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Introduction

We study the effects of agricultural productivity on the industrial sector.

- Classic view that increases in agricultural productivity are a precondition for industrial growth. [Rostow, 1960]
  - increasing income per capita $\rightarrow$ demand for manufacturing goods

- However, this effect can be reversed in an open economy [Matsuyama, 1992]
  - Comparative advantage in agriculture $\rightarrow$ reallocation of labor towards agriculture and smaller industrial sector.
Introduction

- We study the effect of the adoption of a new agricultural technology (GE soybean seeds) on Brazilian manufacturing firms.

- To establish causality, we exploit the timing of adoption and its differential impact on potential yields across geographical areas.

  - GE soy seeds were commercially introduced in the U.S. in 1996 and legalized in Brazil in 2003.

  - Their impact on potential yields depends on local weather and soil characteristics.
Preview of preliminary findings

Main findings on the effects of the soy productivity shock

- **Agriculture**
  - reduction in labor intensity

- **Local Labor Market**
  - reduction in employment share of agriculture

- **Industry**
  - reduction in wages
  - increase in employment, revenues and investment
Structure of Talk

- Data
- Empirical Strategy
- Preliminary Findings
Data

- Agricultural Census 1995-6 and 2006. IBGE
  - municipality-level data on quantity, value and area by crop

- Yearly Industry Survey 1996-2007 IBGE
  - firm-level data on revenues, employment by skill, investment

- Potential yield of soy and other crops from FAO-GAEZ
  - geo-referenced grid of 9.25 x 9.25 km
### Agricultural Census Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Reaped (million ha)</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soy</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All seasonal crops</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment (million workers)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal crops</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: in 1996 soy production employs 42 workers per 1000 ha, while maize employs 106 and sugar 138.
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Basic Correlations in the Data

We start by reporting the correlation between the expansion in area planted with soy within each municipality and:

- Value of output per worker (seasonal crops)
- Labor intensity (seasonal crops)
- Agriculture’s employment share
Basic Correlations in the Data

In levels:

\[ y_{jt} = \alpha_j + \alpha_t + \beta \left( \frac{\text{Soy Area}}{\text{Agricultural Area}} \right)_{jt} + \varepsilon_{jt} \]

In first differences:

\[ \Delta y_j = \Delta \alpha + \beta \Delta \left( \frac{\text{Soy Area}}{\text{Agricultural Area}} \right)_j + \Delta \varepsilon_j \]
# Agricultural outcomes: OLS results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\Delta$ Value per Worker</th>
<th>$\Delta$ Labor Intensity</th>
<th>$\Delta$ % Agri Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ % Soy Area</td>
<td>3.303***</td>
<td>-0.630***</td>
<td>-0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.281)</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.0358)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>3,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ % Maize Area</td>
<td>2.907***</td>
<td>0.679***</td>
<td>0.0204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.0252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4,062</td>
<td>4,053</td>
<td>4,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Basic Correlations in the Data

Quantification

The average change in soy area "explains":

- a 1.8 workers per 1000 ha reduction in labor intensity
- 1/3 of the reduction in seasonal crop employment
Causality

The basic correlation: areas where soy expanded reduced labor intensity in agriculture

- This could be caused by labor saving technological change in agriculture
- Alternatively it could be due to other shocks to local labor markets
  - For example: an increase in labor demand in other sectors could increase wages, inducing agricultural firms to switch to less labor intensive crops, like soy.

- To establish the direction of causality we need an exogenous measure of technological change in agriculture
A Measure of Technological Change in Agriculture

Potential yield of soy and other crops from FAO-GAEZ

- agricultural model prediction based on soil and weather characteristics
  - weather data from East Anglia CRU
  - soil map of the world
  - agronomic model linking weather and soil characteristics to yields for each crop

- worldwide grid of 9.25 x 9.25 km

- reports potential yields under low and high level of inputs
Potential Soy Yields under Low Inputs
Potential Soy Yields under High Inputs
Potential Soy Tech Shock = \( \text{Yield}^{\text{high inputs}} - \text{Yield}^{\text{low inputs}} \)
Empirical Strategy

Effect of agricultural technology shock on two sets of outcomes

- Agriculture
- Industry
Agricultural Outcomes: Empirical Strategy

In first differences:

\[ \Delta y_j = \Delta \alpha + \beta \Delta A_{j}^{soy} + \Delta \varepsilon_j \]

where:

\[ \Delta A_{j}^{soy} = A_{j}^{soy, \text{HIGH inputs}} - A_{j}^{soy, \text{LOW inputs}} \]
Agricultural Outcomes: Empirical Strategy

In first differences:

\[ \Delta y_j = \Delta \alpha + \beta \Delta A_{j}^{soy} + \Delta \varepsilon_j \]

where:

\[ \Delta A_{j}^{soy} = A_{j}^{soy, HIGH \ inputs} - A_{j}^{soy, LOW \ inputs} \]

with controls:

\[ \Delta y_j = \Delta \alpha + \beta \Delta A_{j}^{soy} + \gamma \Delta A_{j}^{maize} + A_{j}^{sugar} + \Delta \varepsilon_j \]
### Agricultural Outcomes: First Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \Delta % \text{ Soy Area} )</th>
<th>( \Delta % \text{ Soy Area} )</th>
<th>( \Delta % \text{ Maize Area} )</th>
<th>( \Delta % \text{ Maize Area} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta A^{\text{soy}} )</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.025***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta A^{\text{maize}} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.003***</td>
<td>0.003***</td>
<td>0.004***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^{\text{sugar}} )</td>
<td>-0.007***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.006***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>3,921</td>
<td>3,921</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>4,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R\text{-squared} )</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** \( p<0.01 \), ** \( p<0.05 \), * \( p<0.1 \)
Agricultural Outcomes: Quantification

The estimated coefficient implies that municipalities with a one standard deviation above the mean increase in potential soy yields

- increased the share of soy in planted land area by 36% of a standard deviation.
## Agricultural Outcomes: Reduced Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>∆ Value per Worker</th>
<th>∆ Labor Intensity</th>
<th>∆ % Agri Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta A^{soy}$</td>
<td>0.143***</td>
<td>-0.088**</td>
<td>-0.027***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta A^{maize}$</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.049***</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A^{sugar}$</td>
<td>-0.036*</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N  | 4,150 | 4,146 | 4,254 |
| R-squared | 0.003 | 0.007 | 0.013 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Industrial Outcomes

- firm-level data from IBGE
  - employment and wages by skill
  - revenues
  - investment
Industrial Outcomes: Empirical Strategy

\[ y_{jt} = \alpha_j + \alpha_t + \beta A_{jt}^{soy} + \varepsilon_{jt} \]

\[ A_{jt}^{soy} = \begin{cases} 
\text{potential yield of soy under high inputs if } t \geq 2003 \\
\text{potential yield of soy under low inputs if } t < 2003
\end{cases} \]
Industrial Outcomes: Empirical Strategy

\[ y_{jt} = \alpha_j + \alpha_t + \beta A_{jt}^{\text{soy}} + \varepsilon_{jt} \]

\[ A_{jt}^{\text{soy}} = \begin{cases} \text{potential yield of soy under high inputs if } t \geq 2003 \\ \text{potential yield of soy under low inputs if } t < 2003 \end{cases} \]

with controls:

\[ y_{jt} = \alpha_j + \alpha_t + \beta A_{jt}^{\text{soy}} + \gamma A_{jt}^{\text{maize}} + \sum_z \theta_z p_t^z A_{j0}^z + \varepsilon_{jt} \]

\[ z = \text{soy, maize and sugar} \]
## Industrial Outcomes: Reduced Form

*plant-level data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A^{soy} )</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
<td>-0.051***</td>
<td>0.030***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.98)</td>
<td>(-16.96)</td>
<td>(5.31)</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A^{maize} )</td>
<td>-0.005***</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>-0.016***</td>
<td>-0.018**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.64)</td>
<td>(17.42)</td>
<td>(-6.04)</td>
<td>(-2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P^z A^z ) controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant fixed effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>550260</td>
<td>549896</td>
<td>546942</td>
<td>241501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust t statistics in parentheses. ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
Industrial Outcomes: Reduced Form
firm-level data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>production / non-production workers</th>
<th>production workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A^{soy}$</td>
<td>0.005*** (4.47)</td>
<td>0.008* (1.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A^{maize}$</td>
<td>-0.003*** (-6.38)</td>
<td>-0.008*** (-3.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^zA^z$ controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm fixed effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>430783</td>
<td>426136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust t statistics in parentheses. ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%
Summary of preliminary findings

- Areas with higher increases in potential soy yields experienced a (relative)
  - reduction in the labor intensity of agricultural production
  - reduction in agriculture’s employment share
  - reduction in wages and increase in employment in manufacturing
- These findings suggest that the effects of changes in agricultural productivity on the industrial sector depend not only on openness but also on factor bias of technological change