

**Economic Shocks and Civil Conflict:
An Instrumental Variables Approach
Data Set**

Edward Miguel
National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) and
Department of Economics
University of California, Berkeley
(emiguel@econ.berkeley.edu)

Shanker Satyanath
Department of Politics
New York University
(shanker.satyanath@nyu.edu)

Ernest Sergenti
Department of Politics
New York University
(ejs210@nyu.edu)

1. OVERVIEW

There is a growing body of research that highlights the association between economic conditions and civil conflict (see Sambanis 2001 for a review). The existing literature, however, does not adequately address the endogeneity of economic variables to civil war, and thus does not convincingly establish a causal relationship. In addition to endogeneity, omitted variables – for example, government institutional quality – may drive both economic outcomes and conflict, producing misleading cross-country estimates.

In “Economic Shocks and Civil Conflict: An Instrumental Variables Approach,” we use exogenous variation in rainfall as an instrumental variable for income growth in order to estimate the impact of economic growth on civil conflict. Weather shocks are plausible instruments for GDP growth in economies that largely rely on rain-fed agriculture, i.e., neither have extensive irrigation systems nor are heavily industrialized. The instrumental variable method makes it credible to assert that the association between economic conditions and civil war is a causal relationship, rather than simply a correlation.

Sub-Saharan Africa is the ideal region for this identification strategy: the World Development Indicator (WDI) database indicates that only one percent of crop land is irrigated in the median African country, and the agricultural sector remains large.

The data used in “Economic Shocks and Civil Conflict: An Instrumental Variables Approach,” are of four kinds: rainfall; conflict; economic, demographic, and development controls; and political institutional controls. The most original of

these four is the rainfall data. Therefore, we devote an entire section of this manual, section 2, to a description of our four rainfall measures and an explanation of the methodology used to construct each. In section 3, we describe all of our data sources by category of data and we provide links to where the original information may be found on-line. A detailed description of each variable in the set is provided in section 4. In addition, this manual contains two appendices: appendix A lists all latitude and longitude points used to generate two of the four rainfall measures, the GPCP and NCEP measures, and appendix B presents the Stata codebook for all variables in the dataset.

2. RAINFALL DATA & CONSTRUCTION OF THE RAINFALL MEASURES

We employ four rainfall data sets:

- A. Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP)

<http://cics.umd.edu/GPCP>

- B. National Centers for Environment Prediction (NCEP)

<http://iridl.ldeo.columbia.edu/SOURCES/.NOAA/.NCEP/.CPC/.Merged/.Analysis/.monthly/>

- C. U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization Climatic (FAOCLIM2) Data

CD-ROM: World-Wide Agroclimatic Database.

FAO-Agrometeorology Group, Rome 2000.

- D. Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)

<http://edcw2ks21.cr.usgs.gov/adds/>

A. Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) Data Set

The Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) database of rainfall estimates stretches back to 1979. The GPCP data rely on a combination of actual weather station rainfall gauge measures and satellite information on the density of cold cloud cover, which is closely related to actual precipitation. The GPCP uses the Huffman et al. (1995, 1997) method of data selection and merging.

Estimates are made at 2.5 latitude and longitude degree intervals. The units of measurement are in millimeters of rainfall per day and are the average

per month. We multiply each monthly average by the number of days in a given month, which gives us an estimate of total monthly rainfall.¹ We then add up all of the total monthly estimates in a given year to generate an estimate of total yearly rainfall for each 2.5 latitude / longitude degree node. For example, the yearly rainfall estimate for any 2.5 latitude / longitude degree node in 1999 was calculated as follows:

$$y_{1999} = a_{9901} \times 31 + a_{9902} \times 28 + a_{9903} \times 31 + a_{9904} \times 30 + a_{9905} \times 31 + a_{9906} \times 30 + a_{9907} \times 31 + a_{9908} \times 31 + a_{9909} \times 30 + a_{9910} \times 31 + a_{9911} \times 30 + a_{9912} \times 31$$

where a_{YYMM} is the average daily rainfall in millimeters for month MM and year YY taken from the GPCP data set

Next, each yearly rainfall estimate per 2.5 latitude / longitude degree node is averaged over all nodes in a given country to produce an estimate of total yearly rainfall per country. For example, our estimate of total yearly rainfall for Kenya is the average of the yearly rainfall estimates for the eight 2.5 latitude / longitude degree nodes in Kenya. See Appendix A for a listing of all nodes used in the calculation of the each country's rainfall estimates.

(Note: No degree grid node fell within the national boundaries for five small African countries – Burundi, Djibouti, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, and Rwanda. In these cases, we assigned the rainfall measures from the nearest node(s) to their borders. See Appendix A.)

¹ Note that the following years contained a leap year: 1980, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, and 2000. For these years, we multiplied the average daily rainfall for February by 29 days instead of 28 days.

B. National Centers for Environment Prediction (NCEP) Data Set

This data set is essentially similar to the GPCP data set presented above. It differs in that it uses the Xie and Arkin (1997) method of data selection and merging. The construction of the total yearly estimates per country is identical to the one used with the GPCP.

C. U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization Climatic (FAOCLIM2) Data

The FAOCLIM2 data set relies solely on gauge measures. Data are available starting in the early 1800's for some countries. Unfortunately, rain gauge coverage becomes increasingly limited after 1990, and especially after 1996, leading to missing observations.

The units of measurement are in millimeters of rainfall per month per gauge station. We first calculate the average rainfall per month for the entire country by taking the average of the rainfall per month measurements across gauge stations. We then add up all of the country monthly averages in a given year to generate our measure of total yearly rainfall per country.

(Note: It is often the case that data are not available for many gauge stations. That is, the total number of gauge stations used to calculate the average rainfall per month is not constant. Therefore, we include an additional variable in our data set, `sm_obs`, the total number of station-month FAOCLIM2 observations per

year per country, to provide an estimate of the degree of precision of the total yearly rainfall per country measure.)

D. Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) Data Set

The Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) database of rainfall estimates also stretches back to 1979. NDVI provides a measure of the living green plant biomass on the surface of the Earth. It differs, therefore, from the other measures that employ satellite imaging, GPCP and NCEP, in that it estimates vegetation on the Earth and not the density of cold cloud cover. Nevertheless, NDVI is closely related to rainfall, with a correlation of 0.9. We do not actively employ this measure in our paper, however, as vegetation levels may be a function of crop choices made in response to civil conflict, and thus could be endogenous to the conflict.

The methodology used to construct the total yearly estimates per country is similar to the one used with GPCP and NCEP. The major difference is, with NDVI, we use latitude and longitude intervals of 1 degree and estimates are made per dekad (roughly 10 days), whereas, with GPCP and NCEP, we use latitude and longitude intervals of 2.5 degrees and estimates are made per month.

Like before, first, we add up all of the total dekad estimates in a given year to generate an estimate of total yearly rainfall for each 1 degree latitude / longitude node. And, next, each yearly rainfall estimate per 1 degree latitude /

longitude node is averaged over all nodes in a given country to produce an estimate of total yearly rainfall per country.

Finally, note, in our paper we focus on the GPCP dataset over the other four. First, as mentioned above, NDVI may suffer from endogeneity. Second, of the three remaining sources, GPCP is the only one that at the same time: includes both gauge and satellite data; corrects for systematic errors in gauge measures; and rejects gauge measures thought to be unreliable (Rudolf 2000).

3. THE MSS Civil War Data Set - Overview

The MSS Civil War Data Set combines data from several sources. The data sets used are listed below, by category of data: rainfall; civil conflict; economic, demographic and development controls; and political institutional controls.

(Note: some sets fall into several categories. When this occurs, the set is listed only once under the first category on our list. For example, from the Fearon and Laitin set, we obtained civil war, economic, and political institutional data. This set is listed under the civil war category.)

1. Rainfall Data Sets

- A. Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP)

<http://cics.umd.edu/GPCP>

- B. National Centers for Environment Prediction (NCEP)

<http://iridl.ldeo.columbia.edu/SOURCES/.NOAA/.NCEP/.CPC/.Merged/.Analysis/.monthly/>

- C. U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization Climatic (FAOCLIM2) Data

CD-ROM: World-Wide Agroclimatic Database.

FAO-Agrometeorology Group, Rome 2000.

- D. Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)

<http://edcw2ks21.cr.usgs.gov/adds/>

2. Civil Conflict Data Sets

- A. Armed Conflict Data – International Peace Research Institute of Oslo, Norway and the University of Uppsala, Sweden (PRIO/Uppsala)

<http://www.prio.no/cwp/ArmedConflict>

- B. Fearon and Laitin (2003)

American Political Science Review, 97(1), 75-90.

<http://www.stanford.edu/group/ethnic/publicdata/publicdata.html>

- C. Doyle and Sambanis

(from Sambanis - Journal of Conflict Resolution vol. 45, no. 3)

<http://www.yale.edu/unsy/civilwars/data.htm>

3. Economic, Demographic, and Development Controls

- A. Global Development Network Growth Database (GDNGD)

<http://www.nyu.edu/fas/institute/dri/index.html>

- B. World Development Indicators (WDI)

CD-ROM: World Development Indicators 2002 Database.

Washington, D.C. 2002.

- C. FAO Stat

<http://apps.fao.org/default.jsp>

- D. Fractionalization Data

Alesina, Alberto, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio

Kurlat, and Romain Wacziarg - Journal of Economic Growth, vol. 8, no. 2, 155-194.

<http://www.stanford.edu/~wacziarg/papersum.html>

4. Political Institutional Controls

A. Polity IV

<http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/>

B. Database of Political Institutions (DPI)

<http://www.worldbank.org/research/bios/pkeefer.htm>

C. Freedom House

<http://www.freedomhouse.org/ratings/index.htm>

D. *The Logic of Political Survival* Data Set

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson and James D. Morrow. 2003. Cambridge: MIT Press.

<http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/data/bdm2s2/Logic.htm>

E. Barro (1991)

(from Levine and Renelt – American Economic Review LXXXII (1992), 942-963.)

<http://www.worldbank.org/research/growth/ddlevren.htm>

4. THE MSS Civil War Data Set – Variable Descriptions

0. Identification Variables

CCODE

Correlates of War (COW) Country Code

YEAR_ACTUAL

From 1981 or the first year of independence of the country

COUNTRY_NAME

Country Name

COUNTRY_CODE

Secondary Country Code. Often but not always the same as the World Bank Country Code

1. Rainfall Variables

A. Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) and Derived

GPCP

Global Precipitation Climatology Project estimate of average precipitation in millimeters per year. The exact source was NASA GPCP V2. It uses the Huffman et al. (1995, 1997) method of data selection and merging. See section 2 for an explanation of the methodology used to construct this measure. Source: Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP)

GPCP_L

GPCP lagged one year

GPCP_L2

GPCP lagged two years

GPCP_G

GPCP growth: $(GPCP - GPCP_I) / (GPCP_I)$

GPCP_G_L

GPCP growth lagged one year: $(GPCP_I - GPCP_I2) / (GPCP_I2)$

GPCP_G_FL

GPCP growth lagged forward one year:

$GPCP_g_fl = GPCP_g[_{n+1}]$ if $ccode == ccode[_{n+1}]$

GPCP_D

GPCP first difference: $(GPCP - GPCP_I)$

GPCP_D_L

GPCP first difference lagged one year: $(GPCP_I - GPCP_I2) / (GPCP_I2)$

GPCP_DF_MEAN

GPCP difference from the mean (of the 1979 to 2001 observations)

GPCP_DF_MEAN_1

GPCP_df_mean lagged one year

GPCP_DF_MEAN_2

GPCP_df_mean lagged two years

B. National Centers for Environment Prediction (NCEP) and Derived

NCEP

National Centers for Environment Prediction (NCEP) estimate of average precipitation in millimeters per year. The exact source was NOAA NCEP CPC Merged Analysis. It uses the Xie and Arkin (1997) method of data selection and merging. See section 2 for an explanation of the methodology used to construct this measure.

Source: National Centers for Environment Prediction (NCEP)

NCEP_L

NCEP lagged one year

NCEP_L2

NCEP lagged two years

NCEP_G

NCEP growth: $(NCEP - NCEP_I) / (NCEP_I)$

NCEP_G_L

NCEP growth lagged one year: $(NCEP_I - NCEP_I2) / (NCEP_I2)$

NCEP_G_FL

NCEP growth lagged forward one year:

$NCEP_g_fl = NCEP_g[_{n+1}]$ if $ccode == ccode[_{n+1}]$

NCEP_D

NCEP first difference: $(NCEP - NCEP_I)$

NCEP_D_L

NCEP first difference lagged one year: $(\text{NCEP_I} - \text{NCEP_I2}) / (\text{NCEP_I2})$

NCEP_DF_MEAN

NCEP difference from the mean (of the 1979 to 2001 observations)

NCEP_DF_MEAN_1

NCEP_df_mean lagged one year

NCEP_DF_MEAN_2

NCEP_df_mean lagged two years

C. U.N. FAO Climatic (FAOCLIM2) Database and Derived**SM_OBS**

Number of Station-Month observations used in the calculation of the FAO average precipitation in millimeters per year index.

Source: FAOCLIM2

FAO

FAO Climatic (FAOCLIM2) Database estimate of average precipitation in millimeters per year. See section 2 for an explanation of the methodology used to construct this measure.

Source: FAOCLIM2

FAO_L

FAO lagged one year

FAO_L2

FAO lagged two years

FAO_G

FAO growth: $(\text{FAO} - \text{FAO_I}) / (\text{FAO_I})$

FAO_G_L

FAO growth lagged one year: $(\text{FAO_I} - \text{FAO_I2}) / (\text{FAO_I2})$

FAO_G_FL

FAO growth lagged forward one year:

$\text{FAO_g_fl} = \text{FAO_g}[_{n+1}]$ if $\text{ccode} == \text{ccode}[_{n+1}]$

FAO_D

FAO first difference: $(\text{FAO} - \text{FAO_I})$

FAO_D_L

FAO first difference lagged one year: $(\text{FAO_I} - \text{FAO_I2}) / (\text{FAO_I2})$

FAO_DF_MEAN

FAO difference from the mean (of the 1960 to the latest available observations)

FAO_DF_MEAN_1

FAO_df_mean lagged one year

FAO_DF_MEAN_2

FAO_df_mean lagged two years

D. Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) and Derived**NDVI**

Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) estimate of the density of plant life, closely related to rainfall in Africa. See section 2 for an explanation of the methodology used to construct this measure.

Source: Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)

NDVI_L

NDVI lagged one year

NDVI_L2

NDVI lagged two years

NDVI_G

NDVI growth: $(\text{NDVI} - \text{NDVI_I}) / (\text{NDVI_I})$

NDVI_G_L

NDVI growth lagged one year: $(\text{NDVI_I} - \text{NDVI_I2}) / (\text{NDVI_I2})$

NDVI_G_FL

NDVI growth lagged forward one year:

$\text{NDVI_g_fl} = \text{NDVI_g}[_{n+1}]$ if $\text{ccode} == \text{ccode}[_{n+1}]$

NDVI_D

NDVI first difference: $(\text{NDVI} - \text{NDVI_I})$

NDVI_D_L

NDVI first difference lagged one year: $(\text{NDVI_I} - \text{NDVI_I2}) / (\text{NDVI_I2})$

NDVI_DF_MEAN

NDVI difference from the mean (of the 1982 to 2001 observations)

NDVI_DF_MEAN_1

NDVI_df_mean lagged one year

NDVI_DF_MEAN_2

NDVI_df_mean lagged two years

2. Civil War Variables**A. PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Data (Monadic) and Derived****TYPE3**

Type3 is PRIO/Uppsala's indicator of Internal Conflict. It can take on four distinct values:

- 0: No Internal Conflict
- 1: Internal Minor Armed Conflict
- 2: Internal Intermediate Armed Conflict
- 3: Internal War

PRIO/Uppsala define Minor Conflict, Intermediate Conflict, and War as follows:

- Minor Armed Conflict: At least 25 battle-related deaths per year and fewer than 1,000 battle-related deaths during the course of the conflict.
- Intermediate Armed Conflict: At least 25 battle-related deaths per year and an accumulated total of at least 1,000 deaths, but fewer than 1,000 per year.
- War: At least 1,000 battle-related deaths per year.

Source: PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Data

TYPE4

Type4 is PRIO/Uppsala's indicator of Internationalized Internal Conflict. It can take on four distinct values:

- 0: No Internationalized Internal Conflict
- 1: Internationalized Internal Minor Armed Conflict
- 2: Internationalized Internal Intermediate Armed Conflict
- 3: Internationalized Internal War

PRIO/Uppsala define Minor Conflict, Intermediate Conflict, and War as follows:

- Minor Armed Conflict: At least 25 battle-related deaths per year and fewer than 1,000 battle-related deaths during the course of the conflict.
- Intermediate Armed Conflict: At least 25 battle-related deaths per year and an accumulated total of at least 1,000 deaths, but fewer than 1,000 per year.
- War: At least 1,000 battle-related deaths per year.

Source: PRIO/Uppsala Armed Conflict Data

WAR_PRIO

Internal War or Internationalized Internal War.

Internal Conflict or Internationalized Conflict with at least 1,000 battle-related deaths per year. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if TYPE3 equals 3 or TYPE4 equals 3, “0” otherwise.

MINOR_PRIO

Minor or Intermediate Internal Conflict or Minor or Intermediate Internationalized Conflict. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if TYPE3 equals 1 or 2 or TYPE4 equals 1 or 2, “0” otherwise.

ANY_PRIO

Any Internal War or Any Internationalized Internal War.

Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if TYPE3 equals 1, 2, or 3 or TYPE4 equals 1, 2, or 3, “0” otherwise.

WAR_PRIO_ON

WAR_PRIO Onset. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if Internal War or Internationalized Internal War onset during country year, “0” otherwise.

MINOR_PRIO_ON

MINOR_PRIO Onset. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if Minor or Intermediate Internal Conflict or Minor or Intermediate Internationalized Conflict onset during country year, “0” otherwise.

ANY_PRIO_ON

ANY_PRIO Onset. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if Any Internal War or Any Internationalized Internal War onset during country year, “0” otherwise.

WAR_PRIO_OFF

WAR_PRIO Offset. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if Internal War or Internationalized Internal War ends during country year, “0” otherwise.

MINOR_PRIO_OFF

MINOR_PRIO Offset. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if Minor or Intermediate Internal Conflict or Minor or Intermediate Internationalized Conflict ends during country year, “0” otherwise.

ANY_PRIO_OFF

ANY_PRIO Offset. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if Any Internal War or Any Internationalized Internal War ends during country year, “0” otherwise.

B. Fearon and Laitin (2003) and Derived

WARS

Number of wars in progress during a given country year

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

WAR

Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if war ongoing during country year, “0” otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

WARL

WAR lagged one year, with 0 for start of country series.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

ONSET

Onset of a Civil War. Dichotomous variable. Coded “1” if civil war onset during country year, “0” otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

ENDED

End of Civil War. Coded “1” if civil war ends during country year, “0” if ongoing, Missing(.) otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

WARYRS

Number of War Years for each onset

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

POP

Population, in thousands.

“For the country years for which it is available, we used the Penn World Tables 5.6 numbers. Otherwise, we used the World Bank estimate (WDI 2001), and then the figure from the Correlates of War National Capabilities Data when neither the World Bank nor PWT provided an estimate. This means that population in years after 1992 are mainly World Bank estimates, while before 1950 everything is from COW. The correlation between these three different sources is nearly perfect, however, so it matters not all which source is used as the ‘base.’”²

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

LPOP

Log of pop

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

² Fearon, James and David Laitin. “Additional Tables for ‘Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War.’” Stanford University, February 6, 2003, p 3.

POLITY2

Revised polity score.

Taken from the Polity IV dataset. Polity is the difference between Polity IV's measure of democracy minus its measure of autocracy. Values range from -10 to 10. The revised polity score fills in missing values based on the following coding: when polity = -66, set polity2 = NULL, when polity = -77, set polity2 = 0, when polity = -88, extrapolate based previous and subsequent values.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

GDPEN

Per Capita GDP.

"We started with the Penn World Tables 5.6 for real per capita income (chain index), measured in 1985 U.S. dollars. This series starts in 1950 and ends in 1992, and provides estimates for 4,243 of our 6,610 country years (64%). We then used the estimates of growth rate of per capita income provided in the 2001 World Development Indicators (WDI, published by the World Bank) to extend these estimates forward to 1999 and backwards to the first year of independence or 1960 (the first year in the WDI data) where possible. This added another 1,116 observations (17% of country years)...."³

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

GDPENL

GDPEN lagged one year, with 0 for start of country series.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

LGDPENL1

Log of GDPENL

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

LPOPL1

Log of population lagged one year, with 0 for start of country series.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COLBRIT

Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if country was a former British colony, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COLFRA

Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if country was a former French colony, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

³ Ibid, p 1.

MTNEST

Percent Mountainous Terrain. Based on work by geographer A.J. Gerard for the World Bank's "Economics of Civil War, Crime, and Violence" project.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

LMTNEST

Log of Mtnest

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

OIL

Oil Exporters.

"We used World Bank (WDI) data on fuel exports as a percentage of merchandise exports, which is available for five year periods from 1960 and annually from 1980 for most countries. Missing years prior to 1980 and after 1960 were linearly interpolated where possible. We next created a dummy variable marking country years that had greater than 33% fuel exports."⁴

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

NCONTIG

Noncontiguous State. Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if a country is a non-continuous state, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

ETHFRAC

Ethnic-linguistic fractionalization based on the Atlas Marodov Mira.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

EF

Ethnic fractionalization based on Fearon (2002).

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

RELFRAC

Religious Fractionalization.

"R. Quinn Meacham started with the CIA Factbook estimates and then used a number of other sources to construct a list of religions by country, and percentage of adherents. Figures are generally for the 1990s, though with few exceptions this variable does not seem to change much over time."⁵

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

NWSTATE

New State. Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if state is in its first two years of existence, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

⁴ Ibid, p 4.

⁵ Ibid, p 4.

POLITY2L

Polity2 lagged one year, with 0 for start of country series.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

INSTAB

Instability. Greater than 2 change in Polity2 measure in last 3 years.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

DEML

Lagged Democracy. Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if polity2l > 5, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

SDWARS

Number of Civil Wars in progress using Doyle and Sambanis's coding.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

SDONSET

Civil War Onset using Doyle and Sambanis's coding. Dichotomous variable.

Coded "1" if onset in current year, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COLWARS

Number of Civil Wars in progress using Collier and Hoeffler's coding.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COLONSET

Civil War Onset using Collier and Hoeffler's coding. Dichotomous variable.

Coded "1" if onset in current year, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COWWARS

Number of Civil Wars in progress using the Correlates of War (COW) coding.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COWONSET

Civil War Onset using the Correlates of War (COW) coding. Coded "1" if onset in current year, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COWWARL

War in last period using Correlates of War (COW) coding. Coded "1" if COW war ongoing in last period.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

SDWARL

War in last period using Doyle and Sambanis. Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if Doyle and Sambanis war ongoing in last period, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

COLWARL

War in last period using Collier and Hoeffler's coding. Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if Collier and Hoeffler war ongoing in last period, "0" otherwise.

Source: Fearon and Laitin (2003)

GDP_G

GDP Growth. $(GDPEN - GDPENL) / (GDPENL)$

GDP_G_L

GDP_G lagged one year

Y_0

GDP per capita at the beginning of the period of analysis, 1979 (1990 for Namibia). GDPEN for 1979 (1990 for Namibia)

POLITY2L_6

Democracy Indicator. Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if POLITY2L \geq 6, "0" otherwise.

WAR_COL

Civil War Incidence using Collier and Hoeffler's coding. Dichotomous variable. Coded "1" if COLWARS $>$ 0, "0" otherwise.

C. Doyle and Sambanis and Derived**WARSTDS**

Civil War Start.

1: First Observation; Missing(.): Other observations of war; 0: No War

Source: Doyle and Sambanis

WAR_ON

Civil War Onset using Doyle and Sambanis coding. Dichotomous variable.

Coded "1" if WARSTDS = 1, "0" otherwise.

WAR_INC

Civil War Incidence using Doyle and Sambanis coding. Dichotomous variable.

Coded "1" if WARSTDS = 1 or WARSTDS = Missing(.), "0" otherwise.

3. Economic, Demographic, and Development Controls

A. Global Development Network Growth Database (GDNGD) and Derived

TOT_100

Terms of trade (goods and services, 1995 = 100)

Source: GDNGD

TOT_100_L

TOT_100 lagged one year

TOT_100_G

TOT_100 growth: $(TOT_{100} - TOT_{100_L}) / (TOT_{100_L})$

B. World Development Indicators (WDI) and Derived

TOT_ADJ

Terms of trade adjusted (constant Local Currency Units) - NY.TTF.GNFS.KN

Source: WDI

TRADE_PGDP

Trade as a percentage of GDP - NE.TRD.GNFS.ZS

Source: WDI

TRADE_GOODS_PGDP

Trade in goods as a percentage of GDP - TG.VAL.TOTL.GD.ZS

Source: WDI

TRADE_GOODS_PGOODSGDP

Trade in goods as a percentage of goods GDP - TG.VAL.TOTL.GG.ZS

Source: WDI

MIL_EXP

Military Expenditure as a percentage of central government expenditure -

MS.MIL.XPND.ZS

Source: WDI

MIL_PERS

Military Personnel, total - MS.MIL.TOTL.P1

Source: WDI

UNEMPLOY

Unemployment, total as a percentage of the total labor force - SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS

Source: WDI

ROADS_NET

Roads, total network (km) - IS.ROD.TOTL.KM

Source: WDI

TAX_REV_P

Tax revenues as a percentage of GDP - GB.TAX.TOTL.GD.ZS

Source: WDI

TAX_REV

Tax revenue (current Local Currency Units) - GB.TAX.TOTL.CN

Source: WDI

MALE_SCHOOL

School enrollment, secondary, male as a percentage of gross enrollment -

SE.SEC.ENRR.MA

Source: WDI

MALE_SCHOOL_NET

School enrollment, secondary, male as a percentage of net enrollment -

SE.SEC.NENR.MA

Source: WDI

POP_DEN

Population density (People per square kilometer) - EN.POP.DNST

Source: WDI

POP_DEN_RUR

Population density rural (People per square kilometer) - EN.RUR.DNST

Source: WDI

AID_CAPITA

Aid received per capita (current US Dollar) - DT.ODA.ALLD.PC.ZS

Source: WDI

GINI

GINI index - SI.POV.GINI

Source: WDI

INCOME_4TH20

Income share held by the fourth 20th percentile of the population -

SI.DST.04TH.20

Source: WDI

INCOME_1ST10

Income share held by the highest 10th percentile of the population -

SI.DST.10TH.10

Source: WDI

INCOME_1ST20

Income share held by the highest 20th percentile of the population -

SI.DST.05TH.20

Source: WDI

INCOME_10TH10

Income share held by the lowest 10th percentile of the population -

SI.DST.FRST.10

Source: WDI

INCOME_5TH20

Income share held by the lowest 20th percentile of the population -

SI.DST.FRST.20

Source: WDI

INCOME_2TH20

Income share held by the second 20th percentile of the population -

SI.DST.02ND.20

Source: WDI

INCOME_3RD20

Income share held by the third 20th percentile of the population -

SI.DST.03RD.20

Source: WDI

LAND_ARABLE

Land use, arable land as a percentage of land area - AG.LND.ARBL.ZS

Source: WDI

LAND_CROP

Land use, permanent cropland as a percentage of land area - AG.LND.CROP.ZS

Source: WDI

LAND_FOREST

Forest area as a percentage of land area - AG.LND.FRST.ZS

Source: WDI

LAND_CROP_IRRIG

Land use, irrigated land as a percentage of cropland - AG.LND.IRIG.ZS

Source: WDI

LAND_OTHER

Land use, other as a percentage of land area - AG.LND.OTHR.ZS

Source: WDI

VA_AGR

Agriculture, value added as a percentage of GDP - NV.AGR.TOTL.ZS

Source: WDI

VA_IND_MANF

Manufacturing, value added as a percentage of GDP - NV.IND.MANF.ZS

Source: WDI

VA_IND_TOT

Industry, value added as a percentage of GDP - NV.IND.TOTL.ZS

Source: WDI

VA_SERV

Services, etc., value added as a percentage of GDP - NV.SRV.TETC.ZS

Source: WDI

POP_0014_FEM

Population ages 0-14, female - SP.POP.0014.FE.IN

Source: WDI

POP_0014_MALE

Population ages 0-14, male - SP.POP.0014.MA.IN

Source: WDI

POP_0014_TOT

Population ages 0-14, total - SP.POP.0014.TO

Source: WDI

POP_0014_PTOT

Population ages 0-14 as a percentage of the total population -

SP.POP.0014.TO.ZS

Source: WDI

POP_1564_FEM

Population ages 15-64, female - SP.POP.1564.FE.IN

Source: WDI

POP_1564_PTOT

Population ages 15-64 as a percentage of the total population -

SP.POP.1564.IN.ZS

Source: WDI

POP_1564_MALE

Population ages 0-14, male - SP.POP.1564.MA.IN

Source: WDI

POP_1564_TOT

Population ages 0-14, total - SP.POP.1564.TO

Source: WDI

POP_65UP_FEM

Population ages 65 and above, female - SP.POP.65UP.FE.IN

Source: WDI

POP_65UP_MALE

Population ages 65 and above, male - SP.POP.65UP.MA.IN

Source: WDI

POP_65UP_FEM_PMALE

Population ages 65 and above, per 100 men - SP.POP.65UP.MF.ZS

Source: WDI

POP_65UP_TOT

Population ages 65 and above, total - SP.POP.65UP.TO

Source: WDI

POP_65UP_PTOT

Population ages 65 and above, percentage of the total population -

SP.POP.65UP.TO.ZS

Source: WDI

POV_HEAD_NAT

Poverty headcount, national, as a percentage of the population - SI.POV.NAHC

Source: WDI

POV_HEAD_RUR

Poverty headcount, rural, as a percentage of the population - SI.POV.RUHC

Source: WDI

POV_HEAD_URB

Poverty headcount, urban, as a percentage of the population - SI.POV.URHC

Source: WDI

POP_RUR_PTOT

Rural population as a percentage of the total population - SP.RUR.TOTL.ZS

Source: WDI

POP_TOT

Population, total - SP.POP.TOTL

Source: WDI

POP_1524_MALE

Population ages 15-24

Source: WDI

PER_0014

Percentage of males ages 0-14 of the total population

Source: WDI

PER_1524

Percentage of males ages 15-24 of the total population

Source: WDI

C. FAO Stat and Derived**FAO_FOODAID**

Food Aid All Donors - Wheat, Rice, Barley, Maize, Rye, Oats, Millet, etc.

Source: FAO Stat

D. Alesina et al. Fractionalization and Derived**ETHNIC**

Ethnic Fractionalization.

Source: Alesina et al. (2003)

LANGUAGE

Linguistic Fractionalization.

Source: Alesina et al. (2003)

RELIGION

Religious Fractionalization.

Source: Alesina et al. (2003)

4. Political Institutional Controls

A. Polity IV and Derived

DEMOC

Institutionalized Democracy Score. Ranges from 0, least democratic to 10, most democratic. In addition, the following variables are coded as such: Interruption Periods (-66), Interregnum Periods (-77), Transition Periods (-88).

Source: Polity IV

AUTOC

Institutionalized Autocracy Score. Ranges from 0, least autocratic to 10, most autocratic. In addition, the following variables are coded as such: Interruption Periods (-66), Interregnum Periods (-77), Transition Periods (-88).

Source: Polity IV

POLITY

Combined Polity Score (DEMOC - AUTOC). The difference between Polity IV's measure of democracy and its measure of autocracy. Values range from -10 to 10.

Source: Polity IV

POLITY2_IV

Revised Polity Score. Same as Polity2 variable above from Fearon and Laitin (2003). (DEMOC - AUTOC). The difference between Polity IV's measure of democracy and its measure of autocracy. Values range from -10 to 10.

The revised polity score fills in missing values based on the following coding: when polity = -66, set polity2 = NULL, when polity = -77, set polity2 = 0, when polity = -88, extrapolate based previous and subsequent values.

Source: Polity IV

DURABLE

Regime Durability.

Source: Polity IV

XRREG

Regulation of Chief Executive Recruitment

Source: Polity IV

XRCOMP

Competitiveness of Executive Recruitment

Source: Polity IV

XRCOMP

Competitiveness of Executive Recruitment

Source: Polity IV

XROPEN

Openness of Executive Recruitment

Source: Polity IV

XCONST

Executive Constraints (Decision Rules)

Source: Polity IV

PARREG

Regulation of Participation

Source: Polity IV

PARCOMP

The Competitiveness of Participation

Source: Polity IV

EXREC

Executive Recruitment Concept

Source: Polity IV

EXCONST

Executive Constraints Concept

Source: Polity IV

POLCOMP

Political Competition Concept

Source: Polity IV

B. Database of Political Institutions (DPI) and Derived**MILITARY**

Is Chief Executive a military officer? Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 if "No," and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

EXECRLC

Party of the Executive. Right (R); Left (L); Center (C); N/A (Missing(.))

Source: DPI

EXECNAT

Party of the Executive Nationalist? Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 if "No," and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

EXECRURL

Party of the Executive Rural? Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 if "No," and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

EXECREG

Party of the Executive Regional? Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 if "No," and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

EXECREL

Party of the Executive Religious? Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 if "No," and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

EXECAGE

Party of the Executive - Time Since Formation under this name?

Source: DPI

ALLHOUSE

Does party of executive control all of the relevant houses? Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 if "No," and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

HERFGOV

Legislature Herfindahl Index Government

Source: DPI

HERFOPP

Legislature Herfindahl Index Opposition

Source: DPI

OPPFRA

Legislature Opposition Fractionalization

Source: DPI

CHECKS

Checks and Balances.

Source: DPI

AUTON

Are there autonomous regions? Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 if "No," and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

MUNI

Are the municipal governments locally elected?

“0 if neither local executive nor local legislature are locally elected. 1 if the executive is appointed, but the legislature elected. 2 if they are both locally elected.”⁶ Missing(.) if no information, or no evidence of municipal governments.

Source: DPI

STATE

Are the state / province governments locally elected?

“0 if neither local executive nor local legislature are locally elected. 1 if the executive is appointed, but the legislature elected. 2 if they are both locally elected.”⁷ Missing(.) if no information, or no evidence of state governments.

Source: DPI

AUTHOR

Do sub-national governments have extensive tax, spending, or regulatory authority? Coded 1 if “Yes,” 0 if “No,” and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

STCONST

Are the constituencies of the senators the states / provinces? Coded 1 if “Yes,” 0 if “No,” and Missing(.) if information not available.

Source: DPI

C. Freedom House and Derived

FH_CIV

Civil Liberties Rating. Barro Transformation: $(7 - \text{FH Measure}) / 6$. The original Freedom House data ranges from 1, the highest level of freedom, to 7, the lowest level of freedom. After the Barro transformation, the data range from 1, the highest level of freedom, to 0, the lowest level of freedom.

Source: Freedom House

FH_POL

Political Rights Rating. Barro Transformation: $(7 - \text{FH Measure}) / 6$. The original Freedom House data ranges from 1, the highest level of freedom, to 7, the lowest level of freedom. After the Barro transformation, the data range from 1, the highest level of freedom, to 0, the lowest level of freedom.

Source: Freedom House

⁶ Keefer, Philip. DPI2000 Database of Political Institutions: Changes and Variable Definition. Development Research Group, The World Bank. March 2002, p 21.

⁷ Ibid, p21.

D. The Logic of Political Survival Data Set and Derived

S

Selectorate Size.

The selectorate is the broader group from which the winning coalition is drawn. It is constructed from the Polity variable Legislative Selection (LEGSELEC). Larger values of S represent larger selectorate sizes.

Source: The Logic of Political Survival Data Set

W

Winning Coalition Size.

W is a composite index based on data from Polity IV and Banks (1996).

Specifically, W combines XRCOMP (the competitiveness of executive recruitment), XROPEN (the openness of executive recruitment) and PARCOMP (the competitiveness of participation) from Polity IV with REGTYPE from Banks (civilian character of regime). W takes on the following values: 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, and 1.0. Larger values of W represent larger coalition sizes.

Source: The Logic of Political Survival Data Set

WoverS

W/S - Loyalty Norm

Source: The Logic of Political Survival Data Set

E. Barro (1991) and Derived

SOC

Socialist Country Dummy. Coded 1 if "Yes," 0 Otherwise.

Source: Levine and Renelt (1992)

7. References

Alesina, Alberto, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio Kurlat, and Romain Wacziarg. (2003). "Fractionalization", *Journal of Economic Growth*, 8(2), 155-194.

Barro, Robert. (1991). "Economic Growth in a Cross Section of Countries", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(2), 407-443.

Beck, Thorsten, George Clarke, Alberto Groff, Philip Keefer, and Patrick Walsh. (2001). "New tools in comparative political economy: The Database of Political Institutions", *World Bank Economic Review*, 15: 1, 165-176.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson and James D. Morrow. (2003). *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Fearon, James and David Laitin. (2003). "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War." *American Political Science Review*, 97(1), 75-90.

Fearon, James and David Laitin. "Additional Tables for 'Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War.'" Stanford University, February 6, 2003.

Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg, and Havard Strand. (2002). "Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A New Dataset", *Journal of Peace Research*, 39(5).

Huffman, G.J., R.F. Adler, B. Rudolf, U. Schneider, P.R. Keehn (1995): Global Precipitation Estimates Based on a Technique for Combining Satellite-Based Estimates, Raingauge Analyses and NWP Model Information. *Journal of Climate* 8(5), p. 1284 - 1295.

Huffman, G.J., R.F. Adler, P.A. Arkin, A. Chang, R. Ferraro, A. Gruber, J. Janowiak, A. McNab, B. Rudolf, U. Schneider (1997): The Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) Combined Precipitation Dataset. *Bull. Americ. Meteor. Soc.* 78(1), 5-20.

Huffman, G.J., R.F. Adler, M.M.. Morrissey, D.T. Bolvin, S. Curtis, R. Joyce, B. McGavock, J. Susskind (2000/2001): Global Precipitation at One-Degree Daily Resolution From Multi-Satellite Observations. Accepted by *J. Hydrometeorology*.

Levine, Ross, and David Renelt. (1992). "Sensitivity Analysis of Cross-Country Growth Regressions", *American Economic Review*, LXXXII, 942-963.

Rudolf, Bruno. (2000). "Satellite-based Global Precipitation Estimates and Validation Results", *Proceedings of the SAF Workshop on Climate Monitoring* (<http://www.eumetsat.de/en/area2/proceedings/eump31/pdf/rudolf.pdf>).

Sambanis, Nicholas. (2001). "Do Ethnic and Non-Ethnic Civil Wars Have the Same Causes? A Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry (Part 1)," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* vol. 45, no. 3.

Sambanis, Nicholas. (2001a). "A Review of Recent Advances and Future Directions in the Quantitative Literature on Civil War", unpublished manuscript, Yale University.

Xie, P. and P.A. Arkin, 1997: Global Precipitation: a 17-year monthly analysis based on gauge observations, satellite estimates, and numerical model outputs. *Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc.* 78, 2539-2558.

Addendum-

In our paper “Economic Shocks and Civil War: An Instrumental Variables Approach” (*Journal of Political Economy*, 2004) we examine the effects of economic growth shocks (as instrumented by rainfall shocks) on civil conflict. There are two ways of conceiving of civil conflict. One is a broad definition that aims to capture a country’s civil war **involvement**. As per this broad definition countries where civil wars occur as well as countries that participate in other countries’ civil conflicts are coded as a 1 on the civil war dummy variable. The second is a narrow definition of civil war that aims solely to capture the **location** of civil conflict. As per this definition a country is only coded as 1 if there is a civil war taking place within its boundaries. We note that the former broad definition is consistent with the causal story proposed in our paper. Our proposed causal mechanism is that adverse economic shocks (instrumented by rainfall shocks in our paper) make it easier to recruit fighters for civil conflicts. This effect of rainfall shocks could apply irrespective of whether fighters are being recruited for conflicts within their own countries or abroad.

The empirical difference between the two definitions is, however, close to moot in the African context because there are very few cases of interventions across borders: a shift from the first to the second definition (using the Uppsala/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset version 1.2a, the dataset available when we wrote the original paper) requires recoding at most 25 out of 743 observations, or only about 3% of all cases.

Unsurprisingly, results hardly vary when we shift from the first to the second definition given the very small number of cases affected. The minor differences are as follows (see Table A below for the details):

- 1) In our paper we emphasize results using the threshold of at least 25 annual deaths to define a civil conflict. We do so because we think this comprehensive definition is more appropriate than the higher 1000 death threshold for smaller countries, and Africa (the focus of our analysis) abounds in small countries. This measure is best thought of as the most complete measure of armed civil conflicts, and is not a measure of “small conflicts” alone: it captures small and large conflicts. As the first four columns of Table A show, the significance level of our core results is almost entirely unaffected by a shift to the narrower definition, and the coefficient values change by very little, less than 5%. *It is fair to say that the main results of our paper are essentially unchanged when we shift the definition from the broad to the narrow definition of civil conflict involvement.*
- 2) As we showed in our original paper (Table 4, last column) the results for the higher 1000 death threshold are only borderline statistically significant at the 90% level. This can be readily explained by the fact that this is a more restrictive cut at the data, excluding many conflicts that should legitimately be counted in the African context (namely, those with annual death tolls between 25 and 1000). The effect on our results of shifting to a narrow definition of conflict, at any rate, is not substantial. The sign is unchanged, the p-value falls only slightly from 0.08

to 0.12 and the coefficient value drops by less than a third, though remains high. The fact that results using the annual 1000 death armed conflict threshold are weaker than for the comprehensive 25 death threshold was already clearly communicated in appendix Table C3 of our original paper via a series of robustness checks on multiple alternative data sets that use the annual 1000 death threshold, so there is little new information conveyed by the recoding discussed above.

In sum, the minor recoding of cases demanded by a shift to the narrow definition of armed conflict has little impact on the empirical results in our 2004 *JPE* paper. As such we interpret the analysis with the narrow definition of armed conflict as yet another valuable robustness check that confirms the main findings in the paper. For analysts who would like to use the narrow coding, we have updated the dataset on our websites. The new variables and their definitions are as follows:

LOCATION: Location of Conflict. 0=Country is not listed as the location of conflict; 1=Country is listed as the location of a Minor Conflict; 2=Country is listed as the location of an Intermediate Conflict; 3=Country is listed as the location of a War

ANY_PRIO_NAR: Dichotomous variable with death threshold of 25. Coded 1 if (TYPE3 equals 1, 2, or 3) or (TYPE4 equals 1, 2, or 3 & LOCATION is greater than 0).

WAR_PRIO_NAR: Dichotomous variable with death threshold of 1000. Coded 1 if (TYPE3 equals 3) or (TYPE4 equals 3 & TYPE3 equals 0 & LOCATION is greater than 0).

We are very grateful to Kristian Skrede Gleditsch (University of Essex) and Peter Sandholt Jensen (University of Aarhus) for suggesting these recodings, and for useful and constructive discussions about the empirical results.

Edward Miguel (University of California, Berkeley)
Shanker Satyanath (New York University)
Ernest Sergenti (New York University)

February 2007

Table A: Economic Growth and Civil Conflict – Broad and Narrow Codings

Explanatory variable	Dependent variable:					
	Civil conflict ≥ 25 deaths			Civil conflict ≥ 1000 deaths		
	Broad (1)	Narrow (2)	Broad (3)	Narrow (4)	Broad (5)	Narrow (6)
Economic growth rate, t	-.41 (1.48) [.782]	-.50 (1.26) [.694]	-1.13 (1.40) [.425]	-.91 (1.21) [.454]	-1.48* (.82) [.080]	-1.04 (.65) [.116]
Economic growth rate, t-1	-2.25** (1.07) [.043]	-2.20** (1.05) [.042]	-2.55** (1.10) [.026]	-2.45** (1.11) [.033]	-.77 (.70) [.278]	-.41 (.62) [.519]
Log(GDP per capita), 1979	.053 (.098) [.592]	.069 (.097) [.482]				
Democracy (Polity IV), t-1	.004 (.006) [.484]	.007 (.006) [.226]				
Ethno-linguistic fractionalization	.51 (.39) [.203]	.43 (.38) [.262]				
Religious fractionalization	.22 (.44) [.620]	.04 (.42) [.917]				
Oil exporting country	-.10 (.22) [.637]	-.07 (.22) [.738]				
Log(mountainous)	.060 (.058) [.308]	.080 (.058) [.173]				
Log (national population), t-1	.159* (.093) [.093]	.128 (.088) [.156]				
Country fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country-specific time trends	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Root MSE	0.36	0.33	0.32	0.29	0.24	0.20
Number of observations	743	743	743	743	743	743

Table A Notes: Results presented in columns (1), (3), and (5) are identical to those presented in Miguel, Satyanath, and Sergenti (2004), Table 4, columns (5), (6), and (7) respectively and are from the sample using the broad definition of conflict. Results presented in columns (2), (4), and (6) are from the sample using the narrow definition of conflict. Huber robust standard errors are in parentheses. P-values are in brackets. Regression disturbance terms are clustered at the country level. The instrumental variables for economic growth in all regressions are growth in rainfall, t and growth in rainfall, t-1. A country-specific year time trend is included in all specifications (coefficient estimates not reported).

* Significantly different from zero at 90 percent confidence.

** Significantly different from zero at 95 percent confidence.

*** Significantly different from zero at 99 percent confidence.