



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

***Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the 2020 Agricultural & Applied Economics Association
Annual Meeting, Kansas City, MO
July 26-28, 2020***

Copyright 2020 by Jessica Rudder. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Abstract ID # 18365

Drought and the Food Retail Sector

Jess Rudder

UC Davis

Motivation: In agriculture-dependent settings, droughts cause a food supply shock that affects how local food markets function.

Research Question: How does drought affect revenue, employment, entry and exit of food retail firms in rural markets?

Methods: I use publicly available micro-data from 6,000 firms in 157 markets spread across four counties in Kenya collected annually from 2013-2017 (McKenzie and Puerto, 2017). I use and difference-in-differences specification to exploit spatial and temporal variation in drought intensity to identify the effect of drought on retail outcomes.

RESULTS


- Firms in drought-affected markets have lower revenue and profits, and have fewer workers.
- Woman-owned firms are more likely to exit drought-affected markets, yet other new firms are *more likely* to enter those same markets.
- The number of competitors increases by over one-third
- Food retailers do not have significantly worse outcomes, although most crowding-in appears to be in cereal sellers.

Results suggest that new firms crowd into markets and existing firms hold onto their firms despite worse outcomes

DATA

- Panel of 3,558 women's-owned firms from 6 surveys administered from 2013-2017. These firms participated in a business training RCT funded by the ILO/World Bank.
- Panel of 157 markets in 4 counties with information on entry and exit in 3 surveys from 2014-2017.
- Repeat cross-section of other firms in the same market (including sector, revenue, and employment) from 3 surveys from 2014-2017
- Drought data come from Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI), .5x.5 degree grid cells, matched to survey month

SETTING



FEWS Food Insecurity Classification

- Green – Minimal/None
- Yellow – Stressed
- Orange – Crisis
- Red – Emergency

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Droughts affect total household consumption by lowering potential revenue earned through sale of crops in output markets (Dercon, 2002). In the absence of insurance and credit markets, households sell assets or engage in temporary income generating strategies to cope with the negative productivity shock (Hoddinott, 2006; Carter and Lybbert, 2012; Janzen and Carter, 2018).

Rural food markets must reconcile a negative supply shock with a demand shock that might be positive (if household purchase more from markets) or negative (if, despite selling assets, household are in a worse financial position).

RESULTS

Table 1: Effect of Drought on All Firms

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Sales per Week	Profit per Week	Workers per Week	Number of Competitors
post × drought	-1821.79*** (555.12)	-431.38*** (138.44)	-0.14*** (0.05)	3.71*** (1.09)
Control Mean	7303.47	1818.61	0.42	10.00
Obs	20533	20458	20848	20654
Adj R-Squared	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.31

Standard errors in parentheses
* p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table 2: Effect of Drought on Cereals Sellers

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Sales per Week	Profit per Week	Workers per Week	Number of Competitors
Post	-3038.35*** (701.38)	-996.84*** (105.24)	-0.43*** (0.07)	3.26** (1.63)
Drought × Post	-2087.11*** (591.83)	-431.14*** (142.52)	-0.13** (0.06)	3.20** (1.23)
Cereals Sector	3357.90*** (411.30)	159.20** (70.43)	0.18*** (0.02)	-3.04*** (0.99)
Drought × CerealsSector	188.77 (729.18)	59.33 (123.80)	0.09*** (0.03)	-0.33 (1.48)
Post × CerealsSector	1402.48* (800.72)	276.77** (135.63)	0.04 (0.04)	1.56* (0.89)
Drought × post × CerealsSector	439.10 (1145.41)	-54.69 (206.81)	-0.01 (0.06)	3.01** (1.21)
Control Mean	7303.47	1818.61	0.42	10.00
Obs	20510	20426	20828	20631
Adj R-Squared	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.32

Standard errors in parentheses
* p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

SPECIFICATION

Differences in Differences:

$$Y_{imt} = \alpha + \beta \text{Drought}_m \times \text{Post}_t + \gamma_1 \text{Drought}_m + \gamma_2 \text{Post}_t + \epsilon_{imt}$$

Triple Differences:

$$Y_{imt} = \alpha + \beta \text{Drought}_m \times \text{Post}_t \times \text{FoodSector}_i + \gamma_1 \text{Drought}_m + \gamma_2 \text{Post}_t + \gamma_3 \text{FoodSector}_i + \delta_1 \text{Drought}_m \times \text{FoodSector}_i + \delta_2 \text{Drought}_m \times \text{Post}_t + \delta_3 \text{Post}_t \times \text{FoodSector}_i + \epsilon_{imt}$$

- Where Y_{imt} are outcomes for firm i , in market m , at time t
- Beta identifies the effect on firm i of being in a market where drought occurred (assuming parallel trends assumption holds).

NEXT STEPS

- Despite not experiencing drought directly, other counties could be affected by drought if they sell crops to drought-affected areas. To check this, I can run event-study regressions in drought and non-drought areas to verify whether non-drought markets experience direct effects from the drought.
- In-kind food distribution in drought-affected markets could contribute to the drop in revenue/profits. So far, no evidence suggests that in-kind food distribution was widespread in the drought-affected markets *in these data*. (Food distribution is widely reported in Northern Kenya).