoito salgado</td>
<td>15202</td>
<td>Refrigerante de cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7102</td>
<td>Carne moída</td>
<td>15203</td>
<td>Refrigerante de guaraná</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7103</td>
<td>Carne não especificada</td>
<td>15204</td>
<td>Refrigerante de laranja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7104</td>
<td>Chá-de-dentro</td>
<td>15209</td>
<td>Refrigerante não especificado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7109</td>
<td>Patinho</td>
<td>15211</td>
<td>Suco de fruta em pó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7201</td>
<td>Acém</td>
<td>15212</td>
<td>Suco de fruta envasado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7203</td>
<td>Carne moída</td>
<td>15301</td>
<td>Café moído</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7204</td>
<td>Carne não especificada</td>
<td>16102</td>
<td>Batata frita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7205</td>
<td>Costela</td>
<td>16105</td>
<td>Frango empanado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7304</td>
<td>Carne moída não especificada</td>
<td>16107</td>
<td>Refeição</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7305</td>
<td>Carne não especificada</td>
<td>16199</td>
<td>Outros Alimentos preparados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7399</td>
<td>Outras Carnes bovinas outras</td>
<td>16201</td>
<td>Mistura para bolo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 4: Adapt Laspeyres Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Context Code</th>
<th>Geographical Context</th>
<th>Adapt Laspeyres Index 2003</th>
<th>Adapt Laspeyres Index 2009</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metropolitana Urbana de Belem</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Norte Urbano</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Norte Rural</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana de Fortaleza</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana de Recife</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana de Salvador</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nordeste Urbano</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nordeste Rural</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana de Belo Horizonte</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana do Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana de Sao Paulo</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sudeste Urbano</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sudeste Rural</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana de Curitiba</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Metropolitana urbana de Porto Alegre</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sul urbano</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sul rural</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Distrito federal</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Centro-oeste urbano exclusive Distrito federal</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Centro-oeste rural exclusive Distrito federal</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>