* Social Economics and Public Policy – Marcelo Neri



Brazilian Population Profile Across Decades

Brazilian Population Portrait (%)

| | 1950 | 1970 | 2000 | 2010 | |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|-----------|
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Sex | | | | | |
| Male | 49,83 | 49,87 | 49,21 | 48,97 | |
| Female | 50,17 | 50,13 | 50,79 | 51,03 | |
| Age Group | | | | | |
| 0 to 9 | 29,62 | 29,94 | 19,40 | 15,08 | |
| 10 to 19 | 22,74 | 23,64 | 20,78 | 17,91 | |
| 20 to 29 | 17,56 | 15,37 | 17,65 | 18,01 | |
| 30 to 39 | 12,10 | 11,49 | 14,89 | 15,53 | |
| 40 to 49 | 8,40 | 8,62 | 11,35 | 13,02 | |
| 50 to 59 | 5,10 | 5,66 | 7,37 | 9,65 | |
| 60 or more | 4,25 | 5,13 | 8,56 | 10,79 | |
| Color or race* | , | , | , | , | |
| White | 61,66 | | 53,74 | 47,73 | |
| Black | 10,96 | | 6,21 | 7,61 2000s | Inversio |
| Yellow | 0,63 | | 0,45 | 1,09 | |
| Brown | 26,54 | | 38,88 | 43,13 | |
| Ignored | 0,21 | | 0,71 | 0,43 | |
| City Size | | | | | |
| Urban | 36,16 | 55,41 | 82,73 | 84,36 | |
| Rural | 63,84 | 44,59 | 17,27 | 15.64 — Bigge | st change |

COHORT ANALYSIS: LOOKING ACROSS GENERATIONS

- Cohort data are imperfect substitutes for longitudinal data since they do not provide information about the same individuals over time. In fact, cohort data presents information from different individuals with a certain set of identical characteristics, such as year and place of birth, gender and race.
- These data have some advantages over panel data. The first is that there is no
 friction problem in the sample, that is, one can usually observe individuals from
 the same cohort in different years, which is simpler than observing the same
 individual over time. Moreover, since the cohort information refers to the mean or
 other moment of the distribution, the possibility of measurement error coming
 from the information of the same individual accompanied at different times is
 reduced. Another advantage comes from the possibility of using more than one
 database at the same time. Longitudinal data are rare.
- An analysis based on pseudo-panels presents two potentially problems. The first is
 in the choice of attribute to analyze, which has to be fixed. There are attributes
 that change over time, such as the position of the individual in the family. For
 example, one who occupies the position of head of the family in this decade did
 not necessarily occupy the same position in previous decades (also the social
 convention may have changed). Therefore, we must choose fixed characteristics,
 such as gender and race. The second problem is that there are mortality
 differentials between the characteristics analyzed, such as men and women,
 whites and blacks, poor and non-poor.

Migration Rural/Urban

We will introduce the **idea** cohort analysis by studying the migratory movements of the Brazilian population. Below we have a view of the changes occurred at two points in time, 1950 and 2010. This type of chart allows us to capture two types of effect: first, the age effect, evaluating how the migratory process varies from a life cycle perspective, that is, we analyzed different ages in the same year (and consequently different generations). In particular, we compared the group with 0 to 9 years old in 1950 with other age groups in the same year. Then, to capture the **simple** year effect, we confronted the population in 2010 with that of 1950, focusing on the same age group in **different** years (and **consequently** different generations). For example, we compared the group with 0 to 9 years in 2010 with the same age

| group in 1950. | Age/Year-> | 1950 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
|--|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 0 a 9 | 29,27 | 50,45 | 62,11 | 72,45 | 79,24 | 81,47 |
| Migration within Brasil - 1950 to 2010 | 10a19 | 34,24 | 54,11 | 65,77 | 74,73 | 80,63 | 81,96 |
| % População Urbana | 20 a 29 | 39,74 | 57,35 | 72,36 | 79,28 | 84,71 | 85,82 |
|) · F | 30 a 39 | 40,85 | 59,95 | 71,53 | 80,91 | 85,51 | 86,35 |
| | 40 a 49 | 41,88 | 60,72 | 70,54 | 78,84 | 85,55 | 86,02 |
| | 50 a 59 | 42,69 | 59,56 | 70,71 | 77,76 | 83,07 | 85,43 |
| | 60 ou mais | 43,81 | 60,57 | 69,32 | 77,34 | 82,82 | 84,14 |



Then we can combine the two points in time (1950 and 2010) to evaluate migratory changes in generational terms (or simple cohort effects), that is, we follow the same generation, in different years and ages. Here we will focus on those born in the 1950s and arriving in 2010 aged 50-59.



Variations in the proportion of urban citizens clearly show the presence of the year and cohort effects. After five decades, the Brazilian population that was essentially rural became urban, a result observed at all ages and generation. There is temporal dominance in both dimensions.

Other Examples: Physical Assets & Human Capital



ne 10

w 30

Next we go into an example of multivariate generation analysis applied to social security contribution and also self-reported ethnicity (race): Cohorts & Color

Other Example: Evolution Social Security Contribution: by Age and By Generations



Source: Demographic Census microdata/IBGE 1980, 1991 e 2000

Cohorts in a Logistic Regression - Brazil Population that Contributes to Social Security

| 3 Parameter | Level | Estimate | StdErr | estat_t sig | cond |
|-------------|-----------------|----------|---------|-------------|---------|
| 1Intercept | | 1.1200 | 0.0065 | 171.370** | 3.06489 |
| 2coorte | 1941-1950 | -0.6239 | 0.0031 | -201.843** | 0.53585 |
| 3coorte | 1951-1960 | -1.3070 | 0.0048 | -271.195** | 0.27063 |
| 4coorte | 1961-1970 | -2.2372 | 0.0068 | -330.889** | 0.10676 |
| 5coorte | 1971-1980 | -3.2279 | 0.0087 | -369.189** | 0.03964 |
| 6coorte | 1981-1990 | -5.4713 | 0.0139 | -394.889** | 0.00421 |
| 7coorte | 1991-2000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | | 1.00000 |
| 8coorte | ZAbaixo de 1940 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | | 1.00000 |
| 9fxage | 0 a 9 | -13.5147 | 68.2584 | -0.198 | 0.00000 |
| Ofxage | 10 a 19 | 0.4978 | 0.0044 | 112.170** | 1.64510 |
| 1fxage | 20 a 29 | 0.6781 | 0.0025 | 274.839** | 1.97021 |
| 2fxage | 40 a 49 | -0.7808 | 0.0028 | -282.786** | 0.45802 |
| 3fxage | 50 a 59 | -1.3194 | 0.0040 | -326.831** | 0.26730 |
| 4fxage | 60 a 69 | -1.9427 | 0.0051 | -382.692** | 0.14331 |
| 5fxage | 70 a 79 | -2.4942 | 0.0075 | -332.218** | 0.08256 |
| 6fxage | 80 ou mais | -2.5738 | 0.0187 | -137.501** | 0.07624 |
| 7fxage | Z30 a 39 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | | 1.00000 |
| 8manoest | | 0.0463 | 0.0026 | 17.776** | 1.04735 |

Controls: sex, education, household position (e.g.: chief, spouse etc..), religion, marital status, size of the city and macro-region Source: Microdata from Census 1980, 1991 e 2000 http://www.fgv.br/ibrecps/informalidade/INF/Espelho/PREVI/PREVI.htm

















Multivariate Cohort Analysis – Diff in Diff



