

Tran, Thi Xuyen

Conference Paper

Typhoon and Agricultural Production Portfolio - Empirical Evidence for a Developing Economy

Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2021: Climate Economics

Provided in Cooperation with:

Verein für Socialpolitik / German Economic Association

Suggested Citation: Tran, Thi Xuyen (2021) : Typhoon and Agricultural Production Portfolio -Empirical Evidence for a Developing Economy, Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2021: Climate Economics, ZBW - Leibniz Information Centre for Economics, Kiel, Hamburg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/242411>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Typhoon and Agricultural Production Portfolio Empirical Evidence for a Developing Economy

Thi Xuyen Tran*

September 10, 2021

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate whether and how households adjust their agricultural practices such as cultivation and livestock to adapt to a severe typhoon. We, therefore, make use of a natural experiment coming from the strong typhoon Ketsana in 2009. We apply the difference-in-differences approach using micro-data on the household level and spatial data of this severe typhoon. Our empirical findings suggest that households alter their agricultural activities in response to a strong typhoon. While they decrease the area planted for staple crops, i.e., rice and cassava, they tend to purchase more livestock, i.e., pigs, in the short term and in the medium term. Our paper not only indicates the adjustment to the crop-livestock system as a livelihood adaptation strategy to a severe typhoon, but it also suggests the shifting trend from crop planting to livestock raising, which emphasizes the contraction of crop farming in the aftermath of this type of event.

Keywords: Typhoon; Agricultural production; Crops; Livestock; Vietnam

JEL classification: O12; O13; Q12; Q15; Q54

*Helmut-Schmidt-University, Hamburg; Address: Holstenhofweg 85, 22043 Hamburg, Germany, email: tranx@hsu-hh.de, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2708-6823

1 Introduction

Global warming is one of the most difficult challenges we are facing today. It also increases the frequency and the severity of some types of natural disasters (Hirabyashi et al. 2013; Leng, Tang, and Rayburg 2015). Natural disasters have impacted negatively on agriculture, especially in developing countries. The losses from the agricultural sector in those countries from 2003 to 2013 amount to 22 percent of the total economic losses damaged by natural hazards, in which crop and livestock activities are the most affected subsectors (FAO 2015).

Typhoons belong to the most frequent natural disasters since they account for 42 percent of all events that occurred in 2018.¹ This type of hazard is also responsible for almost 23 percent of crop damage and losses in developing countries in the period between 2003 and 2013 (FAO 2015). The losses in crop yields are caused mainly by strong winds, heavy precipitation, flooding, and their combination (Tani 1966; Coomes et al. 2016). Typhoons also decrease livestock activities (Mohan 2017; Morris et al. 2002; Jakobsen 2012). Moreover, the future warming will most likely increase the typhoons' severity (Emanuel 2005; Christensen et al. 2007; Bender et al. 2010; Knutson et al. 2010; Callaghan and Power 2011; Dell, Jones, and Olken 2014) and change their tracks (Murakami and Wang 2010), which could damage the crop-livestock system even more. In detail, theory and high-resolution dynamical models project that by the end of the 21st Century the globally averaged intensity of tropical cyclones will be shifted towards stronger storms, whose intensity increases by 2-11 percent. Moreover, the higher resolution modeling studies predict that the precipitation rate within 100 km of the storm center will be increased by 20 percent (Knutson et al. 2010).

The mixed crop-livestock system is the main livelihood of millions of households and plays a crucial role in food security in developing countries (Tarawali et al. 2011; Thornton and Herrero 2014). Moreover, agricultural activities on the household level will be more affected by natural disasters than on the industrial level (Nardone et al. 2010). For instance, rice farming households would need a return period of thirteen years to recover from the tremendous losses caused by a destructive typhoon (Blanc and Strobl 2016; Escarcha et al. 2020). However, there is significant long-distance migration in the aftermath of this type of natural disaster (Gröger and Zylberberg 2016). Although this mechanism helps households overcome income losses through remittances, it could create a lack of labor force for crop farming, which could influence agricultural activities. Therefore, it is vitally important to understand whether and how households adjust their agricultural production portfolio to mitigate the adverse effects of extreme events such as typhoons.

However, the existing literature about the adjustment to the agricultural practices in the aftermath of severe typhoons is relatively limited and has not shown a clear picture. A few studies suggest that households engage in perennial crop and/or raising livestock in response to a strong typhoon (Van

¹Munich Re NatCatSERVICE report, available at <https://www.munichre.com/topics-online/en/climate-change-and-natural-disasters/natural-disasters/the-natural-disasters-of-2018-in-figures.html>

den Berg 2010; Avila-Foucat and Martínez 2018; Serinõ et al. 2021). However, other studies find that households continue their work as usual without any proper adaptation strategy (Huigen and Jens 2006; Hilvano et al. 2016). Moreover, Escarcha et al. (2020) and Escarcha et al. (2018) suggest that shifting from crop farming to livestock-based livelihood is considered an adaptive response to climate change to overcome massive losses in crop yield and income. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no evidence of this transition trend in the case of strong storms.

Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no evidence of the effect of typhoons on planted area of crops. The existing studies have evaluated the agricultural damages from typhoons mostly through yields and harvested areas without taking into account the area planted (Iizumi and Ramankutty 2015; Aragón et al. 2019). This approach would estimate inaccurately the real loss in agricultural output if households adjust their land use factor to adapt to natural disasters (Aragón et al. 2019).

This paper aims to fill the gap in the literature by studying the effect of an extreme event such as a strong typhoon on cultivation and animal husbandry. We test the hypothesis that farmers adjust their crop-livestock system to adapt to the typhoon. We expect that affected households are more likely to decrease the area planted and increase purchasing livestock in comparison with non-affected households because of the following reasons. First, animal husbandry is perceived as relatively more accessible than agricultural land (Rapsomanikis and Maltoglou 2005). Second, it requires less labor intensity (McCarthy et al. 2006) and is more profitable than crop farming (Maharjan et al. 2013; Xing 2018; Miluka et al. 2010). Third, the negative effect of typhoons on the crop is considered more considerable and more lasting than on livestock (Mohan 2017).

We thereby focus on Vietnam, a developing country that is highly vulnerable to tropical typhoons due to its geographical location. Moreover, the agricultural sector plays a crucial role in the Vietnamese economy. We investigate a natural experiment stemming from Typhoon Ketsana in 2009. We combine the Thailand Vietnam Socioeconomic Panel data on the household level and the spatial data about the typhoon from the International Best Track Archive for Climate Stewardship (IBTrACS version 04) dataset of tropical cyclones. We apply the difference-in-differences method to compare the behavior of households in the treatment group with households in the control group before and after the shock. Our findings suggest that households change their agricultural production portfolio in the aftermath of a severe typhoon. They decrease their area planted with rice and cassava, while they tend to increase their pig herd in the short term and in the medium term. This adaptation strategy suggests households' preferences for a less risky source of income, i.e., livestock production that complements other coping strategies such as migration (Gröger and Zylberberg 2016), income diversification (Jacoby and Skoufias 1998), micro-credit (Arouri, Nguyen and Youssef 2015). However, it also suggests the shifting trend from crop farming to raising livestock, emphasizing the contraction of crop farming, which could affect millions of people and animals in developing countries (Iizumi and Ramankutty 2015; Sakamoto et al. 2006; Kotera et al. 2014).

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 delivers an overview of the literature on the impact of typhoons on agricultural production. Section 3 provides information about Typhoon Ketsana. Section 4 presents the agriculture in Vietnam. Section 5 describes the employed data and defines central variables, the treatment group, and the control group. Section 6 outlines the estimation approach and reports the main estimation results. Section 7 reports robustness checks and section 8 concludes.

2 Related Literature

The existing studies on whether and how households change their agricultural production portfolio to attenuate the damages caused by typhoons are limited and have not reached a consensus.²

Some studies show that households modify their agricultural practices in the aftermath of hurricanes (Van den Berg 2010; Avila-Foucat and Martínez 2018). Van den Berg (2010) studies the effect of hurricane Mitch in 1998 on the household income strategy in rural Nicaragua. The paper uses the Living Standards Measurement Surveys data for Nicaragua in three waves 1998, 2001, and 2005 and applies cluster analysis to classify households into seven or eight livelihood strategies. These strategies are based on the shares of land and labor used in different types of productive activities. He observes that there was a difference in cropping and raising livestock between 1998 and 2005. More farmers were engaged in growing perennial crops or livestock production in 2005, seven years after the occurrence of hurricane Mitch.

Moreover, the findings from Serinõ et al. (2021) about the effect of typhoon Haiyan on the livelihood of coconuts farming households in the Philippines are in line with Van den Berg (2010). Since it takes around 7-9 years for replanted coconuts to reach production capacity, households cope with the substantial losses in income by searching for other sources of income, i.e., raising livestock, intercropping coconut with other high-value crops.

The results from Avila - Foucat and Martínez (2018) also support the findings by Van den Berg (2010) and Serinõ et al. (2021). They consider the influence of hurricanes on households' resilience at coastal communities of Oaxaca - a Pacific coastal state of Mexico. Their qualitative analysis is based on 11 in-depth interviews with key informants and their descriptive statistic results are based on a survey of a total of 212 households in Oaxaca. They conclude that the accumulation of livestock to sell is one method for households to improve their situation after being affected by hurricanes.

However, some other studies find either contradictory or weak evidence of this propensity. Huigen and Jens (2006) examine the effect of the super typhoon Harurot (Imbudo) that occurred in 2003 on farmers' socio-economic losses and coping strategies in San Mariano, Isabela, Philippines. The paper uses data from the Land Use Transition Modeling Project, which contains information on 151 farm households before, during and after the typhoon Harurot. They also performed semi-structured interviews with traders, middlemen, and government officials. Their descriptive statistics results indicate that the

²The literature about the effect of climate change and other kinds of natural disasters on cropping and animal husbandry are summarized in Escarcha, Lassa and Zander 2018; Iizumi and Ramankutty (2015); Helgeson, Dietz, and Hochrainer - Stigler (2013); Murray-Tortarolo and Jaramillo (2019); Karimi, Karami, and Keshavarz (2018); Kazianga and Udry (2006); Aragón et al. (2019).

majority of households (78 percent) did not change their agricultural activities and continued their work as usual in the aftermath of the super typhoon. Only 17 percent of the sample reported that they changed some of their crops. Four percent of the respondents stopped their farming. Moreover, households could not build up livestock since they could hardly afford it. This lack of adaptation strategy is also due to the close relationship between households and their traders in the Philippines. In this country, farmers could receive crop investment from the traders. Hence, they don't need to change their agricultural practices to mitigate the damages. The traders also do not encourage farmers to produce another crop as it is not easy for them to adapt their business to other products. Moreover, the findings from Hilvano et al. (2016) indicate that the capital assets such as livestock ownership after the typhoon and the person in charge of house reconstruction related weakly to moderately (0.17 to 0.26) to a household's income recovery. These results are derived from the analysis of how households in Manicani Island, Guiuan, Eastern Samar, Philippines coped with the super Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda), which occurred in 2013.

To the best of our knowledge, there is yet no study investigating the effect of extreme events such as typhoons on input use, i.e., area planted, that is urgently necessary (Iizumi and Ramankutty 2015). Most existing studies have estimated the agricultural damages from typhoons through yields and harvested areas without considering the adjustment to the area planted (Iizumi and Ramankutty 2015; Aragón et al. 2019). If the land use is unchanged, this method is accurate; otherwise, the real loss in agricultural output will be inaccurately evaluated (Aragón et al. 2019). To the best of our knowledge, the only existing evidence for how subsistence farmers adjust their input use to mitigate the losses from extreme heat is from Aragón et al. (2019). Their analysis is based on a panel data approach and micro-data from Peruvian households. They suggest that households increase input use, in particular land use, to cope with extreme temperatures. Their findings confirm that households change input factors such as land use and labor use as a productive adaptation strategy to a negative shock (Benjamin 1992; Taylor and Adelman 2003; Aragón and Rud 2016; Aragón et al. 2019). However, in the case of typhoons, less is known about this coping mechanism.

Therefore, our paper contributes to the literature by providing empirical evidence using a difference-in-differences method to show whether and how households alter the input in crop-livestock activities after being affected by a strong typhoon.

3 Typhoon Ketsana in Vietnam

Vietnam is a long narrow country with a 3200 kilometers coastline, located at the tropical monsoon belt in Southeast Asia. Therefore, it is ranked as one of the most vulnerable countries to natural disasters, especially typhoons (Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery 2011). Over the period from 1987 to 2016, Vietnam was directly affected by 124 tropical storms (Berlemann and Tran 2020). These typhoons originate mainly from the East Sea and the Western Pacific Ocean, where tropical storms occur most frequently around the world. Provinces in the north and middle are the most affected areas since

a large number of typhoons has made landfall in these regions (Institute of Strategy and Policy on Natural Resources and Environment of Vietnam 2009; Takagi 2019). Moreover, over the last century, Vietnam observed an increase in the number of heavy typhoons and a longer typhoon season (Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Vietnam 2016). The typhoons have caused enormous damage for Vietnam, which is estimated to be about 4.5 billion USD (Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery 2011). These events also decreased household income and expenditure (Arouri, Nguyen and Youssef 2015; Thomas et al. 2010; Gröger and Zylberberg 2016), intensified poverty and increased inequality in Vietnam (Bui et al. 2014).

Ketsana is one of the strong typhoons that caused the most damage to Vietnam, particularly the provinces in the middle. Ketsana was originally a tropical depression formed about 860 km to the northwest of Palau on 23rd September 2009. However, this depression quickly developed further. On 26th September 2009, it made landfall in the northern Philippines and brought extreme rainfall, resulting in devastating flooding and mudslides that affected more than 4.9 million people and caused total estimated damage of around 237.5 million USD in this country (Guha-Sapir, Below, and Hoyois 2015).


After devastating the Philippines, Typhoon Ketsana strengthened rapidly, gained peak wind speeds and made a second landfall in the province Quang Nam (adjacent province of Thu Thien Hue) in the middle of Vietnam at around 2 p.m. local time on the 29th September 2009. Ketsana was a category 2 typhoon with maximum sustained winds of up to 150 kilometers per hour when it landed in the country. This typhoon is known as the most destructive typhoon landed in Vietnam since 1990 (Guha-Sapir, Below, and Hoyois 2015; Gröger and Zylberberg 2016). It brought extremely heavy rains and strong wind gusts that caused a severe flood in Thua Thien Hue and other coastal provinces. Gröger and Zylberberg (2016) provide detailed information about local inundation and precipitation intensity.

Although the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control announced several typhoon warnings and a strategy to cope with the landfall of Typhoon Ketsana and the Vietnamese Prime Minister released an urgent telegraph to command potentially affected provinces to evacuate their inhabitants living at the riskiest areas to safer places, these actions could not be accomplished. They could not prevent the grievous damage. In detail, as stated by Guha-Sapir, Below, and Hoyois (2015), Typhoon Ketsana killed 182 people, injured 860 people, made 109000 people homeless, and affected 2.4 million other people in Vietnam. This typhoon also severely destroyed the infrastructure, production, and environment, which led to a total estimated economic loss of 785 million USD.

Thua Thien Hue is a province located in the key economic region in the middle of Vietnam. However, it is also noticeably prone to natural disasters such as typhoons. This province was reported as one of the most affected provinces damaged by Typhoon Ketsana. The Decision 1088/QD-UBND issued on 15th June 2015 by the People's Committee of Thua Thien Hue reports that Ketsana was the strongest typhoon that struck this province since 1990. The loss in the aftermath of this typhoon in this province was also recorded as the highest. Figure 1 shows the affected area in province Thua Thien Hue by Typhoon

Ketsana.³

Figure 1: Affected area in province Thua Thien Hue by Typhoon Ketsana



Source: International Best Track Archive for Climate Stewardship (IBTrACS version 4)

4 Agriculture in Vietnam

Agriculture plays a crucial role in the Vietnamese economy. According to the General Statistics Office of Vietnam (2019), roughly 70 percent of the population lives in rural areas, where agricultural activities are principal. Around 44 percent of the people at the age of fifteen years or above worked in this sector in 2015. Although there has been substantial industrialization in Vietnam, the labor force in agriculture still accounted for more than one-third of the population at the labor age in 2019. As a result, agriculture's share of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in Vietnam accounted for 17 percent in 2015. Notably, during and after the 2007-2008 financial crisis, the agricultural sector's contribution to Vietnam's GDP has steadily increased, while the share of other sectors has decreased (General Statistics Office of Vietnam 2019).

Rice and cassava are the two most important sources of staple food which play a crucial role in national food security in Vietnam. They are also exported to other countries to contribute to international food security. Vietnam is well known for being one of the three largest rice exporters in the world. The rice exported volume in 2018/19 was around 6581 thousand metric tons and had a 2.8 billion USD (United States Department of Agriculture 2020). Moreover, Vietnam is also the second-largest exporter of cassava starch⁴ and cassava products in the world (Kim et al. 2008).

³As we explain in more depth in Section 5.3, typhoons can heavily affect regions within a distance of 100 km from the typhoon's eyes. Therefore, we create a 100 km buffer around Typhoon Ketsana's trajectory (shown in yellow). Households that are living in the communes in province Thua Thien Hue (shown in red) within the buffer are considered heavily affected by Typhoon Ketsana.

⁴<https://wits.worldbank.org/trade/comtrade/en/country/ALL/year/2019/tradeflow/Exports/partner/WLD/product/110814>

Moreover, agricultural activities contribute significantly to poverty reduction and provide livelihood opportunities to local inhabitants in Vietnam (Herrero et al. 2013; Nguyen 2017; Do et al. 2019). Since the population in Vietnam has grown substantially, from 83.1 million in 2005 to 93.4 million in 2015, food demand has increased rapidly (Dinh 2017). Therefore, most rural households own land for cultivation and livestock husbandry (Rapsomanikis and Maltsoğlu 2005). Income from these agricultural activities in households in rural areas makes up the largest share in their total income, which is from 41 percent to 70 percent depending on the regions (Rapsomanikis and Maltsoğlu 2005). Pigs are the most favorite livestock in household's livelihood. Roughly 70 percent of households in Vietnam raise pigs as a livelihood which is estimated at around seven million households (Rapsomanikis and Maltsoğlu 2005; Do et al. 2019) In Vietnam, access to agricultural land is influenced by the land law system. According to the law 24-L/CTN enacted on 14th July 1993 and the law 45/2013/QH13 passed on 29th November 2013, depending on the scale of cultivated land in each region, each household or individual engaged in agricultural production was allocated an agricultural land quota and land use rights for this quota by the state. The term for this land allocation is fifty years. Vietnamese households and individuals were allocated agricultural land in 1993 under the instructions from Decree No. 64-CP passed on 27th September 1993. Therefore, there have been many citizens born after 1993 without agricultural allocation land, although they belong to engaged agricultural households.

If farmers seek more land for their agricultural production, they have the opportunity to apply for the cultivated land available for lease in the land fund managed by People's Committees in the region. However, this fund is limited and only a small number of applications is approved by the authorities. Moreover, the lease term could be up to fifty years. On the one hand this long-term lease facilitates the recovery of invested capital for the renters, but on the other hand it prevents new land seekers from successfully accessing this limited agricultural land fund. Land users also can exchange, transfer, lease, or sublease the land use rights and consider the land use rights as capital. However, the land use rights transaction must meet the condition of the allocation quota prescribed depending on specific conditions in each locality and in each period by the government. Therefore, in Vietnam, agricultural land ownership is also considered relatively less easy to access than raising livestock (Rapsomanikis and Maltsoğlu 2005).

5 Data

5.1 Household Data

The Thailand Vietnam Socio Economic Panel (TVSEP)⁵ is a repeated household survey for Thailand and Vietnam conducted during the period from 2007 to 2019.⁶ As discussed above, in this paper, we focus on data for Vietnam. There are around 2200 households in 3 provinces, Ha Tinh, Thua Thien Hue, and Dak

⁵The website <https://www.tvsep.de/overview-tvsep.html> provides more information about the project and the sample collection process.

⁶In 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2016, 2017 and 2019.

Lak, in which people were asked about: demographics, agriculture, livestock, income, expenditures, insurance, shocks, and other issues. The reference period is twelve months, from April in the year of the data collection on back to the previous May. For instance, the reference period for the survey in 2008 reaches from May 2007 to April 2008.⁷

Since all three provinces were heavily affected by the strong typhoon Nari that occurred in October 2013, we drop the data that was collected in 2016, 2017, and 2019. Because Typhoon Ketsana occurred in September 2009 and the data in 2010 contains the households' information in the period from May 2009 to April 2010, this reference period is not entirely a period *ex post*. Therefore, we exclude data in 2010.⁸ Moreover, in 2011, the data was only collected in the province Thua Thien Hue. As described earlier, this province was also intensely hit by Typhoon Ketsana. Therefore, we only investigate the sample in this province. Doing so enables us to obtain a dataset with four periods 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2013, allowing us to study the effect in the short term and in the medium term post treatment. We construct an unbalanced panel dataset that contains all households in province Thua Thien Hue available in the dataset from 2007 to 2013. Our main results are derived from this unbalanced panel. To show that the low attrition rate in the panel does not affect the main results, we also create a balanced panel, that is the sample of the households in this province, repeatedly taking part in all waves from 2007 to 2013. We present the robustness tests using this balanced panel in Section 7.1.

We are interested in the effect of a severe typhoon on the agricultural portfolio. Since cultivation and livestock are the most critical sectors in agricultural production, we examine these two fields in our paper. From the dataset, we construct two dependent variables. Because rice and cassava are the most important staple crops in developing countries, *i.e.*, Vietnam, the first dependent variable indicates how many 1000 m^2 each household planted rice and cassava over the last twelve months. This variable is a numeric variable and we denote this variable as "Area planted for staple crops". In terms of cultivation, we focus on land use, *i.e.*, area planted, as this input factor is considered the most important capital in agriculture.⁹ The second left-hand-side variable is a count variable that gives information about the number of piglets was added to the herd by purchasing or receiving in kind in each household over the last twelve months. For simplicity, we call this variable "Purchased pigs" as piglets for fattening in rural areas are mainly purchased from breeders (Riedel et al. 2012). This variable indicates the investment in livestock production.

The TVSEP data also provides numerous variables on the household level that can be used as explanatory variables.¹⁰ First, we have information on the age of the household head. Since agricultural work requires physical strength, the older the household head is, the less engaged he is in farming. Second, we control for the gender of household head that takes the value of 1 if the household head is

⁷The reference period for the data in 2013 is from April 2012 to March 2013.

⁸We refer to the data in 2010 as "incomplete data" which appears in Figures 2, 3, 5 and 6.

⁹Since a majority of farmers in Asia on average have farm size of less than 15 hectares (Samberg et al. 2016), we exclude nine households in the dataset that reported their area planted for rice and cassava larger than 15 hectares (150 000 m^2). These observations are considered to be outliers.

¹⁰The selected explanatory variables are based on Sarker, Alam and Gow (2013) and Vo et al. (2021).

male and zero otherwise. Third, we expect that a household with a highly educated household head is less likely to engage in agricultural activities. We construct a dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the household head obtains high education and zero otherwise. Fourth, we use the information on the household size as an indicator of human resources in the household. Besides, if the households have property insurance, they can be more confident of their financial situation. The insurance variable is a dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the household bought property insurance and zero otherwise. Finally, we add a dummy variable that indicates whether the households received remittances from absent members in the control variable group. We expect that if the households could receive this transfer, they would have the ability to invest more in agricultural production.

5.2 Storm data

Our treatment is based on the natural experiment that a typhoon affects some regions in province Thua Thien Hue, Vietnam. Therefore, we employ spatial data for Typhoon Ketsana, which is available in the International Best Track Archive for Climate Stewardship (IBTrACS version 04) dataset.¹¹ This dataset is collected by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).¹² This dataset provides information on the typhoon's position (geographic coordinates of the typhoon's eyes) and maximum wind speed (in knots) in six-hourly storm intervals.

We use the described storm data to identify affected households and non-affected households. We also have the survey data on the household level, which contains the commune of residence for each household. In order to be able to combine these two sorts of data, we use a Vietnamese shapefile on the commune level.¹³ The following subsection describes the definition of the treatment group and the control group.

5.3 Definition of Treatment and Control Group

We identify households in the treatment group and households in the control group based on whether Typhoon Ketsana hit their location or not. Firstly, we connect the eyes of Typhoon Ketsana's intervals to construct its trajectory. Then we create a buffer around the trajectory. Since typhoons can heavily affect regions within a distance of 100 km (Holland, Belanger and Fritz 2010; Knutson et al. 2010), we choose all households living within a radius of 100 km from the typhoon's trajectory as the treatment group. The control group must contain households that were neither affected by the typhoon nor suffered directly from this event. Therefore, we exclude those living closer than 25 km to the treatment area. As a result, our control group consists of households outside the 125 km buffer from the typhoon's trajectory. Figure 1 presents the households in affected areas. Moreover, we want to explore whether the effect remains when we consider households living within the radius of 125 km from the typhoon's trajectory as treated

¹¹For more detailed information on cyclones see e.g., Berlemann (2016); Berlemann and Wenzel (2018); Yang (2008) or Keller and DeVecchio (2016).

¹²The IBTrACS version 04 data were downloaded from: <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/ibtracs/index.php?name=ib-v4-access> on 10.01.2020.

¹³The shapefiles were downloaded from <https://gadm.org> on 06.05.2018.

households. We call this treatment the broad treatment and the robustness test results using the broad treatment are reported in subsection 7.2. Among 2733 households in the unbalanced panel, the treatment group contains 985 households and the control group consists of 826 households. In the balanced panel, there are 1684 households, of which 916 households are in the treatment group and 768 households are in the control group. The attrition rate in the panel dataset by groups is relatively low, which is not more than 10 percent per wave. The estimation results in the robustness checks in section 7.1 do not show any difference in household's behavior between the unbalanced panel and the balanced panel. Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics for households in the unbalanced panel by groups.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics by groups

	Treatment group (985 obs)				Control group (826 obs)			
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Age of household head	45.78	14.13	16	92	53.40	13.60	27	92
Gender of household head (1-male, 0-Female)	0.84	0.37	0	1	0.85	0.36	0	1
Education of household head (1-yes, 0-No)	0.12	0.33	0	1	0.14	0.35	0	1
Remittances from absent members (1-yes, 0-No)	0.12	0.33	0	1	0.28	0.45	0	1
Insurance (1-yes, 0-No)	0.05	0.21	0	1	0.08	0.27	0	1
Household size	5.32	2.04	1	14	5.54	2.08	1	14
Area planted for staple crops (1000 m^2)	3.75	4.62	0	38	5.75	7.27	0	66.6
Purchased pigs (units)	1.07	2.83	0	30	1.45	3.89	0	42

On average, the households in the treatment group had fewer household members, had a younger and less educated household head, bought less property insurance, received fewer remittances from absent members, planted fewer staple crops and raised fewer pigs than the households in the control group. In detail, the household head at the average household in the treatment group is 45.78 years old, roughly eight years younger than the one in the control group. However, concerning education, 12 percent of households in the treatment group have a household head with a high school degree or a higher educational level, which is smaller than the figure in the control group. Furthermore, 5 percent of households in the treatment group reported to have bought property insurance, which is slightly smaller than in the control group. Regarding remittances from absent members, 28 percent of households in the control group got this transfer, two times the proportion in the treatment group (12 percent). Moreover, the average household in our treatment group has 5.32 members, whereas the average household in the control group has 5.54 members. Concerning the agricultural production, the average household in the control group planted 5750 m^2 crops in the last twelve months, which is 2000 m^2 more than in the treatment group. Likewise, on average, the households in the control group bought 1.45 piglets, whereas the households in the treatment group purchased 1.07 animals.

6 Empirical Analysis

6.1 Estimation Approach

Our primary aim is to study whether and how households adjust their agricultural activities after suffering from a strong typhoon. For this purpose, we make use of a natural experiment coming from Typhoon Ketsana. We conduct an empirical analysis comparing treated and non-treated households before and after the natural disaster. Our investigation is based on the difference-in-differences (DiD) approach with the pretreatment period 2008 and posttreatment periods 2011 and 2013. Data in 2007 is used only for placebo estimations, which are described in subsection 6.2. Since we have two post-disaster waves, we apply DiD with multiple periods, following Angrist and Pischke (2009). This estimation approach is described in the following equation:

$$A_{i,h,t} = \alpha + \lambda * Treatment_i + \sum_{j=2011}^{2013} \gamma_j * Year_{j,t} + \sum_{j=2011}^{2013} \delta_j * Year_{j,t} * Treatment_i + \beta X'_{i,t} + \alpha_i + \epsilon_{i,h,t} \quad (1)$$

where $A_{i,h,t}$, the dependent variable, is Area planted/Purchased livestock for household i living in commune h at time t with $t \in \{2008, 2011, 2013\}$. $Treatment_i$ is a time-constant dummy variable, indicating the treatment status of the household i . It takes the value of 1 if the household belongs to the treatment group and zero otherwise. Since we have observations for two post-disasters, we include the time dummy variables $Year_{j,t}$ taking the value of 1 whenever $j = t$, with $j \in \{2011, 2013\}$. For instance, $Year_{2011,t}$ takes the value of 1 for observations in 2011 and zero otherwise. We are interested in the parameters δ_j with $j \in \{2011, 2013\}$, which correspond with the interactions between time and the treatment. These parameters reveal the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome in 2011 and 2013. $X_{i,t}$ is a vector of control variables on the household level such as age of household head, gender of household head, education of the household head, remittances from absent members, insurance, and household size. We also control for household fixed effects α_i that capture time-invariant household unobservable characteristics. Finally, $\epsilon_{i,h,t}$ stands for the unexplained residual.

We estimate the equation (1) via OLS using the unbalanced panel dataset. The estimation results are presented in subsection 6.3 and subsection 6.4. In order to show that our main results remain unchanged, although there is a low attrition rate in the panel data, we estimate (1) for the balanced panel. We report the estimation result in subsection 7.1 as a robustness check.¹⁴

Since Purchased pigs is a count variable, we estimate the equation (2) using the Poisson regression model to compare differences in pre- and post-treatment measures of the number of livestock purchased as a robustness test.

$$A_{i,h,t} = \alpha + \lambda * Treatment_i + \sum_{j=2011}^{2013} \gamma_j * Year_{j,t} + \sum_{j=2011}^{2013} \delta_j * Year_{j,t} * Treatment_i + \beta X'_{i,t} + c_h + \epsilon_{i,h,t} \quad (2)$$

¹⁴We calculate robust standard errors and report them in parentheses in the estimation result tables.

The equation (2) is similar to The equation (1), except that we control for commune fixed effects instead of household fixed effects.¹⁵ One may suspect that some serial correlation in our treatment may exist, we solve this problem by calculating the standard errors clustered on the household level (Bertrand, Duflo, and Mullainathan 2004). The interaction coefficient of the DiD term δ_j also estimates the effect of the treatment on the outcome (Kondo et al. 2015). The estimation results suggest that estimating the Poisson regression model rather than OLS does not lead to distorted results. In the following subsections, we present and discuss the identification assumption in the DiD approach and the estimation results.

6.2 Identification Assumption

The most crucial assumption in the DiD method is that the treatment group and the control group must have parallel trends in the absence of the treatment. Therefore, we need to verify that both households in the treatment group and households in the control group experienced the same trend in planting crops and animal husbandry in the absence of Typhoon Ketsana. In order to test this assumption, we apply two different methods. First, we calculate the mean of the outcome variables by groups and draw the graphs that visually show these trends over time. Figure 2 clearly presents the parallel trends of the area planted and purchased livestock in the treatment group and the control group ex ante.




Figure 2: Parallel Trends

Secondly, we provide quantitative evidence for the parallel trends by conducting placebo tests. In order to run the tests, we restrict our sample to the pre-treatment 2007 and 2008, and replicate our benchmark strategy as if Typhoon Ketsana hit Vietnam in September 2007, two years before the actual occurrence.¹⁶ We estimate the equation (1) using this restricted sample. That means we compare the area planted and purchased animals between the affected group and the non-affected group before and after the occurrence of placebo Typhoon Ketsana. The results from Table 2 show that the coefficients of

¹⁵The commune is the smallest administrative level in Vietnam.
¹⁶We follow the method described in Gröger and Zylberberg (2016).

our placebo treatment in all regressions turn out to be statistically insignificant. These results confirm the graphical results from the first method, which indicate the equal trends in planting crops and raising swine in treated households and non-treated households before Typhoon Ketsana occurred. Therefore, we can apply DiD technique to our analysis.

Table 2: Placebo estimations using the unbalanced panel

	Dependent variable:	
	<i>Area planted for staple crops</i>	<i>Purchased pigs</i>
	(1)	(2)
Treatment	-3.165 (2.834)	1.507 (1.754)
Year 2008	-0.111 (0.182)	-0.889* (0.463)
DiD 2008	0.041 (0.285)	0.373 (0.485)
Household's characteristics	Yes	Yes
Household fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Observations	939	939
Adjusted R ²	0.726	0.337

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

6.3 Typhoon and crops

As the first step in our empirical analysis, we investigate how households adapt their crops to the powerful typhoon Ketsana. We estimate equation (1) using the unbalanced panel. The corresponding results are reported in Table 3.

Table 3: Estimation results for staple crops

Dependent variable: <i>Area planted for staple crops</i>	
(1)	
Treatment	0.511 (1.370)
Year 2011	3.349*** (0.456)
Year 2013	3.179*** (0.506)
DiD 2011	-1.401** (0.558)
DiD 2013	-1.284** (0.566)
Household's characteristics	Yes
Household fixed effects	Yes
Observations	1,332
Adjusted R ²	0.624

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

After the typhoon Ketsana occurred, we observe a strong and statistically significant difference in area planted between the two groups in the short term and in the medium term. Our estimate predicts that in 2011 an average affected household reduced 1401 m^2 area planted compared to an average non-affected household. Two years later, this effect is still existent with a reduction of 1284 m^2 in the average treated household in comparison with the average control household. Therefore, our estimate suggests that the strong typhoon decreases the land use among the exposed households in the short run and in the medium run.

Land use is considered the most important agricultural input. However, as discussed earlier, to the best of our knowledge, there is no evidence so far on the effect of typhoons on the area planted. Our finding, that is based on the extreme typhoon Ketsana, indicates that a typhoon has a significant negative effect on the size of crop farming. Our result supports the result from the standard production model, that households are more likely to reduce area planted in response to a negative shock (Benjamin 1992). Since typhoon Ketsana lead households members to long-distance migration as a coping strategy in province Thua Thien Hue (Gröger and Zylberberg 2016), that causes a lack of labor force for rice and cassava farming. Our finding supports De Brauw (2010) and McCarthy et al. (2006), showing migrant households decrease staple crop production because of domestic labor deficiency.

However, our findings are not in line with the results from Huigen and Jens (2006) that households did not alter their agricultural activities to cope with a strong typhoon. As stated above, due to the

strongly dependent relationship between farmers and traders in the Philippines, it is not necessary for farmers to change the cultivation of crops to adapt to the strong typhoon. That is not the case in Vietnam, where households are responsible for their agricultural practices on their own.

6.4 Typhoon and Livestock

In the next step of our analysis, we consider the effect of Typhoon Ketsana on the household's animal husbandry. We again estimate the equation (1) using the unbalanced panel data. The referring estimation results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4: Estimation results for livestock

	Dependent variable: <i>Purchased pigs</i>	
	<i>OLS</i>	<i>Poisson Regression</i>
	(1)	(2)
Treatment	1.840 (2.390)	-0.116 (0.475)
Year 2011	-1.011*** (0.377)	-0.846*** (0.293)
Year 2013	-1.049** (0.414)	-0.940*** (0.321)
DiD 2011	1.236*** (0.433)	1.163*** (0.405)
DiD 2013	1.546*** (0.455)	1.427*** (0.412)
Household's characteristics	Yes	Yes
Household fixed effects	Yes	No
Commune fixed effects	No	Yes
Observations	1,332	1,332
Adjusted R ²	0.100	
Log Likelihood		-2,848.799

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

In column (1), robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

In column (2), robust standard errors are clustered at the household level and reported in parentheses.

The estimation result from column (1) in Table 4 indicates that there is a positive and statistically significant difference in investing in livestock between the two groups ex post. The coefficient of the variable *DiD 2011* is positive and statistically significant. This result indicates that the average household in the treatment group increased 1.2 purchased pigs compared to the average household in the control group ex post. Moreover, the estimated effect in the medium term (in 2013) is more pronounced than in the short term. On average, the treated households tend to raise their herd of pigs by 1.5 in comparison

with the control household. Therefore, our results suggest that households in the treatment group are more engaged in raising pigs after a strong typhoon.

As described earlier, the left-hand-side variable is a count variable. We thus estimate DiD using the Poisson regression as a robustness test. The referring estimation results are summarized in column (2) of Table 4. We also find a positive and statistically significant difference between households in the treatment group and those in the control group purchasing pigs before and after the treatment. Our Poisson estimate suggests that the marginal effects are also roughly 1.2 in 2011 and 1.5 in 2013, which are identical to the effects from OLS estimates.¹⁷ Therefore, our results remain qualitatively and quantitatively under the different modeling approaches.

As explained earlier, animal husbandry is perceived as relatively more accessible than agricultural land in Vietnam (Rapsomanikis and Maltsoglou 2005). It also requires less labor intensity (McCarthy et al. 2006), is more profitable than crop farming (Maharjan et al. 2013; Xing 2018; Miluka et al. 2010), and is relatively liquid to use as a buffer for future incidents (Dercon 1998). Moreover, storms do not affect all agricultural products in the same way. The negative effect of typhoons on crops is relatively more significant and remains for a longer time than the effect on livestock (Mohan 2017). As a result, investment into livestock ranks as the most frequently reported coping strategy for natural disasters (Helgeson, Dietz, and Hochrainer-Stigler 2013). Therefore, it is reasonable for households to choose to keep livestock over to plant staple crops in the aftermath of a strong typhoon. Our results indicate that households increase pig herd because pigs are considered less vulnerable during typhoons than poultry. This type of livestock has a high capacity to survive in extreme conditions and its mortality rate during typhoons is low (Huigen and Jens 2006).

Our results support the findings in Escarcha et al. (2020), Escarcha et al. (2018), and Jones and Thornton (2009) that households prefer livestock raising to crop farming to have a less risky source of income in response to a powerful typhoon. Our findings are also in line with those found by Van den Berg (2010) and Avila-Foucat and Martínez (2018) that households do choose investing in animal husbandry as an adaptation strategy in response to a strong typhoon. However, our results do not fit Huigen and Jens (2006) and Hilvano et al. (2016). As explained earlier, the lack of adaptation in the case of the super typhoon in the Philippines comes from the close relationship between the farmers and the traders. The farmers' decision in their agricultural activities in this country is influenced by the traders, that does not exist in other countries. Altogether, we might conclude that households tend to invest in accumulating pigs in order to cope with the losses from a powerful typhoon.

¹⁷We evaluate the marginal effect at the mean of household-level control variables.

7 Robustness Tests

7.1 Balanced Panel

In the first stability check, we test the main results by using the balanced panel dataset. To do so, we first check whether the treatment group and the control group in the balanced panel have parallel trends in the absence of the treatment. We follow the strategy described in subsection 6.2. As we expected, Figure 3 demonstrates the parallel trends of the quantity of land used and purchased pigs in the treated households and the control households in the balanced panel ex ante. Moreover, the results from the placebo tests using the balanced panel, which are reported in Table 7 in Appendix, again confirm the findings using the balanced panel. We find that all coefficients of the interaction effects are not significantly different from zero. That means the households in the treatment group and the control group in the balanced panel also experienced the same trends in land use and accumulating pigs before the occurrence of the treatment.

Since the parallel trend assumption holds with our balanced panel, we estimate equation (1) using this sample. We test whether households in our balanced panel change their crop-livestock system in the aftermath of Typhoon Ketsana. The results in Table 5 indicate that the treated households significantly decreased their area planted for staple crops and increased purchased pigs in comparison with control households in the short time and in the medium time. The coefficients of all the variables show a relatively equivalent effect as in the case using the unbalanced sample. That means, the small attrition rate in the panel does neither affect the results quantitatively nor qualitatively.




Figure 3: Parallel trends using the balanced panel

Table 5: Estimation results using the balanced panel

	Dependent variable:		
	<i>Area planted for staple crops</i>	<i>Purchased pigs</i>	
	OLS (1)	OLS (2)	Poisson Regression (3)
Treatment	0.554 (1.373)	1.812 (2.370)	-0.087 (0.497)
Year 2011	3.418*** (0.468)	-1.041*** (0.394)	-0.851*** (0.303)
Year 2013	3.146*** (0.505)	-1.064** (0.420)	-0.979*** (0.328)
DiD 2011	-1.527*** (0.567)	1.265*** (0.448)	1.162*** (0.415)
DiD 2013	-1.313** (0.563)	1.542*** (0.457)	1.416*** (0.420)
Household's characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes
Household fixed effects	Yes	Yes	No
Commune fixed effects	No	No	Yes
Observations	1,263	1,263	1,263
Adjusted R ²	0.629	0.114	
Log Likelihood			-2,752.747

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01


In columns (1) and (2), robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

In column (3), robust standard errors are clustered at the household level and reported in parentheses.

7.2 Broad treatment

In the second step of the robustness check, we test our hypothesis using the broad treatment. We consider all households living within a distance of 125 km from Typhoon Ketsana's trajectory as affected households. Our control group contains households living outside the 125 km distance buffer from the typhoon's trajectory. Figure 4 presents the households in province Thua Thien Hue hit by Typhoon Ketsana.

Figure 4: Affected area in province Thua Thien Hue by the broad treatment



Source: International Best Track Archive for Climate Stewardship (IBTrACS version 4)

We replicate the estimation strategy described in section 6. We estimate equation (1) using two specifications, that are the unbalanced panel and the balanced panel. We also find the parallel trends in planting crops and accumulating livestock of the treatment group and the control group ex ante. Figure 5 clearly presents these parallel trends using the unbalanced panel.¹⁸




Figure 5: Parallel Trends (Unbalanced panel)

Since the identification assumption holds under the broad treatment circumstance, we estimate the equation (1) via OLS. Table 6 reports results with area planted for staple crops and purchased pigs on

¹⁸Figure 6 in Appendix shows the parallel trends using the balanced panel.

the left-hand side.

Table 6: Estimation results using the unbalanced and balanced panel in the broad treatment

	Dependent variable:			
	<i>Area planted for staple crops</i>		<i>Purchased pigs</i>	
	<i>Unbalanced panel</i>	<i>Balanced panel</i>	<i>Unbalanced panel</i>	<i>Balanced panel</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Treatment	0.536 (1.293)	0.564 (1.291)	2.109 (2.460)	2.088 (2.439)
Year 2011	3.452*** (0.450)	3.539*** (0.463)	-0.999*** (0.369)	-1.025*** (0.384)
Year 2013	2.997*** (0.483)	2.984*** (0.482)	-1.074*** (0.393)	-1.085*** (0.397)
DiD 2011	-1.418*** (0.506)	-1.503*** (0.517)	1.192*** (0.387)	1.220*** (0.401)
DiD 2013	-0.917* (0.531)	-0.919* (0.530)	1.291*** (0.406)	1.292*** (0.408)
Household's characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Household fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,015	1,926	2,015	1,926
Adjusted R ²	0.662	0.667	0.186	0.198

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

The coefficients of the variable *DiD 2011* in columns (1) and (2) of Table 6 turn out to be statistically significant. This means there was a significant difference in cropping between the two groups ex post. On average, the households in the treatment group declined 1418 m^2 area planted in 2011 compared to the control households. However, this effect became weaker in 2013 with 917 m^2 . Since the effect of strong storms on the households living further from the storms' eyes is smaller and remains for shorter time than the effect on households living close to storms' eyes, it is no surprise that the negative effect on the broad treated households in the medium time weaker than in the short time. Therefore, our findings suggest that the affected households by Typhoon Ketsana are less engaged in planting staple crops ex post in comparison with the non-affected households.

In the final step, we estimate equation (1) via OLS with Purchased pigs as the dependent variable. The estimation results are reported in columns (3) and (4) in Table 6. The coefficients of the interaction variable between the treatment and time in 2011 and in 2013 turn out to be positive and statistically significant. The estimation results in column (3) indicate that the average household in the affected group increased their livestock by approximately 1.2 and 1.3 in comparison with the average household in the non-affected group in the short time and in the medium time ex post, respectively. The estimation results using the balanced panel also confirm these findings. Our results again suggest that households

that are affected by the strong typhoon tend to invest more in livestock, i.e., pigs, and engage less in planting staple crops as a coping strategy.

8 Summary and conclusions

The increasing danger of climate-related natural disasters, particularly typhoons, keeps threatening farmers' livelihood in developing countries, which is based mainly on the mixed crop-livestock system. However, the existing literature about whether and how these households adjust their agricultural production in response to a severe typhoon remains understudied. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no evidence of the shifting trend from crop farming to livestock raising in the case of strong storms. The current studies also have not taken into account the crops-planted area when evaluating the agricultural losses from typhoons. If this input factor changes, the shortcoming would evaluate incorrectly the real loss in agricultural output.

Our paper adds to the limited literature by investigating a natural experiment from the strong typhoon Ketsana in 2009. We combine micro-data on the household level and the spatial data on this typhoon. Our paper aims to compare households' behavior in the treatment group and the control group before and after the shock by applying a difference-in-differences approach. The households in the treatment group are identified by their location. All households living within a radius of 100 km from the typhoon's trajectory are in the treatment group as typhoons can severely damage regions within a distance of 100 km from the typhoon's eyes. Our control group consists of households that lived outside the 125 km distance buffer from the typhoon's trajectory to make sure that they were neither affected by Typhoon Ketsana nor suffered directly from this typhoon.

We find that households do adjust their agricultural production portfolio in the aftermath of a severe typhoon. They tend to reduce their staple crops farming and increase accumulating pigs in the short time and in the medium time. This behavior is considered as a livelihood adaptation strategy that complements other coping strategies such as migration, diversification of income sources, credit, savings.

Our paper helps policymakers have a clear picture of the influence of the typhoon on the transformation in the crop-livestock system in a developing country. Our results are essential to design land-management strategies and policies for effective adaptation mechanisms to help farmers cope with the potential impact of extreme events, i.e, typhoons. The contraction of crops planting could raise the likelihood of lacking basic food and threaten millions of people and animals in developing countries. Our results also suggest that future research estimating the damages to agriculture caused by natural disasters should take land use into account.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Thailand Vietnam Socio Economic Panel project (A long-term panel project financed by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) for collecting and providing the household level data used in this paper.

References

- [1] Angrist, J. D., and Pischke, J. S. (2009). *Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist's companion*. Princeton university press.
- [2] Aragón, F., Oteiza, F., and Rud, J. P. (2019). Climate Change and Agriculture: Subsistence Farmers? Response to Extreme Heat. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 13 (1): 1-35.
- [3] Aragón, F. M., and Rud, J. P. (2016). Polluting industries and agricultural productivity: Evidence from mining in Ghana. *The Economic Journal*, 126(597), 1980-2011.
- [4] Aroui, M., Nguyen, C., and Youssef, A. B. (2015). Natural disasters, household welfare, and resilience: evidence from rural Vietnam. *World development*, 70, 59-77.
- [5] Avila-Foucat, V. S., and Martínez, A. F. (2018). Households' resilience to hurricanes in coastal communities of Oaxaca, Mexico. *Society & Natural Resources*, 31(7), 807-821.
- [6] Bender, M. A., T. R. Knutson, R. E. Tuleya, J. J. Sirutis, G. A. Vecchi, S. T. Garner, and I. M. Held (2010). Modeled Impact of Anthropogenic Warming on the Frequency of Intense Atlantic Hurricanes. *Science*, 327, 454 – 458.
- [7] Benjamin, D. (1992). Household composition, labor markets, and labor demand: testing for separation in agricultural household models. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 287-322.
- [8] Berlemann, M (2016). Does hurricane risk affect individual well-being? Empirical evidence on the indirect effects of natural disasters. *Ecological Economics* 124 (2016) 99-113.
- [9] Berlemann, M. and T.X. Tran (2020). Tropical Storms and Temporary Migration. Empirical Evidence for Vietnam.
- [10] Berlemann, M and Wenzel, D. (2016). Long-term Growth Effects of Natural Disasters - Empirical Evidence for Droughts. *Economics Bulletin*, Volume 36, Issue 1, pages 464-476.
- [11] Bertrand, M., Duflo, E., and Mullainathan, S. (2004). How much should we trust differences-in-differences estimates?. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 119(1), 249-275.
- [12] Blanc, E. and Strobl, E., (2016). Assessing the impact of typhoons on rice production in the Philippines. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 55(4), pp.993-1007.
- [13] Bui, A. T., Dungey, M., Nguyen, C. V., and Pham, T. P. (2014). The impact of natural disasters on household income, expenditure, poverty and inequality: evidence from Vietnam. *Applied Economics*, 46(15), 1751-1766.
- [14] Callaghan, J., and Power, S. B. (2011). Variability and decline in the number of severe tropical cyclones making land-fall over eastern Australia since the late nineteenth century. *Climate Dynamics*, 37(3-4), 647-662.
- [15] Chau, V. N., Cassells, S., and Holland, J. (2015). Economic impact upon agricultural production from extreme flood events in Quang Nam, central Vietnam. *Natural Hazards*, 75(2), 1747-1765.

- [16] Christensen, J. H., B. Hewitson, A. Busuioc, A. Chen, X. Gao, I. Held, R. Jones, R. K. Kolli, W.-T. Kwon, R. Laprise, V. Magaña Rueda, L. Mearns, C. G. Menendez, J. Räisänen, A. Rinke, A. Sarr, and P. Whett (2007). Regional Climate Projections. *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*, in S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller, eds, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; New York.
- [17] Coomes, O. T., Lapointe, M., Templeton, M., and List, G. (2016). Amazon river flow regime and flood recessional agriculture: Flood stage reversals and risk of annual crop loss. *Journal of hydrology*, 539, 214-222.
- [18] De Brauw, A., 2010. Seasonal migration and agricultural production in Vietnam. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 46(1), pp.114-139.
- [19] Dell, M., Jones, B. F., and Olken, B. A. (2014). What do we learn from the weather? The new climate-economy literature. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(3), 740-98.
- [20] Dercon, S. (1998). Wealth, risk and activity choice: cattle in Western Tanzania. *Journal of Development Economics*, 55(1), 1-42.
- [21] Devendra, C., (2012). Rainfed areas and animal agriculture in Asia: The wanting agenda for transforming productivity growth and rural poverty. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 25(1), p.122.
- [22] Dinh, T. X. (2017). An overview of agricultural pollution in Vietnam: the livestock sector. World Bank.
- [23] Do, T. L., Nguyen, T. T., & Grote, U. (2019). Livestock production, rural poverty, and perceived shocks: Evidence from panel data for Vietnam. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 55(1), 99-119.
- [24] Emanuel, K. (2005). Increasing destructiveness of tropical cyclones over the past 30 years. *Nature*, 436(7051), 686.
- [25] Escarcha, J. F., Lassa, J. A., and Zander, K. K. (2018). Livestock under climate change: a systematic review of impacts and adaptation. *Climate*, 6(3), 54.
- [26] Escarcha, J.F., Lassa, J.A., Palacpac, E.P. and Zander, K.K., (2020). Livelihoods transformation and climate change adaptation: The case of smallholder water buffalo farmers in the Philippines. *Environmental Development*, 33, p.100468.
- [27] Escarcha, J.F., Lassa, J.A., Palacpac, E.P. and Zander, K.K., (2018). Understanding climate change impacts on water buffalo production through farmers' perceptions. *Climate Risk Management*, 20, pp.50-63.
- [28] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (2015). *The Impact of Natural Hazards and Disasters on Agriculture and Food and Nutrition Security - A call for Action to Build Resilient Livelihoods*.
- [29] General Statistics Office of Vietnam (2019). *Statistical Yearbook of Vietnam*, Hanoi, Vietnam.
- [30] General Statistics Office of Vietnam (2015). *Statistical Yearbook of Vietnam*, Hanoi, Vietnam.
- [31] Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (2011). Vulnerability, Risk Reduction and Adaptation to Climate Change. Vietnam. In *Climate Risk and Adaptation Country Profile*. World Bank Group, Washington, D.C.

- [32] Gröger, A., and Zylberberg, Y. (2016). Internal labor migration as a shock coping strategy: Evidence from a typhoon. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8(2), 123-53.
- [33] Guha-Sapir, D., Below, R., and Hoyois, P. (2015). EM-DAT: International disaster database. *Catholic University of Louvain: Brussels, Belgium*, 27(2015), 57-58.
- [34] Helgeson, J. F., Dietz, S., and Hochrainer-Stigler, S. (2013). Vulnerability to weather disasters: the choice of coping strategies in rural Uganda. *Ecology and Society*, 18(2).
- [35] Herrero, M., Grace, D., Njuki, J., Johnson, N., Enahoro, D., Silvestri, S., & Rufino, M. C. (2013). The roles of livestock in developing countries. *Animal*, 7(s1), 3-18.
- [36] Hilvano, N. F., Nelson, G. L. M., Coladilla, J. O., and Rebancos, C. M. (2016). Household Disaster Resiliency on Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda): The Case of Manicani Island, Guiuan, Eastern Samar, Philippines. *Coastal Engineering Journal*, 58(01), 1640007.
- [37] Hirabayashi, Y., Mahendran, R., Koirala, S., Konoshima, L., Yamazaki, D., Watanabe, S., ... and Kanae, S. (2013). Global flood risk under climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(9), 816-821.
- [38] Holland, G. J., Belanger, J. I., and Fritz, A. (2010). A revised model for radial profiles of hurricane winds. *Monthly weather review*, 138(12), 4393-4401.
- [39] Huigen, M. G., and Jens, I. C. (2006). Socio-economic impact of super typhoon Harurot in San Mariano, Isabela, the Philippines. *World Development*, 34(12), 2116-2136.
- [40] Iizumi, T. and Ramankutty, N. (2015). How do weather and climate influence cropping area and intensity?. *Global Food Security*, 4, pp.46-50.
- [41] Institute of Strategy and Policy on Natural Resources and Environment of Vietnam (2009). Vietnam Assessment Report on Climate Change. With assistance of UNEP. Vietnam.
- [42] Jacoby, H. G., and Skoufias, E. (1998). Testing theories of consumption behavior using information on aggregate shocks: Income seasonality and rainfall in rural India. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 80(1), 1-14.
- [43] Jakobsen, K. T. (2012). In the eye of the storm? The welfare impacts of a hurricane. *World Development*, 40(12), 2578-2589.
- [44] Jones, P.G. and Thornton, P.K.. (2009). Croppers to livestock keepers: livelihood transitions to 2050 in Africa due to climate change. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 12(4), pp.427-437.
- [45] Karimi, V., Karami, E., and Keshavarz, M. (2018). Vulnerability and adaptation of livestock producers to climate variability and change. *Rangeland Ecology & Management*, 71(2), 175-184.
- [46] Kazianga, H., and Udry, C. (2006). Consumption smoothing? Livestock, insurance and drought in rural Burkina Faso. *Journal of Development economics*, 79(2), 413-446.
- [47] Kim, H., Van Bo, N., Long, H., Hien, N.T., Ceballos, H. and Howeler, R.. (2008). Current situation of cassava in Vietnam. In A New Future for Cassava in Asia: Its Use as Food, Feed and Fuel to Benefit the Poor. Proc. 8th Regional Workshop, held in Vientiane, Lao PDR (pp. 100-112).

- [48] Knutson, T. R., McBride, J. L., Chan, J., Emanuel, K., Holland, G., Landsea, C., ... and Sugi, M. (2010). Tropical cyclones and climate change. *Nature geoscience*, 3(3), 157-163.
- [49] Kondo, M. C., Keene, D., Hohl, B. C., MacDonald, J. M., and Branas, C. C. (2015). A difference-in-differences study of the effects of a new abandoned building remediation strategy on safety. *PloS one*, 10(7), e0129582.
- [50] Kotera, A., Nguyen, K. D., Sakamoto, T., Iizumi, T., and Yokozawa, M. (2014). A modeling approach for assessing rice cropping cycle affected by flooding, salinity intrusion, and monsoon rains in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *Paddy and water environment*, 12(3), 343-354.
- [51] Lechner, M. (2011). The estimation of causal effects by difference-in-difference methods. *Foundations and Trends in Econometrics*, 4 (3), 165-224.
- [52] Leng, G., Tang, Q., and Rayburg, S. (2015). Climate change impacts on meteorological, agricultural and hydrological droughts in China. *Global and Planetary Change*, 126, 23-34.
- [53] Maharjan, A., Bauer, S., & Knerr, B. (2013). Migration for labour and its impact on farm production in Nepal. Kathmandu, Nepal: Centre for the Study of Labour and Mobility.
- [54] McCarthy, Nancy, Carletto, G., Davis, B., and I. Maltoglou. Assessing the impact of massive out-migration on agriculture. ESA Working paper No. 06-14. FAO, Rome (2006).
- [55] Miluka, J., Carletto, G., Davis, B., & Zezza, A. (2010). The vanishing farms? The impact of international migration on Albanian family farming. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 46(1), 140-161.
- [56] Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Vietnam (2016). Climate Change and Sea Level Rise Scenarios for Vietnam. Hanoi, Vietnam.
- [57] Mohan, P. (2017). Impact of hurricanes on agriculture: Evidence from the Caribbean. *Natural Hazards Review*, 18(3), 04016012.
- [58] Morris, S. S., Neidecker-Gonzales, O., Carletto, C., Munguía, M., Medina, J. M., and Wodon, Q. (2002). Hurricane Mitch and the livelihoods of the rural poor in Honduras. *World Development*, 30(1), 49-60.
- [59] Murakami, H., and Wang, B. (2010). Future change of North Atlantic tropical cyclone tracks: Projection by a 20-km-mesh global atmospheric model. *Journal of Climate*, 23(10), 2699-2721.
- [60] Murray-Tortarolo, G. N., and Jaramillo, V. J. (2019). The impact of extreme weather events on livestock populations: the case of the 2011 drought in Mexico. *Climatic Change*, 153(1-2), 79-89.
- [61] Nardone, A., Ronchi, B., Lacetera, N., Ranieri, M. S., and Bernabucci, U. (2010). Effects of climate changes on animal production and sustainability of livestock systems. *Livestock Science*, 130(1-3), 57-69.
- [62] NASA (2009). Hurricane Season 2009. Typhoon Ketsana (Western Pacific). https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/hurricanes/archives/2009/h2009_Ketsana.html.
- [63] Nguyen, T. H. (2017). An overview of agricultural pollution in Vietnam: The crops sector. World Bank.

- [64] Nong, D. H., Ngo, A. T., Nguyen, H., Nguyen, T. T., Nguyen, L. T., & Sumeet, S. (2021). Changes in Coastal Agricultural Land Use in Response to Climate Change: An Assessment Using Satellite Remote Sensing and Household Survey Data in Tien Hai District, Thai Binh Province, Vietnam. *Land*, 10(6), 627.
- [65] Puhani, P. A. (2012). The treatment effect, the cross difference, and the interaction term in nonlinear "difference-in-differences" models. *Economics Letters*, 115(1), 85-87.
- [66] Rapsomanikis, G., and Maltoglou, I. (2005). The contribution of livestock to household income in Vietnam: A household typology based analysis (No. 855-2016-56227).
- [67] Riedel, S., Schiborra, A., Huelsebusch, C., Huanming, M. and Schlecht, E., (2012). Opportunities and challenges for smallholder pig production systems in a mountainous region of Xishuangbanna, Yunnan Province, China. *Tropical animal health and production*, 44(8), 1971-1980.
- [68] Sakamoto, T., Van Nguyen, N., Ohno, H., Ishitsuka, N., and Yokozawa, M. (2006). Spatio-temporal distribution of rice phenology and cropping systems in the Mekong Delta with special reference to the seasonal water flow of the Mekong and Bassac rivers. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 100(1), 1-16.
- [69] Samberg, L.H., Gerber, J.S., Ramankutty, N., Herrero, M. and West, P.C., (2016). Subnational distribution of average farm size and smallholder contributions to global food production. *Environmental Research Letters*, 11(12), p.124010.
- [70] Sarker, M. A. R., Alam, K., and Gow, J. (2013). Assessing the determinants of rice farmers' adaptation strategies to climate change in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*.
- [71] Serinõ, M.N.V., Cavero, J.A., Cuizon, J., Ratilla, T.C., Ramoneda, B.M., Bellezas, M.H.I. and Ceniza, M.J.C., (2021). Impact of the 2013 super typhoon haiyan on the livelihood of small-scale coconut farmers in Leyte island, Philippines. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 52, p.101939.
- [72] Takagi, H. (2019). Statistics on typhoon landfalls in Vietnam: Can recent increases in economic damage be attributed to storm trends?. *Urban Climate*, 30, 100506.
- [73] Tani, N., 1966: On the prevention measure of the damage from typhoon in south Kyushu. *Bull. Kyushu Agric. Exp. Station*, 12, 343-387.
- [74] Tarawali, S., Herrero, M., Descheemaeker, K., Grings, E. and Blümmel, M., (2011). Pathways for sustainable development of mixed crop livestock systems: Taking a livestock and pro-poor approach. *Livestock science*, 139(1-2), 11-21.
- [75] Taylor, J. E., and Adelman, I. (2003). Agricultural household models: genesis, evolution, and extensions. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 1(1), 33-58.
- [76] Thomas, T., Christiaensen, L., Do, Q. T., and Trung, L. D. (2010). Natural disasters and household welfare: evidence from Vietnam. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 5491.
- [77] Thornton, P. K., and Herrero, M. (2014). Climate change adaptation in mixed crop-livestock systems in developing countries. *Global Food Security*, 3(2), 99-107.

- [78] Uddin, M. N., Bokelmann, W., and Entsminger, J. S. (2014). Factors affecting farmers' adaptation strategies to environmental degradation and climate change effects: A farm level study in Bangladesh. *Climate*, 2(4), 223-241.
- [79] United States Department of Agriculture (2020). Global Market Analysis. Grain: World Markets and Trade.
- [80] Van den Berg, M. (2010). Household income strategies and natural disasters: Dynamic livelihoods in rural Nicaragua. *Ecological Economics*, 69(3), 592-602.
- [81] Vo, H. H., Mizunoya, T., & Nguyen, C. D. (2021). Determinants of farmers' adaptation decisions to climate change in the central coastal region of Vietnam. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Regional Science*, 5(2), 327-349.
- [82] Xing, Z. (2018). Development impacts of remittances in agricultural households in Fiji. *Remittances Review*, 3(1), 19-49.
- [83] Zhang, G., Dong, J., Zhou, C., Xu, X., Wang, M., Ouyang, H., and Xiao, X. (2013). Increasing cropping intensity in response to climate warming in Tibetan Plateau, China. *Field Crops Research*, 142, 36-46.


Appendix

Table 7: Placebo estimations using the balanced panel


	Dependent variable:	
	<i>Area planted for staple crops</i> (1)	<i>Purchased pigs</i> (2)
Treatment	-3.108 (2.825)	1.449 (1.754)
Year 2008	-0.062 (0.190)	-0.930* (0.493)
DiD 2008	-0.037 (0.301)	0.476 (0.509)
Household's characteristics	Yes	Yes
Household fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Observations	842	842
Adjusted R ²	0.721	0.363

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.



(a) Area planted for staple crops



(b) Purchased pigs

Figure 6: Parallel trends in the broad treatment (Balanced panel)