



**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](mailto: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.*

**Resilience to an acute covariate shock:**

**The Nepal earthquake of 2015 and offsetting NGO treatment effects**

**William M. Thompson, UGA**

[wilt78@uga.edu](mailto:wilt78@uga.edu)

**Sarah Janzen, Montana State**

**Nick Magnan, UGA**

***Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the 2017 Agricultural & Applied Economics Association  
Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, July 30-August 1***

*Copyright 2017 by Thompson et al. 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.*



# Resilience to an Acute Covariate Shock: The 2015 Nepal Earthquake and Offsetting NGO Treatment Effects

William M. Thompson<sup>1</sup>; Sarah Janzen, PhD<sup>2</sup>; Nicholas Magnan, PhD<sup>1</sup>

1. University of Georgia 2. Montana State University

## ABSTRACT

In the spring of 2015 central Nepal was rocked by a catastrophic earthquake and a series of significant aftershocks. This event destroyed homes and infrastructure, killed livestock, interrupted access to water, disrupted preparations for the monsoon rice season, cut off access to markets for agricultural inputs and outputs, and generally disrupted the economics life of the vulnerable population in the affected area...

## Background

- The 2015 Nepal earthquake killed nearly 9000 people and injured around 22,000. The magnitude of the quake was 8.1 M with a modified Mercalli intensity of IX.
- Heifer International operates the Smallholders in Livestock Value Chain program in the affected area. The SLVC enhances physical capital (through a transfer of meat goats), human capital (through technical trainings), and social capital (through soft-skills training and by formation of self help groups).
- In addition to the standard benefits, a subset of SLVC beneficiaries in the most devastated areas received an additional zero-interest, 'revolving fund' (RF) loan of roughly (\$150 USD), repayable after two years.
- We consider a household to be more resilient if they were able to weather the earthquake without resulting to costly coping strategies like selling productive assets, taking on additional debt, and cutting meals.

## Identification Strategy

There are three configurations of NGO treatment, each delivered at the village level:

- I. Heifer beneficiaries (HI)
- II. Heifer beneficiaries who received the RF (RF)
- III. Untreated control households

Treatment I was randomly assigned one year prior to the earthquake as described in Janzen et al. (2017); here we rely on the structure of the RCT. Treatment II was not randomly assigned, but consists of villages where the HI program antedates the earthquake and type I villages. Some controls were randomly assigned along with I, and other are located in untreated villages sampled after the 2015 earthquake. We include all untreated households in all regressions, and control for time-invariant observable factors that affect selection of a village into treatment. RF effects will also be estimated by PSM (results not shown on this draft).

## Results: HI Effects\*

	Control mean (SD)	HI	EQK	HI*EQK	N
Sold Livestock	0.124 (0.330)	-0.001 (0.025)	0.089 (0.023)***	-0.075 (0.026)***	1,335
Cut Meals	0.116 (0.321)	0.002 (0.015)	0.116 (0.035)***	-0.096 (0.034)***	1,335
Took Loan	0.203 (0.403)	-0.002 (0.032)	0.168 (0.035)***	-0.089 (0.043)**	1,335
Permanent Housing	0.300 (0.459)	0.099 (0.089)	-0.328 (0.046)***	0.138 (0.045)***	795
Goat Herd	3.611 (3.670)	3.238 (0.847)***	0.292 (0.381)	-0.066 (0.571)	1,335
Livestock Income	4.306 (5.021)	1.933 (1.005)*	-0.109 (0.505)	-0.363 (0.654)	1,334
Total Income	11.222 (1.234)	-0.316 (0.186)*	-0.305 (0.097)***	0.212 (0.117)*	1,334

OLS regressions, clustered (VDC) standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p < 0.01, \*\* p < 0.05, \* p < 0.1.

## Results: RF Effects\*

	Control mean (SD)	RF	EQK	RF*EQK	N
Sold Livestock	0.124 (0.330)	-0.136 (0.153)	0.112 (0.048)**	0.045 (0.061)	1,472
Cut Meals	0.116 (0.321)	0.429 (0.088)***	0.091 (0.040)**	-0.200 (0.050)***	1,472
Took Loan	0.203 (0.403)	0.081 (0.144)	0.143 (0.046)***	-0.060 (0.064)	1,472
Permanent Housing	0.300 (0.459)	-0.579 (0.132)***	-0.238 (0.047)***	0.312 (0.055)***	1,152
Goat Herd	3.611 (3.670)	1.196 (1.822)	-0.414 (0.428)	0.610 (0.684)	1,472
Livestock Income	4.306 (5.021)	-3.909 (1.745)**	-0.174 (0.668)	2.392 (0.761)***	1,471
Total Income	11.222 (1.234)	-0.763 (0.339)**	-0.297 (0.104)***	0.455 (0.158)***	1,471

OLS regressions, clustered (VDC) standard errors in parentheses; \*\*\* p < 0.01, \*\* p < 0.05, \* p < 0.1.

## Objective

The objective of this study is to estimate the treatment effects of (i) belonging to a Heifer International self-help group in the earthquake affected areas and (ii) belonging to an HI group that received an additional zero-interest loan.


## Data

We conducted surveys of HI and RF households approximately one year after the earthquake. The survey instrument included detailed information on income, assets, credit and savings, and specific coping strategies employed.

Outcomes presented here include binary variables that indicate selection of a coping strategy (sold livestock, cut meals, took out a loan), a binary variable that indicates the respondent has returned to permanent housing, the size of the respondent's goat herd, livestock income earned in the year after the quake, and total house income in the year after the quake.

The sample frame included 7 districts. Two of these, Nuwakot and Dhading, were severely affected (see map inset), two of which were moderately affected, and three of which were largely unaffected. We obtained localized measures of MMI (shaking intensity) from the USGS.

We also draw on the 2011 Nepal census for village level data that predates both the HI treatment and the earthquake.



## Empirical Specifications

For each specification we use OLS, where the treatment effects of interest are an earthquake effect, an NGO treatment effect, and an interaction effect.

The earthquake effect is the local MMI.

We control for observable covariates that affect selection of a village into treatment by HI, and that affect individual uptake of treatment. Where the outcome is binary we use an LPM.

We cluster standard errors at the village level.

## Discussion

- Probabilities of selling livestock, cutting meals, and taking loans are increasing in earthquake severity. Total income is decreasing in earthquake severity
- HI beneficiaries experiencing a strong earthquake effect are less likely than controls to have sold livestock as a coping strategy, but RF recipients are less likely. This effect validated by a strong increase in livestock income among RF beneficiaries. Goat herds are also larger among HI, but are no different from controls in RF.
- Earthquake-affected HI and RF are less likely than controls to have cut meals as a coping strategy.
- Earthquake-displaced HI and RF are more likely to be back in permanent housing.
- Earthquake affected HI and RF earned higher incomes than controls in the year after the earthquake.

\*Results are preliminary. Do not cite.

## CONTACT

Will Thompson  
Department of Agriculture and  
Applied Economics  
The University of Georgia  
Email: willt78@uga.edu