

**B A S I S**



■ Collaborative Research  
Support Program

# **Vulnerability and Shocks in 15 Ethiopian Villages, 1999-2004**

**Stefan Dercon**

University of Oxford

**John Hoddinott**

International Food Policy Research Institute

**Tassew Woldehanna**

Addis Ababa University

## **BASIS CRSP**

This posting is provided by the BASIS CRSP Management Entity

Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics,

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Tel: (608) 262-5538

Email: [basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu)

<http://www.basis.wisc.edu>

**April 2005**

**John Hoddinott**  
International Food Policy Research Institute  
j.hoddinott@cgiar.org

BASIS CRSP outputs posted on this website have been formatted to conform with other postings but the contents have not been edited. This output was made possible in part through support provided by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), under the terms of Grant No. LAG-A-00-96-90016-00, and by funding support from the BASIS Collaborative Research Support Program and its management entity, the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA. All views, interpretations, recommendations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the supporting or cooperating organizations.



Copyright © 2005 by authors. All rights reserved.  
Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for noncommercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

## **Vulnerability and Shocks in 15 Ethiopian Villages, 1999-2004**

Stefan Dercon  
University of Oxford

John Hoddinott  
International Food Policy Research Institute

Tassew Woldehanna  
Addis Ababa University

April 2005

The authors thank the Food-For-Peace Office of USAID and the World Food Programme for generously funding the survey work and USAID, WFP, and DfID for funding the analysis that underlies this paper; in particular, we thank P. E. Balakrishnan, Robin Jackson, Malcolm Ridout, and Will Whelan for their support. We have benefited from superb research assistance from Yisehac Yohannes. Errors are ours.

Address for correspondence: John Hoddinott, International Food Policy Research Institute, 2033 K Street NW, Washington DC 20006; e mail: [J.Hoddinott@cgiar.org](mailto:J.Hoddinott@cgiar.org).

## 1. Introduction

Improving our understanding of risk and vulnerability is an issue of increasing importance for Ethiopia as it is for much of Africa. A small, but growing, body of evidence, points to the role that risk, shocks, and vulnerability in perpetuating poverty. Specifically, uninsured shocks—adverse events that are costly to individuals and households in terms of lost income, reduced consumption, or the sale or destruction of assets—are a cause of poverty. Dercon (2004) demonstrates that rainfall shocks have persistent impacts on growth; further, he shows that covariates capturing the severity of the 1984-85 famine are causally related to slower growth in household consumption in the 1990s. Hoddinott and Kinsey (2001) and Alderman, Hoddinott, and Kinsey (2004) show that rainfall shocks are causally related to reduced human capital formation and that the magnitudes of these effects are meaningful. For example, Alderman, Hoddinott, and Kinsey (2004) estimate that children affected by the civil war and drought shocks of the late 1970s and early 1980s in rural Zimbabwe suffered a loss of about 14 percent of lifetime income.

Further, the threat of such events may cause households and individuals to take actions that, while providing some additional protection against shocks, come at the cost of income gains. In India, Morduch (1990) shows that asset-poor households devote a larger share of land to safer traditional varieties of rice and castor and than to riskier, high-value activities. Dercon (1996) finds that Tanzanian households with limited liquid assets grow proportionately more sweet potatoes, a low-return low-risk crop. A household with average livestock holdings devotes 20 percent less of its land to sweet potatoes than a household with no liquid assets. The crop portfolio of the richest quintile

yields 25 percent more per adult than that of the poorest quintile. Dercon (2002) summarizes other studies which also point toward the conclusion that household choices that limit exposure to risk come at the cost of significantly lower incomes. But while shocks are perceived to be pervasive in much of Africa, there is surprisingly little quantitative data on their incidence, severity, and consequences.<sup>1</sup>

This paper examines who is vulnerable to different types of shocks in rural Ethiopia. Using the two most recent rounds of the Ethiopian Rural Household Survey, it will characterize the nature, frequency, and severity of climatic, economic, health, and other shocks faced by rural Ethiopian households. It examines how shocks affect households, assess what shocks have been most important to different groups in Ethiopia and will explore who was worst affected. In addition, it will assess the impact of these on levels and changes in measures of household well-being between 1999 and 2004.

## **2. Data**

Ethiopia is a federal country divided into 11 regions. Each region is subdivided into zones and zones into *woredas*, which are roughly equivalent to a U.S. or U.K. county. *Woredas*, in turn, are divided into Peasant Associations (PA) or *Kebeles*, an administrative unit consisting of a number of villages. Peasant Associations were set up in the aftermath of the 1974 revolution. Our data are taken from the Ethiopia Rural Household Survey (ERHS), a unique longitudinal household data. Data collection started in 1989, when a survey team visited six Peasant Associations in Central and Southern

---

<sup>1</sup> World Bank (2005) provides evidence on the impact of various shocks, most notably rainfall and illness on consumption, using cross-sectional data from 1995 and 2000. Dercon (2004), Dercon and Krishnan (2000a, 2000b), Skoufias and Quisumbing (2003) and IDS/SC-UK (2002) also discuss the impact of shocks on household welfare and Yamano, Alderman, and Christiaensen (2005) examine the impact of rainfall shocks on child health.

Ethiopia. The survey was expanded in 1994 to encompass 15 Peasant Associations across four regions, yielding a sample of 1477 households. An additional round was conducted in late 1994, with further rounds in 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2004.

As part of the survey re-design and extension that took place in 1994, the sample was re-randomized by including an exact proportion of newly formed or arrived households in the sample, as well by replacing households lost to follow-up by those which were considered by village elders and officials as broadly similar to in demographic and wealth terms. The nine additional PAs were selected to better account for the diversity in the farming systems found in Ethiopia. The sampling in the PAs newly included in 1994 was based on a list of all households was constructed with the help of the local Peasant Association officials. The PA was responsible for the implementation of the land reform following the 1974 and held wide ranging powers as a local authority. All land is owned by the government. To obtain land, households have to register with the PA and lists of the households who have been allocated land are kept. For these reasons, these household lists were a good source of information for the construction of a sampling frame. To ensure that landless households were not excluded, the sample was stratified within each village to ensure a representative number of landless households to be included. Similarly, an exact proportion of female headed households were included via stratification.

Table 1 gives the details of the sampling frame and the actual proportions in the total sample (Dercon and Krishnan (2003) provides further characteristics about these localities). Using Westphal (1976) and Getahun (1978) classifications, Table 1 also shows that population shares within the sample are broadly consistent with the population

shares in the three main sedentary farming systems—the plough based cereals farming systems of the Northern and Central Highlands, mixed plough/hoe cereals farming systems, and farming systems based around *enset* (a root crop also called false banana) that is grown in southern parts of the country. Note too that in 1994, the Central Statistical Office collected a data set as part of the Welfare Monitoring System. Many of the average outcome variables, in terms of health and nutrition were very similar to the results in the ERHS, suggesting that living conditions in our sample did not differ greatly from those found more generally throughout rural Ethiopia, see Collier, Dercon, and Mackinnon (1997).

For these reasons, it can be argued that the sampling frame to select the villages was strictly stratified in the main agroecological zones and subzones, with one to three villages selected per strata. Further, sample sizes in each village were chosen so as to approximate a self-weighting sample, when considered in terms of farming system: each person (approximately) represents the same number of persons found in the main farming systems as of 1994. However, results should not be taken as being nationally representative. The sample does not include pastoral households or urban areas.<sup>2</sup> Also, the practical aspects associated with running a longitudinal household survey when the sampled localities are as much as 1,000 kilometers apart in a country where top speeds on the best roads rarely exceed 50 kilometers per hour constrained sampling to only 15 communities in a country of thousands of villages. So while these data can be considered broadly representative of households in nonpastoralist farming systems as of 1994, extrapolation from these results should be done with care.

---

<sup>2</sup> Pastoral areas were excluded, in part, because of the practical difficulties in finding and resurveying such highly mobile households over long periods of time.

### **3. Shocks in Rural Ethiopia: A Description**

In this section, we present data on the distribution of shocks in our rural Ethiopian sample. Our objective is descriptive—we want to understand what shocks occurred, how widespread these were, who was affected by them and what were their consequences. Since this descriptive approach generates a large number of figures and tables, we focus on discerning broad patterns in these data.

We define shocks as adverse events that lead to a loss of household income, a reduction in consumption and/or a loss of productive assets. Data used in this section are based on a household-level “shocks” module developed in Hoddinott and Quisumbing (2003) that was field tested and refined to meet the specific circumstance of rural Ethiopian households, which in turn was an improvement on a shock module implemented in the 1995 round of the ERHS (Dercon (2002)). The module asks households to consider a list of adverse events and indicate whether the household was adversely affected by them. For example, in the Ethiopian version, respondents are asked, “Has this household been affected by a serious shock – an event that led to a serious reduction in your asset holdings, caused your household income to fall substantially or resulted in a significant reduction in consumption?”

Shocks are divided into a number of broad categories: climatic; economic; political/social/legal; crime; and health. Climatic shocks include obvious examples such as drought and flooding, but also erosion, frosts and pestilence affecting crops or livestock. Economic shocks include problems in terms of access to inputs (both physical access and large increases in price), decreases in output prices, and difficulties in selling agricultural and nonagricultural products. Political/social/legal shocks include the



confiscation of assets or arbitrary taxation by government authorities, social or political discrimination or exclusion and contract disputes. Crime shocks include the theft and/or destruction of crops, livestock, housing, tools or household durables as well as crimes against persons. Health shocks include both death and illness. In addition, we also consider miscellaneous shocks such as conflicts and disputes with other family members, neighbors or other village residents regarding access to land or other assets. For each shock, we obtain three items of information: when this shock occurred, whether it was confined to this household or whether it was more widespread, and what were the consequences in terms of income, assets and consumption.

Our description of shocks experienced by households in our Ethiopian sample begins with Figures 1 to 5. These enumerate the shocks that occurred between 1999 and 2004 (i.e. whether a household experienced a particular type of shock at least once). Drought is the most common climatic shock with more than half the surveyed household reporting this as a shock. However, other climatic shocks are common too. For example, more than one household in three reported having been adversely affected by pests or diseases that affected crops in their field, stored crops or livestock. Input (output) shocks were also relatively common, with these also reported by more than (slightly less than) a third of surveyed households. By contrast, political/social/legal shocks were reported to be relatively uncommon in this sample over this period with no single shock being reported by more than 7 percent of respondents. While crime shocks appear relatively uncommon, the information presented in Figure 4 is slightly misleading in the sense that while few households report any one incidence of crime, a larger proportion of households—just over 20 percent—report being the victim of some sort of criminal

activity. Death and illness are reported by a significant proportion of households; miscellaneous shocks such as disputes appear in this sample to be rare.

Table 2 indicates the extent to which the more commonly reported shocks are idiosyncratic (restricted to this household or this household and some others) or covariate (affecting all households in the village and possibly those nearby). Not surprisingly, drought, input, and output shocks are reported to be covariate with 79, 68, and 83 percent of affected households reporting that the spread of this shock included at least all households in the village. Theft or other crimes, death or illness are described in more than 90 percent of cases as idiosyncratic with pests and diseases affecting crops or livestock appearing to be a mix of idiosyncratic and covariate shocks.

Table 3 reports the consequences of the most commonly reported shocks. These are divided into five categories: loss of household income; income loss and reduced consumption; loss of productive assets; a combination of asset, income, and consumption loss; and other (not specified) effects. In somewhat loose terms, Table 3 explores the extent to which certain types of shocks have different effects on households. The rows are ordered so that covariate shocks (drought, input, and output shocks) appear first, followed by pests (a mix of idiosyncratic and covariate shocks) and idiosyncratic shocks (crime, death, and illness).

While the survey module does not directly ask about the severity of impact, one could infer severity by comparing the percentages of reported impact on income and consumption with those shocks that lead to a loss of productive assets. In this regard, the striking feature of Table 3 is the absence of any obvious pattern of effect. Output shocks are somewhat less likely to lead to asset losses than other types of shocks; this may be

due to the incidence of these shocks—see below. A death of a husband, wife, or another person is also less likely to lead to asset losses. By contrast, drought, input shocks, pests, and illnesses all are associated with loss of productive assets by at least 40 percent of households reporting being affected by these shocks.

We investigated further who is affected by these shocks, based on “pre-shock” characteristics. That is to say, we disaggregate the sample by characteristics observed in the 1999 survey round and cross-tabulate these against shocks that occurred between 1999 and 2004 as reported by households in 2004.. While such information by itself cannot be taken as an indicator of vulnerability (because it does not take into account the severity of shocks nor its impact), it provides some clues as to what types of households are most likely to be affected by different types of shocks.

In general, the incidence of these shocks does not differ markedly by characteristics such as sex of head (27 percent of sampled households were female-headed in 1999) with the exception of illness shocks which are much more commonly reported by male-headed households. There are no marked differences when we disaggregate on the basis of other demographic characteristics such as age of head, household size or dependency ratios. Households headed by individuals who have any schooling (only 17 percent of household heads have any schooling) were more likely to report being adversely affected by economic shocks affecting input and output markets as well as illness. While this may seem counter-intuitive, it may be that such households are more likely to experience such shocks because they are more likely to be engaged in market transactions. By contrast, there are some significant differences when we

disaggregate by land quintiles.<sup>3</sup> Better-off households are more likely to be affected by pest, input, and output shocks.

#### **4. Shocks in Rural Ethiopia: An Econometric Assessment**

While the discussion in Section 3 provides a detailed overview of the types of shocks experienced by households in our sample, it does not give us a quantitative sense of the consequences of these shocks nor does it tell us anything about the persistence of their consequences. Also, there are limits to cross-sectional analysis—it is difficult to tell for example if conditional on location, wealth and other observable characteristics, female headed households are more adversely affected by droughts than male-headed households. So in this section, we complement our descriptive analysis with an econometric assessment of the impact of these shocks on one measure of welfare, log per capita consumption.

Our baseline results are reported in Table 4. The dependent variable is the log of per capita consumption. This is constructed in the following fashion. Food and nonfood consumption were covered in separate modules in the questionnaire. The section on food asked about 33 specified food items; for each, households were asked about the amounts they had consumed out of purchases, consumption out of own stock and consumption from gifts and wages in-kind in the last week. These consumption levels are valued using prices obtained from local market surveys fielded at the same time as the household survey. Nonfood items are limited to non-investment goods so that we include consumables such as matches, batteries, soap, kerosene and the like, clothing and

---

<sup>3</sup> These land quintiles are based on a household's landholdings relative to other households in the same village. This procedure is preferable to calculating quintiles across the entire distribution in the data, since different areas have different potential and land quality.

transport but exclude investments in durable goods such as housing. Different recall periods were used for different items; for comparability all are changed into monthly (30 day) consumption and expressed in per capita terms.<sup>4</sup>

Log per capita consumption ( $lnpcexp$ ) of household  $i$  in village  $v$  in 2004 is a function of two broad sets of household characteristics: household characteristics observed in 1999 ( $H_{iv, 1999}$ ) and shocks to households experienced between 1999 and 2004 ( $S_{iv, 2004}$ ). In addition, we include a vector that captures such potentially confounding factors such as the month in which the interview took place to capture seasonality. Vectors of parameters to be estimated are  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\kappa$ . Denoting  $\varepsilon_{iv, 2004}$  as the white noise disturbance term, we write this relationship as:

$$lnpcexp_{iv, 2004} = \gamma \cdot H_{iv, 1999} + \beta \cdot S_{iv, 2004} + \kappa \cdot X_{iv, 2004} + \varepsilon_{iv, 2004} .$$

Observable household characteristics are characteristics of the head (age, sex and schooling), demographic household characteristics (log size and dependency ratio), and household wealth (landholdings and livestock ownership, the latter expressed in livestock units). Also included are measures of households' networks and connections within the village that may also affect consumption levels: whether the household belongs to an ethnic or religious minority; whether it is related to anyone holding an official position in the locality; and whether a parent of the household head was an important person in the social life of the village. Dummy variables are included for each village so that this is, in effect, a village fixed effects regression. The implication is that shocks are identified by within-village variation, which may make identification of covariate shocks difficult.

---

<sup>4</sup> Dercon and Krishnan (2003) show that earlier survey rounds, using various permutations of adult equivalency does not fundamentally affect the analysis of the determinants of living standards.

Nevertheless, more covariate shocks are found in virtually all villages. Even in the case of drought, there is no village where all households indicate having been affected in the last five years. Both factors appear to allow identification of the impact of these relatively covariate in our data.

Given that some shocks are relatively more common than others, we aggregate the data we have on shocks into the following categories, whether the household had experienced, between 1999 and 2004, the following events that had led to a loss of household income, a reduction in consumption and/or a loss of productive assets: a drought; too much rain, pests or diseases that affected field crops or crops in storage; pests or diseases that affected livestock; difficulty in obtaining inputs or increases in input prices; inability to sell or decreases in output prices; lack of demand for nonagricultural products; theft or destruction of tools, inputs, cash, crops, livestock, housing or consumer goods, death of head, spouse or another person; and illness of head, spouse or another person.

Basic results are reported in Table 5. Observable household characteristics associated with wealth in 1999 (land, livestock and education of the head) are positively correlated with consumption levels in 2004. Bigger households and households with higher dependency ratios have lower consumption levels but other demographic characteristics (sex and age of the household head) do not have a statistically significant effect on consumption. “Connections” appear to help. Households who have relations in positions of power, or whose parents were important in the village, have higher levels of consumption controlling for other household characteristics as do households who are part of an ethnic minority within the village.

The striking feature of the results of the shocks variables is how *unimportant* many of them seem to be. Experiencing a drought at least once in the previous five years lowers per capita consumption by approximately 20 percent and experiencing an illness which reduces per capita consumption by approximately 9 percent are the only shock variables that have a statistically significant effect on consumption, and the latter is only significant at the 11 percent level. Other past shocks have, controlling for a wide range of household characteristics, have no statistically significant impact on current (2004) levels of consumption.

Table 4, however, examines only the average effects of these shocks across all households in the sample. In Table 5 we disaggregate households by pre-shock (1999) characteristics and explore the extent to which the impact of shocks differs across different household types. Table 5 disaggregates on the basis of sex of head, education of head and landholdings. It indicates that drought and illness shocks are more important for certain household types than for others. Female headed households, households where the head has no schooling and households in the bottom three quintiles of landholdings within their villages all report a much bigger impact of drought shocks experienced at least once in the last five years on current levels of consumption. Illness shocks appear more important for richer households (as measured by relative landholdings) and households where the head has no schooling.

Lastly, Table 6 examines the extent to which shocks have long lasting effects. We take the set of shocks reported in the previous tables and disaggregate them into those that occurred in the previous two years and those that occurred between 2 and five years prior to the 2004 survey. Three past shocks would appear to have persistent effects:

droughts, falls in demand for nonagricultural products and illnesses all experienced between 1999 and 2001 are all associated with lower consumption in 2004. Not only do we observe a statistically significant effect of these shocks, recall that we are controlling for a large number of potentially confounding factors *and* the magnitude of these effects is meaningful with each reducing current consumption by between 13 and 19 percent.

Somewhat surprisingly, the large falls in grain prices observed in Ethiopia in 2001 do not appear to affect consumption. However, this price shock is likely to have had a larger effect on households in grain-surplus areas.<sup>5</sup> To investigate further, we reestimated this model, restricting the sample to three villages (Yetmen, Sirbana Godeti, and Trirufe Ketchma) that historically have been grain surplus villages. We do find evidence of a persistent effect of the output price shock. In these three villages, households reporting that they had been adversely affected by falls in output prices between 1999 and 2001 have per capita consumption levels in 2004 approximately 28 percent lower than comparable households not reporting this shock.

We briefly note a robustness check. The specification used controls for household characteristics in 1999, including human capital (education), social capital and physical capital (land, livestock). We reestimated these regressions using the level of consumption in 2004 as the dependent variable, using the same control variables as before but also including lagged (1999) consumption as a regressor. Lagged consumption was instrumented using further lags of consumption and asset values (using preceding rounds of the data). The results were effectively the same in terms of the impact of the shock variables.

---

<sup>5</sup> In a related exercise, we explored whether the fall in international coffee prices had a similar adverse affect on households in coffee growing areas but could find no evidence of such an effect in our sample.



In addition to asking households about individual shocks that had adversely affected them, households were also asked to enumerate the three most important adverse shocks that they had experienced over the previous five years. These are summarized in Table 7; they provide a further way of checking the validity of the econometric results. Virtually all households (95 percent) reported a most important shock, 85 percent reported a second most important shock and 62 percent reported a third most important shock. The most commonly reported “worst shocks” are drought (47 percent), death (43 percent), and illness (28 percent). When we disaggregate by degree of importance of these worst shocks, we see that these same three shocks were always listed as being the most important adverse shocks experienced by these households. Two, drought and illness, also appear as shocks that adversely affect current consumption. While death shocks do not appear to have an effect on consumption, Table 3 indicates that—unlike other shocks—households often reported that the death of a husband, wife or another person had an “other effect” (other than an effect on income, consumption, or productive assets) on households.

Input and output shocks, pests affecting crops and crime are all reported by between 11 and 14 percent of households. Other shocks are less frequently reported. Strikingly, policy shocks (land redistribution, state confiscation of assets, resettlement, villagization or forced migration, bans on migration, forced contributions, or arbitrary taxation) which featured so prominently in earlier rounds of the ERHS have substantially diminished in importance. Only 7 percent of households reported being adversely affected by such policy shocks compared to 42 percent who reported being affected by these prior to 1994 (Dercon 2002, Table 1).

## 5. Conclusions

Ethiopia is a shock-prone country. Virtually all households report being adversely affected by shocks between 1999 and 2004. Drought shocks and illness shocks are the most important shocks in the sense that households report these as being especially important *and* controlling for other household and village characteristics, they are associated with lower levels of per capita consumption. The magnitudes of these effects are nontrivial. Experiencing a drought at least once in the previous five years lowers per capita consumption by about 20 percent and experiencing an illness reduces per capita consumption by approximately 9 percent. In particular, the impact of drought shocks has to be put in perspective: the main drought in this period, in 2002, tends to be considered by the government and relief agencies as a well-managed drought episode, with few reported famine deaths across the countries. Our finding of an effect of about 20 percent lower consumption, several years later, suggests that its impact was still severe despite the reasonably effective response.

Other shocks are more important for certain types of households and for certain localities than for others. Female-headed households, households where the head has no schooling and households in the bottom three quintiles of landholdings within their villages all report a much bigger impact of drought shocks experienced at least once in the last five years on current levels of consumption. Illness shocks appear more important for richer households (as measured by relative landholdings) and households where the head has no schooling.

The importance of different types of shocks appears to be changing. Dercon (2002) reports that in the 1990s, drought and policy shocks were the predominant adverse events reported by these households. While drought remains important, policy shocks such as land redistribution and arbitrary taxation are now much less important than they were while death and illness shocks are now much more important.

Some shocks appear to have long lasting effects. Households reporting have been adversely affected by drought, illness, or (in the case of grain surplus villages) output price shocks between 1999 and 2001 had significantly lower levels of consumption—between 13.7 and 28 percent—when observed several years later in 2004. Dercon (2004) reports similar results, showing that drought shocks experienced in the 1980s were causally associated with slower growth in the 1990s. That shocks have long-lasting effects has important policy implications: uninsured risk does not just cause short-term welfare fluctuations but has long-term effects in terms lower consumption and poverty. Protecting households against shocks may well have a high return in fighting long-term ‘chronic’ poverty. Nevertheless, these estimates are still relatively ‘short-term’ effects, and the true long-term impact cannot be identified from this work. For example, the implications of uninsured risk on activity and asset decisions, whereby households avoid profitable but risky activities for fear of low welfare levels if droughts or other serious events occurs would affect consumption and poverty levels, but would not be identified in this analysis. In short, the true impact of risk and shocks may still be underestimated.

Hoddinott and Quisumbing (2003) note that understanding shocks and their consequences is a necessary (though not sufficient) step to the design of programs and interventions designed to blunt their pernicious effects. Specifically, they note that

assessing vulnerability to shocks requires answering four interlinked questions: (1) Who is vulnerable? (2) What are the sources of vulnerability? (3) How do households cope with risk and vulnerability? and (4) What is the gap between risks and risk management mechanisms? This paper provides direct evidence on questions (1) and (2) as well as showing that the inability of households to insure against or mitigate these shocks has led to subsequent reductions in household welfare. Companion work by Gilligan and Hoddinott (2004, 2005) and Hoddinott, Dercon, and Krishnan (2005) provides evidence on (3) and (4).

A final comment is due on the methodology used. The results are dependent on linking information on self-reported shocks to welfare outcomes. The results appear suggestive and robust, but this does not imply that there is no problem with this type of information. If unobserved heterogeneity is correlated with the direct shock terms, then what we may be picking up is not the impact of the shock, but some other characteristic, correlated with observing particular shocks. Arguably, we may then be measuring that unobserved characteristic and not the impact of the shock. While possible, this does not seem to be a convincing explanation for our findings related to shocks such as drought. Still, we may be missing some very important events and trends in this period, not readily picked up in our 'shocks' module. Our evidence on the relative importance of particular shocks may then be misleading. For example, a gradual deterioration of circumstances, for example due to land degradation or a gradual decline in returns and prices for some activities, may be relevant for outcomes, but not picked up readily in our questionnaires. These concerns suggest that more evidence is needed on how to collect effective

information on shocks and other events and trends, to analyse the impact of uninsured risk and prioritise interventions.

## Tables

**Table 1: The distribution of households in the Ethiopian Rural Household Survey, by agroecological zone**

	Population share in 1994	Sample share in 1994	Number of villages
	(percent)		
Grain plough complex: Northern Highlands	21.2	20.2	3
Grain plough complex: Central Highlands	27.7	29.0	4
Grain plough: Arsi/Bale	9.3	14.3	2
Sorghum plough/hoe: Hararghe	9.9	6.6	1
<i>Enset</i> (with or without coffee/cereals)	31.9	29.9	5
Total	100.0	100.0	15

**Source:** Dercon and Hoddinott (2004).

**Note:** Percentages of population share relate to the rural sedentary population; they exclude pastoralists who account for about 10 percent of total rural population.

**Table 3: Extent of shocks, by selected shocks, Ethiopia**

	Households reporting this shock	How widespread was this shock?				
		Only affected this household	Affected some households in this village	Affected all households in this village	Affected this village and nearby villages	Affected areas beyond this <i>kebele</i>
		Idiosyncratic ←-----→ covariate				
Drought	52%	6%	15%	32%	26%	21%
Pests or diseases affecting crops or livestock	38	20	29	25	18	8
Input shocks (price increase or difficulties in access)	35	13	18	27	23	18
Output shocks (price decrease or difficulty making sales)	29	6	12	36	33	14
Victim of theft or other crime	22	77	14	4	3	1
Death of husband, wife or another person	35	80	10	5	4	1
Illness of husband, wife or another person	39	83	9	5	3	0

**Notes:** Data are taken from the Ethiopian Rural Household Survey, Round 6; 1,368 households provided reported information.



**Table 4: Severity of shock, by selected shocks, Ethiopia**

	<b>Loss of household income</b>	<b>Income loss and reduced consumption</b>	<b>Loss of productive assets</b>	<b>Asset loss; asset loss and income loss or reduction in consumption</b>	<b>Other effects</b>
Drought	25%	32%	21%	20%	1%
Input shocks (price increase or difficulties in access)	26	31	17	23	3
Output shocks (price decrease or difficulty making sales)	33	32	10	22	4
Pests or diseases affecting crops or livestock	24	35	20	19	2
Victim of theft or other crime	31	26	24	19	1
Death of husband, wife or another person	25	15	15	19	26
Illness of husband, wife or another person	29	21	20	24	7

**Notes:** Data are taken from the Ethiopian Rural Household Survey, Round 6; 1,368 households provided reported information.

**Table 5: Impact of shocks and other covariates on (log) consumption per capita, 2004**

Covariate	Estimated coefficient	t statistic (absolute value)
Shocks in prior five years		
Drought	-0.196	2.69**
Pests or diseases that affected field crops or crops in storage	-0.029	0.40
Pests or diseases that affected livestock	0.013	0.19
Difficulty in obtaining inputs or increases in input prices	0.036	0.75
Inability to sell outputs or decreases in output prices	-0.077	1.15
Lack of demand for nonagricultural products	-0.131	1.13
Theft or destruction of tools, inputs, cash, crops, livestock, housing, or consumer goods (crime)	0.036	0.55
Death of head, spouse, or another person	0.025	0.63
Illness of head, spouse, or another person	-0.096	1.64
Other controls		
Female-headed, 1999	-0.012	0.21
Log age head, 1999	0.097	1.37
Head has schooling, 1999	0.096	2.28**
Log household size, 1999	-0.287	7.65**
Dependency ratio, 1999	-0.039	2.60**
Household in second land quintile, 1999	0.056	0.91
Household in third land quintile, 1999	0.149	1.65*
Household in fourth land quintile, 1999	0.153	2.33**
Household in top land quintile, 1999	-0.031	0.37
Livestock units, 1999	0.029	3.24**
Member, ethnic minority	0.169	2.52**
Member, religious minority	0.078	1.04
Relative holds official position in PA	0.125	3.00**
Mother or father was important in social life of village	0.161	3.20**
R <sup>2</sup>	0.33	
Sample size	1,290	

**Notes:** Standard errors are robust to locality cluster effects; \* Significant at the 10 percent level; \*\* significant at the 5 percent level; PA dummies, month of interview dummies, and perceptions of rainfall in previous harvest year are also included but not reported.

**Table 6: Impact of shocks by household characteristic on (log) consumption per capita, 2004**

	Female-headed households	Male-headed households	Head has no schooling	Head has some schooling	Household is in bottom three land quintiles	Household is in top two land quintiles
Drought	-0.442 (3.63)**	-0.094 (1.02)	-0.208 (2.57)**	-0.164 (1.81)*	-0.205 (2.41)**	-0.145 (1.03)
Pests or diseases that affected crops	0.017 (0.14)	-0.026 (0.29)	0.016 (0.22)	-0.255 (2.95)**	-0.018 (0.23)	-0.039 (0.51)
Pests or diseases that affected livestock	-0.076 (0.39)	0.049 (0.64)	0.021 (0.26)	-0.014 (0.20)	-0.053 (0.65)	0.051 (0.49)
Difficulty in obtaining inputs or increases in input prices	0.012 (0.09)	0.046 (0.92)	0.054 (0.91)	-0.045 (0.55)	0.035 (0.66)	0.079 (0.74)
Inability to sell outputs or decreases in output prices	0.031 (0.13)	-0.060 (1.14)	-0.092 (1.13)	-0.030 (0.31)	-0.063 (0.49)	-0.156 (1.57)
Lack of demand for nonagricultural products	-0.191 (0.66)	-0.173 (2.24)**	-0.175 (1.30)	0.238 (0.79)	-0.100 (0.81)	-0.279 (1.70)*
Crime shocks	0.181 (1.21)	0.001 (0.10)	0.017 (0.21)	0.072 (1.17)	-0.010 (0.15)	0.122 (1.01)
Death of head, spouse or another person	-0.184 (1.52)	0.061 (1.42)	0.038 (0.75)	-0.057 (0.94)	0.036 (0.71)	0.048 (0.74)
Illness of head, spouse or another person	-0.138 (0.78)	-0.069 (1.05)	-0.139 (2.33)**	0.079 (0.78)	-0.066 (0.94)	-0.154 (2.24)**

**Notes:** Specification as per Table 7; standard errors are robust to locality cluster effects; \* Significant at the 10 percent level; \*\* significant at the 5 percent level; PA dummies, month of interview dummies, and perceptions of rainfall in previous harvest year are also included but not reported.

**Table 7: Impact of shocks by timing of shock on (log) consumption per capita, 2004**

Covariate	Estimated coefficient	t statistic (absolute value)
Drought, 2002-04	-0.163	2.46**
Drought, 1999-2001	-0.137	2.72**
Pests or diseases that affected crops, 2002-04	-0.006	0.07
Pests or diseases that affected crops, 1999-2001	-0.052	1.05
Pests or diseases that affected livestock, 2002-04	-0.002	0.18
Pests or diseases that affected livestock, 1999-2001	0.022	0.24
Difficulty in obtaining inputs or increases in input prices, 2002-04	0.055	0.63
Difficulty in obtaining inputs or increases in input prices, 1999-2001	0.001	0.02
Inability to sell outputs or decreases in output prices, 2002-04	-0.187	2.23**
Inability to sell outputs or decreases in output prices, 1999-2001	-0.026	0.36
Lack of demand for nonagricultural products, 2002-04	-0.037	0.19
Lack of demand for nonagricultural products, 1999-2001	-0.195	2.28**
Crime shocks, 2002-04	-0.018	0.36
Crime shocks, 1999-2001	0.083	0.99
Death of head, spouse, or another person, 2002-04	0.043	0.69
Death of head, spouse, or another person, 1999-2001	-0.001	0.02
Illness of head, spouse, or another person, 2002-04	-0.019	0.32
Illness of head, spouse, or another person, 1999-2001	-0.151	2.33**
R <sup>2</sup>	0.34	
Sample size	1,290	

**Notes:** Specification as per Table 7; Standard errors are robust to locality cluster effects; \* Significant at the 10 percent level; \*\* significant at the 5 percent level; PA dummies, month of interview dummies, and perceptions of rainfall in previous harvest year are also included but not reported.

**Table 11: Household self-reports of the worst shocks experienced between 1999 and 2004**

<b>Most commonly reported worst shocks</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Drought	46.8
Death of head, spouse or another person	42.7
Illness of head, spouse or another person	28.1
Inability to sell outputs or decreases in output prices	14.5
Pests or diseases that affected crops	13.8
Crime	12.7
Difficulty in obtaining inputs or increases in input prices	11.3
Policy/political shocks (land redistribution, state confiscation of assets, resettlement, villagization, or forced migration, bans on migration, forced contributions, or arbitrary taxation)	7.4
Pests or diseases that affected livestock	7.0


  

<b>Most commonly reported worst shocks, by degree of importance</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Most important shock	
Drought	32.6
Death of head, spouse, or another person	26.1
Illness of head, spouse, or another person	8.0
Second most important shock	
Death of head, spouse, or another person	14.8
Drought	13.6
Illness of head, spouse, or another person	12.3
Third most important shock	
Illness of head, spouse, or another person	12.2
Death of head, spouse, or another person	8.1
Drought	8.0


**Notes:** Data are taken from the Ethiopian Rural Household Survey, Round 6; 1,371 households provided reported information; in response to the question, “what were the three most important shocks to affect this household,” 95 percent of households reported a most important shock, 85 percent reported a second most important shock, and 62 percent reported a third most important shock.

## Figures


**Figure 1: Households reporting climatic shocks between 1999 and 2004, Ethiopia**




**Figure 2: Households reporting economic shocks between 1999 and 2004, Ethiopia**



**Figure 3: Households reporting political/social/legal shocks between 1999 and 2004, Ethiopia**




**Figure 4: Households reporting crime shocks between 1999 and 2004, Ethiopia**





**Figure 5: Households reporting death/illness/conflict shocks between 1999 and 2004, Ethiopia**



## References

- Alderman, H., J. Hoddinott, and B. Kinsey. 2004. Long-term consequences of early childhood malnutrition. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C. Photocopy.
- Collier, P., S. Dercon, and J. Mackinnon. 1997. *Social Sector Review - Per II, Ministry of Finance*. Addis Ababa: Government of Ethiopia.
- Dercon, S. 1996. Risk, crop choice and savings: Evidence from Tanzania. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 44 (3): 385-415.
- Dercon, S. 2002. Income risk, coping strategies and safety nets. *World Bank Research Observer* 17 (2): 141-166.
- Dercon, S. 2004. Growth and shocks: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Journal of Development Economics* 74 (2): 309-329.
- Dercon S., and P. Krishnan. 2003. *Changes in poverty in rural Ethiopia 1989-1995*: in A.Booth and P.Mosley, (eds.) *The New Poverty Strategies* , Palgrave MacMillan, London.
- Dercon, S., and P. Krishnan. 2000a. In sickness and in health: Risk-sharing within households in Ethiopia. *Journal of Political Economy* 108 (4): 688-727.
- Dercon, S., and P. Krishnan. 2000b. Vulnerability, poverty and seasonality in Ethiopia. *Journal of Development Studies* 36 (6): 25-53.
- Getahun. 1978. Report on framing systems in Ethiopia. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- Gilligan, D., and J. Hoddinott. 2004. Using community targeting to provide drought relief: Evidence from Ethiopia. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C. Photocopy.
- Gilligan, D., and J. Hoddinott. 2005. The impact of food aid on consumption and asset levels in rural Ethiopia. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C. Photocopy.
- Hoddinott, J., and B. Kinsey. 2001. Child growth in the time of drought. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 63 (3): 409-436.
- Hoddinott, J., and A. Quisumbing. 2003. Methods for microeconomic risk and vulnerability assessments. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C. Photocopy.

- Hoddinott, J., S. Dercon, and P. Krishnan. 2005. Networks and informal mutual support in fifteen Ethiopian villages: A description. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C. Photocopy.
- IDS/SC-UK. 2002. Destitution in the Northeastern Highlands (Amhara Region). Interim Report.
- Morduch, J. 1990. Risk, production and savings: Theory and evidence from Indian households. Department of Economics, Harvard University, Cambridge Mass., U.S.A. Photocopy.
- Skoufias, E., and A. Quisumbing. 2003. *Consumption insurance and vulnerability to poverty: A synthesis of evidence from Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Mali, Mexico, and Russia*. Food Consumption and Nutrition Division Discussion Paper 155. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Westphal, E. 1976. Farming Systems in Ethiopia. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- World Bank. 2005. *Poverty and Well-Being: The Role of Agriculture and Shocks*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Yamano, T., H. Alderman, and L. Christiaensen. 2005. Child growth, shocks and food aid in rural Ethiopia. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, vol. 87-2, pp.273-88.