SOLVAY BRUSSELS SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS
& MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES

Education, labor markets, and natural disasters

Thesis submitted by Tillmann HEIDELK
in fulfilment of the requirements of the PhD Degree in Economics and Management Sciences ("Docteur en Sciences Économiques et de Gestion")
Academic year 2019-2020

Supervisors: Professor Philip VERWIMP

Professor Paula GOBBI

European Center for Advanced Research in Economics and Statistics (ECARES),
Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB)

Thesis jury:

Professor Marjorie GASSNER (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Chair)
Professor Bram DE ROCK (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Secretary)
Professor Eleonora NILLESEN (United Nations University; UNU-MERIT)
Professor Guilhem CASSAN (Université de Namur)

fnrs
FREEDOM TO RESEARCH

Contents

Dedication i

Acknowledgements iii

1. Introduction 1

2. Increasing Access by Waiving Tuition: Evidence from Haiti 7
- 2.1. Introduction . . . 7
- 2.2. An Approach to Increasing Access: Tuition Waivers . . . 9
- 2.3. Measuring Results . . . 15
- 2.4. Conclusions . . . 25

3. Natural disasters and educational attainment 29
- 3.1. Introduction . . . 29
- 3.2. Literature review . . . 31
- 3.3. Background on Mexico . . . 35
- 3.4. Quantitative framework . . . 38
- 3.5. Results . . . 46
- 3.6. Robustness Checks . . . 50
- 3.7. Channels and discussion . . . 56
- 3.8. Conclusion . . . 64

4. Natural Disasters and Returns to Education 67
- 4.1. Introduction . . . 67
- 4.2. Literature review . . . 70
- 4.3. The 2010 Haiti earthquake . . . 72
- 4.4. Theoretical framework . . . 73
- 4.5. Quantitative framework . . . 75
- 4.6. Results . . . 79
- 4.7. Robustness checks . . . 83
- 4.8. Discussion and channels for changes in returns . . . 92
- 4.9. Conclusion . . . 97

5. Conclusion 101

References **105**

Appendix **128**

A. Increasing Access by Waiving Tuition: Evidence from Haiti **129**

A.1. Analysis of Tuition Waiver Program Assignment Randomization 129

B. Natural disasters and educational attainment **133**

B.1. Data 133

B.2. Additional Results 139

B.3. Robustness checks 143

B.4. Channels 151

C. Natural Disasters and Returns to Education **159**

C.1. Derivations of theoretical framework 159

C.2. Data 162

C.3. Additional results 165

C.4. Robustness checks 171

C.5. Additional results: channels of decreasing returns to education 184

List of Figures

2.1. Impact of TWP on class size in grades 1-6. 23
2.2. Total number of students (grades 1-6) in treatment and control schools (2002-3 and 2011-12). 24
2.3. Average student-teacher ratios (grades 1-6) in treatment and control schools (2002-3 and 2011-12). 25

3.1. Pre-existing trends. 46

4.1. Differences in labor income for people with high (H) and low (L) education. 69
4.2. (Scaled) Earthquake intensity (PGA), in communes. Darker shaded areas experienced stronger exposure and destruction. 73
4.3. Each dot represents the $\hat{\tau}$ coefficient from estimations for all treatment dummies $\omega_{0/1}$, following specification (1b) in table (4.2). 80
4.4. Income across sectors. 95

B.1. Example DesInventar data card, serial 05-885 (DesInventar, 2019a). 133
B.2. Frequencies of impactful disasters, over time, in classes. 134
B.3. Annual average number of impactful disasters in municipalities, 1980-2013. 135
B.4. Municipalities whose number of recorded impactful disasters in 2005-2010 exceeded 2 SD of the average number of recorded impactful disasters in their relevant state in 2000-2005. 135

C.1. Population density in Haiti. 162
C.2. Each dot represents the $\hat{\tau}$ coefficient from estimations for all treatment dummies $\omega_{0/1}$, following specification (3) in table (4.2). 166
C.3. Change in average number of years of education over time in departments, based on DHS data. Baseline for inter-temporal comparison is 1994. 167
C.4. Each dot represents the $\hat{\tau}$ coefficient from estimations for all treatment dummies ω_k, given $\omega_j = .29, j < k, j \in [0, 1[$. 169
C.5. Each dot represents the $\hat{\tau}$ coefficient from estimations for all treatment dummies ω_k, given $\omega_j = .63, j > k, j \in]0, 1]$. 169
C.6. Extending figure (C.4) to all possible values of ω_j and ω_k. 170
C.7. Extending figure (C.5) to all possible values of ω_j and ω_k. 170

C.8. Share of households exposed to Hurricane Sandy in communes, based on ECVMAS II, including all households. 173
C.9. Share of households exposed to Cholera epidemic in communes, based on ECVMAS 2012/2013, including all households. 173
C.10. Expected earthquakes. 174
C.11. Share of population in commune who lived in another commune and not abroad, before 2010 earthquake, based on ECVMAS I, II. 174
C.12. Each marker represents the $\hat{\tau}$ coefficient from estimations for all treatment dummies $\omega_{0/1}$: (1b) from table (4.2). (Aa), (Ca) from table (C.6). 176
C.13. Each dot represents the coefficients $\hat{\tau}^l$ and $\hat{\tau}^u$ from estimations applying a lower and an upper treatment dummy $\bar{\omega}^l_{0/1} \approx 0.16$ and $\omega^u_{0/1} \in [.3, .9]$. 179
C.14. Each dot represents the coefficients $\hat{\tau}^l$ and $\hat{\tau}^u$ from estimations applying a lower and an upper treatment dummy $\bar{\omega}^l_{0/1} \approx .30$, $\omega^u_{0/1} \in [.3, .9]$. 179

List of Tables

2.1. School sample compared to all nonpublic schools . . . 17
2.2. School sample and identification rates . . . 18
2.3. Comparison of treatment and control groups . . . 21
2.4. Estimated impacts of treatment observed in 2011-12 school year . . . 22

3.1. Summary statistics . . . 42
3.2. Main results: upper secondary education, age [17,18] . . . 47

4.1. Summary statistics . . . 76
4.2. Main results: changing Mincerian returns to education . . . 79

A.1. Comparing selected schools to nonselected applicant schools in the 2002 census . . . 130

B.1. Disaster overview 2005-2010 . . . 136
B.2. Complete summary statistics . . . 137
B.3. Test for heteroskedasticity . . . 139
B.4. Complete main results: upper secondary education, age [17,18] . . . 140
B.5. Intensive margin . . . 141
B.6. Urbanization . . . 142
B.7. Robustness check: placebo test 1990-2000 . . . 143
B.8. Robustness check: placebo test 1990-2000-2010 . . . 144
B.9. Robustness check: placebo test older cohorts . . . 145
B.10. Robustness check: adding duration data . . . 146
B.11. Robustness check: no population weights . . . 147
B.12. Robustness check: variation of threshold . . . 148
B.13. Robustness check: variation of sample conditions . . . 148
B.14. Robustness check: limitation of control group . . . 149
B.15. Overview multiple disasters 2005-2010 . . . 150
B.16. Robustness check: multiple disasters . . . 150
B.17. Channel: school enrollment, age [17,18] . . . 151
B.18. Channel: NEET, age [17,18] . . . 152
B.19. Channel: income parents (mother + father) . . . 152
B.20. Channel: parental employment . . . 153

B.21. Channel: number of own children, age [17,18] . . . 154
B.22. Channel: number of own children, gender specific, age [17,18] . . . 155
B.23. Channel: violent conflict . . . 156
B.24. Channel: Physical and human capital destruction . . . 157
B.25. Channel: share of teachers in population . . . 158

C.1. Complete summary statistics . . . 163
C.2. Complete main results: changing Mincerian returns to education . . . 165
C.3. Changes in perceived income in 2001 vs. 2000 . . . 167
C.4. Overview disasters Haiti based on Guha-Sapir et al. (2015) . . . 171
C.5. T-tests: education by migration (only 2013 data) . . . 172
C.6. Confounding shocks and migration . . . 175
C.7. Main results across different regions . . . 176
C.8. Selection on unobservables following Oster (2017) . . . 178
C.9. Higher order polynomials . . . 180
C.10. Cluster level fixed effects . . . 181
C.11. Alternative weights . . . 182
C.12. Censored years of schooling . . . 183
C.13. Labor market affiliation . . . 185
C.14. Changing sector-specific Mincerian returns to education in primary activity 186
C.15. Changing returns to working in sector of primary activity . . . 187
C.16. Individual characteristics . . . 188