Climate shocks and economic growth: evidence from the last half century by Melissa Dell, Benjamin Jones and Benjamin Olken

Discussion by: Fabrizio Perri University of Minnesota and Minneapolis FED

NBER EFG Summer 2009

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

The background question

 What are the effects of climate changes on overall economic activity?

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

• Compile panel dataset (1950-2003, all countries) with climate variables (temperature and precipitation)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

• Compile panel dataset (1950-2003, all countries) with climate variables (temperature and precipitation)

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

• Merge it with standard macro variables (PWT)

- Compile panel dataset (1950-2003, all countries) with climate variables (temperature and precipitation)
- Merge it with standard macro variables (PWT)
- Document and quantify statistical relations between climate and economic activity

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

- Compile panel dataset (1950-2003, all countries) with climate variables (temperature and precipitation)
- Merge it with standard macro variables (PWT)
- Document and quantify statistical relations between climate and economic activity

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Assess what can we learn

My comments

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

- A review of the findings
- An identification issue
- A suggestion

The backgroud fact



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

The backgroud fact



Hot countries are pooreer: an extra 1C is associated with 10% lower GDP

The backgroud fact



Hot countries are pooreer: an extra 1C is associated with 10% lower GDP

The logic of this paper

• One explanation for cross sectional temperature/growth relation is that hot countries (maybe because they are hot) received poor institutions and these caused slow growth

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

The logic of this paper

- One explanation for cross sectional temperature/growth relation is that hot countries (maybe because they are hot) received poor institutions and these caused slow growth
- Global warming debate searches effects of climate change (keeping institutions constant), so cross sectional evidence not informative

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

The logic of this paper

- One explanation for cross sectional temperature/growth relation is that hot countries (maybe because they are hot) received poor institutions and these caused slow growth
- Global warming debate searches effects of climate change (keeping institutions constant), so cross sectional evidence not informative
- The paper focuses on temperature changes over the last 50 years, with the idea that institutions over the period are constant (and not correlated with temperature changes) and thus isolate effects of temperature changes

Two models

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

- The "agricolture" model
- Temperature changes affect GDP growth
- The "siesta" model
- Temperature levels affect GDP growth

The effect of climate change under the two models



How are the models identified?

Run the following regression

$$g_{it} = \beta_0 T_{it} + \beta_1 T_{it-1}$$

• Under the agricolture model $\beta_0 + \beta_1 = 0, \beta_0 = \beta < 0$

$$g_{it} = \beta \left(T_{it} + T_{it-1} \right)$$

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

- Under the siesta model $\beta_0 + \beta_1 > 0$
- In general $\beta_0+\beta_1$ identifies the siesta effect, β_1 the agricolture effect

An interesting test

	Dependent	variable is Agr.	output growth		
Rich countries	β ₀ -0.5% (0.4%)	β ₁ 0.4% (0.4%)			
Poor countries	- 4.2% (1.1%)	3.3% (1.2%)			
Note: include country and time effects, s.e. are clustered					



An interesting test

	Dependent variable is Agr. output growth				
	β_0	β_1			
Rich countries	-0.5%	0.4%			
	(0.4%)	(0.4%)			
	4.00/	0.00/			
Poor countries	-4.2%	3.3%			
	(1.1%)	(1.2%)			
Neter include country, and time offects a country clustered					

Note: include country and time effects, s.e. are clustered

- The agricultural model works well for agriculture in poor countries!
- In poor countries weather changes have large effect on crops (one extra degree lowers output by 4%)

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Key findings

When model is estimated using overall GDP growth:

- Precipitation has little overall effect
- For rich countries temperature has very little effect
- For poor countries strong evidence of siesta effect, not much agricolture effect

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Key findings

When model is estimated using overall GDP growth:

- Precipitation has little overall effect
- For rich countries temperature has very little effect
- For poor countries strong evidence of siesta effect, not much agricolture effect

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

- A 1*C* permament increase in temperature levels is associated with $\simeq 1\%$ decline in overall growth
- Effects are quantitatively very large!

The identification

- Regression include country fixed effects so the relation is identified purely through time series i.e. variation in temperature within country are associated with variation in growth in the same country
- Some countries with large and significant "Siesta Effect" are: Cuba (13%) Niger (7%) Comoros (3.8%), Ivory Coast (2%)

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

• Driven by episodes of very large or small growth (not common in rich countries)

Temperature and growth in 4 countries



200

A longer run approach

- A different way of measuring the effect (more robust to large temporary growth episodes) is to focus on longer periods of time and see if long run changes in temperature (within a country) are associated changes in growth
- DJO do that by splitting the sample in 2 and find strong effects of changes in temperature on changes in growth but results depend on the particular sample split

A more robust exercise

- Consider all possible non overlapping windows (i.e. 1960-1969 v/s 1970-1979, 1961-1970 v/s 1971-1980 etc.) and regress changes in growth on changes in temperature
- Do this for windows of different lengths (5,10,15,20 years)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

Effects of changes in levels of temperature on growth



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - シタ(で)



▲ロ▶▲圖▶▲圖▶▲圖▶ 圖 の��.



▲ロ▶▲圖▶▲圖▶▲圖▶ 圖 の��.



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ・三 ・ のへで



An extra 1C associated with only 0.1% lower ann, growth

Results

- For poor countries find negative effects of temperature on growth
- Evidence of adaptation (i.e. effects much smaller at longer horizon)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Large standard errors

Conclusions

- Very interesting paper on first order issue
- Temperature changes have a sizeable effect on agricoltural output of poor countries
- Changes in temperature levels have an effect on growth of poor countries (more uncertainty on the size of this effect)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Conclusions

- Very interesting paper on first order issue
- Temperature changes have a sizeable effect on agricoltural output of poor countries
- Changes in temperature levels have an effect on growth of poor countries (more uncertainty on the size of this effect)

Caveats

 The exercise is helpful for assessing some of consequences of global warming, but does not informs on the effect of tail events caused by raising temperature (i.e. flooding of Bangladesh), often mentioned the policy debate

Conclusions

- Very interesting paper on first order issue
- Temperature changes have a sizeable effect on agricoltural output of poor countries
- Changes in temperature levels have an effect on growth of poor countries (more uncertainty on the size of this effect)

Caveats

- The exercise is helpful for assessing some of consequences of global warming, but does not informs on the effect of tail events caused by raising temperature (i.e. flooding of Bangladesh), often mentioned the policy debate
- Aggregate approach of evaluating damages not too informative for policy analysis