



The impact of the 2015 El Niño-induced drought on household consumption: evidence from rural Ethiopia

Tesfahun Asmamaw Kasie, Birhan Sisay Demissie, Mihret Jember Bahry, Gashaw Mulu Gessesse & Letenah Ejigu Wale

To cite this article: Tesfahun Asmamaw Kasie, Birhan Sisay Demissie, Mihret Jember Bahry, Gashaw Mulu Gessesse & Letenah Ejigu Wale (2019): The impact of the 2015 El Niño-induced drought on household consumption: evidence from rural Ethiopia, *Climate and Development*, DOI: [10.1080/17565529.2019.1701400](https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2019.1701400)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2019.1701400>



Published online: 18 Dec 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



The impact of the 2015 El Niño-induced drought on household consumption: evidence from rural Ethiopia

Tesfahun Asmamaw Kasie^a, Birhan Sisay Demissie^a, Mihret Jember Bahry^a, Gashaw Mulu Gessesse^b and Letenah Ejigu Wale^c

^aInstitute of Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Studies, Bahir Dar University, Bahirdar, Ethiopia; ^bDepartment of Development and Environmental Management, University of Gondar, Gondar, Ethiopia; ^cInstitute of Economic Research, Bahir Dar University, Bahirdar, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

This paper evaluates the impact of the 2015 El Niño-induced drought on household consumption in Ethiopia. A difference-in-difference method was used to compare consumption changes over time in a group unaffected by the drought to the changes in a group affected by the drought. By using the ESS household-level consumption aggregate data, we find that the 2015 drought reduces affected household's annual consumption by 8%, and the reduction was largely driven by changes in the lower tails of the consumption distribution. Overall, we find a significant consumption decline due to the 2015 drought, and much of the decline has been experienced among the consumption poor, indicating shock resilience inequality among rural households.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 11 January 2019
Accepted 28 November 2019

Keywords

Drought; consumption; difference-in-difference; rural Ethiopia

1. Introduction

Rural communities in developing countries face several types of shocks that threaten their well-being. These include droughts, floods and market and price fluctuations, and their adverse impacts may undermine people's short- and long-term welfare status (Dercon, Hoddinott, & Woldehanna, 2005a; Gray & Mueller, 2012; Little, Stone, Mogues, Castro, & Negatu, 2006). However, the magnitude and likelihood of such negative impacts have been shown to vary within affected populations mainly due to differences in their vulnerability, which is a function of household's exposure to the shock and its ability to cope without compromising its long-term economic and social status (Bohle, Downing, & Watts, 1994; Watts & Bohle, 1993). Because of vulnerability differences, households affected by similar magnitudes of shocks experience change differently in their well-being outcomes (Blaikie, Cannon, Davis, & Wisner, 2014).

Among major shocks, drought is the most frequent and catastrophic in many developing countries. Particularly in rural areas where agriculture is the major livelihood, droughts often cause substantial income loss and recurrent seasonal food shortages with further aggravation of existing vulnerability to famine (Devereux, Vaitla, Swan, Hunger Watch (Organization), & Action Against Hunger (Association), 2008). The frequency and impacts of drought shock in Ethiopia has been increasing from time to time since the 1980s. The top five catastrophic drought episodes that led for many humanitarian catastrophe and placed millions of people for urgent assistance include the 1972–1974, 1983–1984, 2002–2003, 2010–2011 and the 2015 droughts (DRMFSS, 2015; HRD, 2016; Michael, Lance, & Zewdu, 2016). A focus on such large-scale national drought shocks may arguably receive a

high degree of intrinsic policy interest for the management of risks and emergencies.

Understanding the real impacts of such catastrophic droughts in general and in Ethiopia in particular on household well-being have been the focus of many empirical studies. For example, some studies estimated drought impact on human capital (Alderman, Hoddinott, & Kinsey, 2006), household consumption (Dercon, Hoddinott, & Woldehanna, 2005b; Hill & Porter, 2017), growth (Dercon, 2004), multidimensional food security (Demeke, Keil, & Zeller, 2011) and wealth inequality (Thiede, 2014). All the above studies showed the significant impact of a particular drought exposure on various well-being outcomes with further suggestion that well-being outcomes vary systematically across different types of households due to differences in their capacity to deal with shocks. Rural Ethiopia is the focus of these previous studies, including this study, as there is a strong linkage between rural livelihoods and weather conditions.

There are three major reasons why we motivate to study the impacts of drought on household consumption in Ethiopia. First, although previous studies focus on the impact of similar large-scale national drought shocks, estimated impacts of these studies varied as they reflect the unique contexts of a particular drought episode as well as the country's emergency management capability of the time. This study focuses on changes in consumption due to rural household's exposure to the 2015 El Niño-induced drought that affect more than 15 million people of the country's population (DRMFSS, 2015; HRD, 2016). Unlike previous droughts in Ethiopia, this drought is the worst in 60 years since the driest periods of 1950s (Michael et al., 2016). Building on previous studies with a focus on the impact of droughts that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s,

understanding how the recent drought in 2015 affected household level consumption outcomes may provide new insights related to the role of a particular shock and response context in determining how heterogeneous outcomes could be.

Second, although the availability of panel data surveys is improving for developing countries, they are not yet widespread and nationally representative. For example most of the previous studies in Ethiopia used the 1989–2004 ERHS (Ethiopia Rural Household Survey) and the 2005–2011 EDHS (Ethiopia Demographic & Health Survey) datasets, which are either repeated cross-sectional or incomplete panel datasets with wider time gaps between baseline and follow-up data collection periods. Using such datasets collected in a wider time frame presents the difficulty to fully account for the changes in outcomes caused by changes in group composition and changes in confounding covariates over time. The data we draw enable to properly take such changes into account and can result in a very different understanding of drought shock impact on household consumption differences across groups than measures applied in other studies. This study exploits the opportunities of a quasi-experimental design by taking advantage of the timeline of the recent drought crisis and the unique Ethiopian Socioeconomic Survey (ESS) of 2012–2016 (Central Statistical Authority, National Bank of Ethiopia, & World Bank, 2017).

Third, despite empirical studies in Ethiopia (Deressa, 2007; Deressa & Hassan, 2009; Devereux, Sabates-Wheeler, Tefera, & Taye, 2006; Ruth & Catherine, 2013) and elsewhere in Africa (Bryan, Deressa, Gbetibouo, & Ringler, 2009; Campbell et al., 2016; Seaman, Sawdon, Acidri, & Petty, 2014; Ziervogel, Bhawanani, & Downing, 2006) on this issue, such studies are subject to critics due to their well-known biases in the ex-ante predictions of the magnitude of drought impact using a conventional regression framework. For instance, in their study in Ethiopia, Ruth and Catherine (2013) reported that moderate drought results in a 3% reduction in total consumption, while severe drought results in a 33.3% loss in total consumption. Other studies such as by Dercon et al. (2005b) also estimated a 20% impact of droughts on household consumption. Part of the explanation for these varied impact estimates is that estimated shock impacts were based on reported shock occurrences, and it is also partly explained by the representativeness and quality of data used. With the availability of data on key covariates and objective indicator for treatment assignment, the ESS rich dataset allow us to perform a combined method of propensity score matching (PSM) and difference-in-difference (DID) impact estimation procedure to investigate consumption effect of the 2015 drought that occur between the last two survey periods.

The crisis timeline and the timeframe for ESS data collection allow us to capture the effect of the drought on household consumption in the short term. With the upcoming ESS data for 2018 to be available in the near future, the same research design could be used to capture relatively long-term effect of the 2015 drought. More importantly the ESS dataset meets the minimum requirements of two observations before the event and one observation after the event, which is necessary to test the fundamental assumption of the DID model. The paper is organized as follows. The next section presents the theory of

change and research hypotheses. Section 3 outlines the data used to generate the outcome and covariate variables, and the empirical method estimates the impact of drought on household consumption. Section 4 discusses study results on the impact of drought on household consumption. Finally Section 5 concludes with some policy and further research recommendations.

2. Theory of change and research hypothesis

For most impact studies of development programmes, results chain (Gertler, Martinez, Premand, Rawlings, & Vermeersch, 2016) is often used representing the theory of change that guides the development of research questions and choice of outcome indicators. In our case, however, the theory of change is based on an asset–income–outcome causal chain suggested by Dercon (2001), which is often called the risk chain model (Alwang et al., 2001; Hoddinott & Quisumbing, 2010). According to Heitzmann, Canagarajah, & Siegel (2002), risk chain model has three main components. The first component is the extent to which a household faces a shock, which has a bearing on household's well-being. These shocks may be household specific, commonly referred to as idiosyncratic, such as illness or death in the household, business failure, unemployment, among others. Another category of shocks is community specific, also known as covariate shocks, which include droughts, epidemics, flood, among others. The second component of risk chain illustrates the fact that the extent to which a shock will affect a household's welfare depends on its response to such events. Recently, the term resilience is used to capture the latter component. According to FAO, this capacity is a function of access to basic services, access to social safety net, available assets and adaptive capacity to deal with shocks. The third component of the risk chain depicts the welfare outcomes of the household. These could be measured in terms of the level of income, consumption, nutrition, health or education (Dercon, 2001).

In general, the risk chain model postulates that the magnitude of negative well-being consequences is a function of not only the degree to which they are exposed to negative shocks that effect on their welfare but also the extent to which they can cope with such shocks when they occur (Hoddinott & Quisumbing, 2010). In specific terms, the impact of a drought shock on welfare outcomes (in this case, consumption) is determined by the interaction between people's exposure to drought and their resilience capacity to deal with its effect on food and income sources. We are interested to estimate the change in consumption attributable to the 2015 drought exposure. This requires to obtain an appropriate counterfactual reflecting what would happen to consumption of drought-affected groups if they had not exposed to the 2015 drought. Hence, as suggested by the risk chain model, a valid counterfactual could be established by matching affected groups and non-affected comparison groups based on resilience characteristics.

With the above theoretical foundation describing the results chain, we propose two related hypotheses to be tested in this study. Given similar distribution of resilience factors against shocks, the first hypothesis is to test whether average consumption of affected groups was reduced significantly compared with

average consumption among non-affected comparison groups. The second hypothesis is to test whether consumption changes associated with the drought was largely driven from the lower consumption groups. For both hypotheses, the effect measure of interest is an average treatment effect on the treated (ATET) or causal effect in the exposed.

3. Data and methods

The data that form the empirical analysis of this study is the rural category of the Ethiopian Socioeconomic Survey (ESS), three waves panel data conducted by Ethiopian Central Statistical Authority (CSA) and the World Bank (Central Statistical Authority et al., 2017; Central Statistical Authority & World Bank, 2013, 2015). The ESS data are part of the World Bank's Living Standards Measurement Study-Integrated Surveys on Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) project and started as the Ethiopian Rural Socio-economic Survey (ERSS) in 2012, covering rural areas and small towns. In the rural areas, a sample of about 3470 was interviewed. The ERSS was renamed as Ethiopian Socioeconomic Survey (ESS) in 2014, during which the 2012 sample was re-interviewed with the inclusion of additional urban sample of households. The third wave of the ESS was conducted in 2016, re-interviewing sample households in both rural and small towns for the third time.

Due to the strong linkage between their livelihoods and weather conditions, we used only the rural category of the ESS data. The ESS for this category has a very low attrition rate of less than 5% during the last two waves in 2014 and 2016. The dataset is available on the official website of Ethiopian Central Statistical Authority and LSMS-ISA Project website of the World Bank.¹

We took advantage of the timeline of the 2015 drought shock and ESS data collection to evaluate the impact of the 2015 El Niño-induced drought on consumption of rural households based on the DID estimation procedure. The second and the third surveys were used to represent the baseline and follow-up data, respectively, that are used to compare mean changes in our outcome of interest before and after the drought. The follow-up data for our measure of outcome were collected in March 2016, and the short-term impact of the drought on consumption could be observed following the failure of the typical rainy seasons between March and August of the year 2015. The first ESS survey were used to estimate placebo effect as a test for the common trend assumption of the DID estimation procedure.

3.1. Outcome variable: household consumption expenditure

One common measure of poverty and well-being in developing countries is aggregated household consumption expenditures. Consumption, as opposed to household income, is the common measure of household welfare in Ethiopia. We used household consumption expenditure as our outcome variable based on the ESS consumption data. The components of ESS household consumption include food and non-food consumption expenditures (Central Statistical Authority & World Bank, 2017).

Food expenditures include expenses for 25 different food items with a recall period of the last 7 days. While the non-food expenditures recall period was either the last 1 month or the last 12 months depending on the item. Before totalling, all individual consumption expenditure values are expressed in annual terms.

Moreover, we undertake two major tasks to construct our outcome variables. First, we normalize the total household consumption expenditure on the basis of household composition (adult equivalent household size) to make it a comparable welfare indicator among households. Second, per adult equivalent household, consumption expenditure has to be adjusted to account for both spatial and temporal price variations. We use spatial price indices available in the ESS dataset at regional level relative to national average prices to account for spatial price variations. Similarly, to adjust for inflation at the national level, making the values comparable across waves, we inflate the value of the first wave of household consumption to the second wave levels by a factor of 1.21 as reported in the annual report of the Central Statistical Authority (2015). Moreover, we also deflate the value of the third wave consumption to the second wave level by the same factor.

3.2. Covariate variables: resilience capacity against shock

The risk chain model postulates that the extent to which a shock will affect a household's welfare depends not only on the degree to which they are exposed to negative shocks but also on the extent to which they can cope with such shocks when they occur (Hoddinott & Quisumbing, 2010). Recently, the term resilience is used to capture the latter component. Resilience capacity is a set of conditions, attributes or skills that enable households to achieve resilience in the face of shocks including drought.

We assume that, even without drought, there may be differences in consumption levels between drought-affected and non-affected groups due to differences in their resilience capacities. Hence, to estimate the impact of drought on consumption, it is necessary to match both groups to balance on resilience characteristics.

The theoretical foundation of resilience capacity measurement used in this paper is based on the recommendations of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) model. In RIMA II, four types of resilience capacities are recognized. These include access to basic services (ABS), adaptive capacity (AC), assets (ASS) and social safety nets (SSN). Given their complexity, these concepts cannot be measured using one single indicator. Measuring them requires combining a variety of indicators into an overall measure. The best method for such purpose is factor analysis. When factor analysis is employed, only the indicators that have a scoring coefficient of the expected sign (positive or negative) based on the theoretical understanding of how the indicators work together to measure the overall concept are included. Factor analysis is implemented in STATA 14 using the principal-factor method for ABS, AC and ASS, while SSN pillar is constructed using the minimum-maximum method of index construction.

In the ABS resilience pillar, we take four available variables that are associated with accessing basic services: households access to credit, health, extension services and household' residence distance to the district town. Except the variable town, all of the ABS variables have categorical scales. In the case of AC resilience pillar, four observed variables are used, namely, the diversification of households' income sources,² the diversification of livestock reared by the household,³ the diversification of crops grown in the households' agricultural land⁴ and the literacy status of the household head. The ASS component of resilience used three observed indicators, per capita size of agricultural land measured in hectare and the number of livestock the household owns measure in tropical livestock unit (TLU)⁵ to represent productive assets as well as the wealth index⁶ in the case of the non-productive assets. Two indicators, namely, formal and informal transfer of money to the household in the past 12 months represent the social safety net (SSN) pillar of resilience. The observed variables of the SSN pillars comprise all transfers received by the household in Ethiopian Birr (ETB) in the past 12 months in per capita.

3.3. A measure of drought: enhanced vegetation index (EVI) anomaly

Several indices have been developed to measure and characterize droughts. Among these indices, Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) (McKee, Doesken, & Kleist, 1993), which relies on precipitation, and Palmer Drought Severity Index (Palmer, 1965) (PDSI), which uses precipitation and temperature, are often considered to be robust measures of droughts. The limitation of such indices has been the difficulty to obtain the quality data with adequate spatial coverage particularly in developing countries like Ethiopia. However, with the advancements in remote sensing technology, such limitations have been overcome and satellite data have been recently used at large to monitor droughts based on the development of vegetation indices. These include Vegetation Condition Index (VCI) (Kogan, 1995) and Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI) (Huete et al., 2002). The former is Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) for each pixel on the basis of the maximum statistical range over the historical record of available imagery. The later provides complementary information about the spatial and temporal variations of vegetation, while minimizing many of the contamination problems present in the NDVI such as those associated with canopy background and residual aerosol influences (Huete et al., 2002).

The ESS dataset includes EVI values for the growing periods of 2015 as well as the long-term average for the same period for each zone covered by the survey. The later EVI values represent the "normal" growing conditions for the vegetation in a given zone, representing the long-term EVI average of the period 1990–2015. Hence, vegetation stress that a particular zone exhibits due to drought over a given year can be used to characterize the health of the vegetation relative to the norm. We calculated EVI anomaly for a given zone by subtracting the zone's long-term average value of EVI for the growing periods from the 2015 growing period average EVI. The EVI anomaly reflects agricultural drought, which is the most important type of drought in Ethiopia. Generally negative EVI anomalies would

indicate vegetation stress reflecting a particular zone that experiences drought in 2015 during which experiencing a given vegetation stress is considered exposure (or treatment) in this study. The EVI anomaly calculated for the growing period in 2015 shows that more than half of enumeration areas included in the ESS survey exhibited negative deviations from the normal vegetation development. In few severely affected areas, vegetation performance declines by 41% from the normal vegetation condition of the specified period. We assign locations' drought status by defining the EVI anomaly threshold at which a vegetation stress is considered a drought. We follow NASA classification system in which an anomaly class from negative 0.025 (−2.5%) to positive 0.025 (2.5%). EVI anomaly values represent a normal vegetation condition of a particular area, which is typical for the period in consideration. Those anomaly classes (EVI anomaly <−0.025) and (EVI anomaly >0.025) are generally considered as below-normal and above-normal vegetation conditions, respectively with the former relates to drought conditions. Hence, those areas, included in the ESS survey, that exhibit an EVI anomaly (<−0.025) were considered to be drought affected, and subsequently sample households were assigned in the treatment group if they reside in those areas affected by drought and comparison groups otherwise.

3.4. Analytic strategy

To test the potential impact of the 2015 El Niño-induced drought on the consumption of rural households in Ethiopia, we followed a quasi-experimental approach based on the difference in difference (DID) method. The DID method estimates the counterfactual for the change in the outcome for the treatment group by calculating the change in the outcome for the comparison group. As applied to our study, it compares the outcome (consumption) changes over time for the group unaffected (comparison group) by the intervention (drought exposure in 2015) with the group affected (treatment group) by the intervention and attributes the difference in consumption to the effect of the intervention. Consumption aggregate data obtained from the ESS panel surveys of 2014 and 2016 were used to represent consumption levels at the baseline, before the drought and during the follow-up period and after the drought, respectively.

This method allows us to take into account any differences between the treatment and comparison groups that are constant over time including differences due to unobserved time invariant factors (Gertler et al., 2016; Khandker, Koolwal, & Samad, 2009). Furthermore, the exogenous placement of EVI anomalies reflecting drought exposure in 2015 across zones in the study area provides a natural experiment for examining the relationship between the 2015 drought and changes in consumption. Hence, selection bias will not be a problem because drought is a negative intervention or exposure, and households are presumably neither targeted nor self-select into drought-affected areas. However, baseline levels and expected trends in consumption may vary systematically with drought exposure due to differences in the choice of risk response mechanisms and shock response capacity among households. For this reason, we employed a combined method of PSM and DID

to address such systematic differences. By using the baseline data, we can match the treatment and comparison groups on baseline characteristics that may cause systematic differences so that any difference that arise in the outcomes of the treatment and comparison groups in the post-intervention period is attributed to the intervention (the 2015 drought) itself. In this study, baseline characteristics used for matching include resilience capacity of households discussed above in four key pillars that affects both the capacity to deal with drought shock and the outcome of interest (consumption). Balancing on the distribution of these covariates between treatment and comparison groups would allow to construct a valid counterfactual.

Therefore, we employed propensity score methods in conjunction with the DID model, i.e. we run the DID model on only matched samples, which are balanced on the distribution of confounding resilience pillars in both the treatment and comparison groups. Hence, the combined method would allow us to establish a valid counterfactual group and ensure that the estimated treatment effect is associated with the drought shock. The variables and the measurement of these confounding factors are discussed in Section 3.2 following FAOs methodology based on the factor analysis. The propensity score is first estimated based on a logit function, and we chose kernel matching algorithm to balance the distribution of resilience capacity pillars between the two groups on the basis of the estimated propensity score. We chose this matching estimator as it balances the distribution of covariates with smaller mean differences between the two groups and results in large matched sample size compared with other matching algorithms. This matching technique allows to avoid bad matches (Rosenbaum, 2002) by cutting off those observations whose propensity scores are smaller than the minimum and greater than the maximum of treated and comparison groups, respectively.

Using the matched samples obtained from the above matching procedure, we estimate our DID regression equation specified below to compute the effect of the 2015 drought on consumption. For this, we employed a simplified estimation procedure developed by Villa (2016), which allows to run both the PSM and DID estimation procedures simultaneously.

$$\ln y_{it} = \alpha T_i + \beta P_T + \gamma D_{it} + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where the dependent variable $\ln y_{it}$ is the natural logarithms of consumption by household i in year t measured in per capita expenditure in birr (adjusted to the 2014 real price); T_i is treatment status equal to 1 for households residing in the drought-affected areas; P_T is period (a dummy variable equal to 1 for the follow-up period) and D_{it} is an interaction term between treatment and time. The parameter γ measures the mean change in consumption associated with the drought event. The parameters α and β measure individual and period fixed effects, respectively.

The matched samples with optimal balance in key covariates could reduce the bias in our estimation caused by systematic differences between treatment and comparison groups. Our DID estimation procedure on matched samples could remove both systematic differences between the two groups and the

effects of time-invariant unmeasured confounding factors. However, DID works best on the assumption of common trend overtime for the outcome of the treatment and comparison groups in the absence of the intervention. This assumption holds if the effect of time varying covariates is the same for the treatment and comparison groups. In our case, even after matching, we cannot assume that the effect of covariates is the same for the treatment and comparison groups over time. This necessitates us to conduct a formal test of the validity of the common trend assumption in our data. Unfortunately, there is no direct test for the common trend assumption. However, we managed to check the outcome trends for the treatment and comparison groups by using more ESS data collected before the baseline period to perform a placebo test. We have done this test in our data and found that the common trend assumption holds (see Table 4 in Section 4.3 for the placebo test result).

4. Results and discussion

This section presents estimates of the effect of the 2015 drought on household consumption. We report estimates of our DID model based on the matched comparison groups and equal-sized treatment groups. We start by describing average levels and trends of the outcome of interest and covariate distribution during 2014–2016. We also present baseline covariate balance among treatment and comparison groups both before and after matching based on resilience pillars. We then present and discuss estimates of the drought impact on consumption including additional impact estimates based on the quantile difference-in-difference regression to compare the changes caused by the drought between the lower and upper tails of the consumption distribution.

4.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 1 presents the mean levels and trends of consumption including distribution of covariates in both pre-drought and post-drought periods. Number of observations and mean values are presented in consecutive columns of the table for both periods. The variation in number of observations is due to missing values reported for some variables. Mean consumption declines significantly during 2014–2016 period. Except access to basic services that do not vary overtime, significant changes in the mean levels of all covariates were observed during 2014–2016.

Table 1. Summary of household consumption and resilience capacity by year.

Variables	N (2014)	Mean1	N (2016)	Mean2	Mean Diff
Consumption per adult eq. (2014 real price)	2883	4860	2774	4596	264.253***
Access to basic services	3196	0.525	3089	0.524	0.001
Adaptive capacity	3196	0.547	3014	0.255	0.292***
Household asset	3195	0.122	3088	0.596	-0.474***
Safety net	3195	0.016	3089	0.008	0.007***

* $p < 0.1$.

** $p < 0.05$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

Mean levels of resilience capacity decline on most of the resilience pillars during 2014–2016, indicating the deteriorating resilience capacity against shocks. In terms of adaptive capacity and safety net, both are important for households to deal with and react against shocks, the observed decline might be due to wide coverage of the drought exposure in 2015 that may limit safety net coverages as well as access to alternative food or income sources as coping mechanisms. It might also indicate inadequate preparedness to deal with shocks well before the drought occurrence. However, non-declining trend in the mean level of household asset may reflect the asset smoothing behaviour of a typical rural household in Ethiopia that tend to protect their assets during periods of stress instead of drawing down assets to meet consumption gaps caused by transitory shocks.

4.2. Covariate balance between treatment and comparison groups

Our estimates assume that the change in consumption in the comparison group is an unbiased estimate of the counterfactual. Propensity scores are used to balance treatment and comparison groups on a set of baseline characteristics of resilience against shock (on key covariates defined in Section 3.2 above) to make the groups as similar as possible with respect to those observed baseline characteristics. Based on the propensity scores, we therefore perform kernel matching procedure to construct a valid counterfactual. The covariate balance before and after matching is presented in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. The mean levels of the outcome of interest i.e. consumption and covariates are estimated at the baseline period (2014) for both treatment and comparison groups. The mean consumption at the baseline is significantly higher among comparison groups compared with the mean consumption among treatment groups in both cases, before matching and after matching.

Before matching (Table 2), many of the differences in covariates between treatment and comparison groups were statistically significantly different at baseline. In three of the resilience pillars, drought-affected groups exhibited lower levels of assets and adaptive capacity as well as access to social safety net to deal with shocks. This implies that the two groups are systematically different, and our estimate would have been biased even without the intervention (exposure to the 2015 drought).

However, following matching (Table 3), no covariate seems likely to demonstrate a practical difference at baseline, and our

Table 2. Mean covariate differences between treatment and comparison groups before matching.

Variable(s)	Mean Control	Mean Treated	Diff.	t	Pr(T > t)
Consumption per adult eq. (2014 real price)	5019	4755	−263.4	2.75	0.0060***
Access to basic services	0.475	0.55	0.075	9.25	0.0000***
Adaptive capacity	0.559	0.543	−0.015	1.85	0.0640*
Household asset	0.127	0.12	−0.008	3.06	0.0022***
Safety Net	0.018	0.014	−0.005	2.33	0.0200**

* $p < 0.1$.
** $p < 0.05$.
*** $p < 0.01$.

Table 3. Mean covariate differences between treatment & comparison groups after matching.

Variable(s)	Mean Control	Mean Treated	Diff.	t	Pr(T > t)
Consumption per adult eq. (2014 real price)	5023	4755	−267.7	2.92	0.0035***
Access to basic services	0.549	0.554	0.005	0.61	0.54
Adaptive capacity	0.55	0.544	−0.007	0.8	0.424
Household asset	0.121	0.12	−0.001	0.45	0.653
Safety net	0.014	0.014	0	0.08	0.939

* $p < 0.1$.
** $p < 0.05$.
*** $p < 0.01$.

Table 4. Estimated effect of the 2015 drought and placebo effect on In consumption.

Variables	Drought effect	Placebo effect
Diff-in-diff	−0.0787*** (0.0276)	0.0431 (0.0265)
Observations	5257	5440
R-squared	0.007	0.017
Mean control $t(0)$	8.385	8.567
Mean treated $t(0)$	8.359	8.434
Diff $t(0)$	−0.0265	−0.133
Mean control $t(1)$	8.388	8.487
Mean treated $t(1)$	8.283	8.397
Diff $t(1)$	−0.105	−0.0899

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$.
** $p < 0.05$.
*** $p < 0.01$.

matching procedure assured the comparison group to be a reasonable counterfactual. All of the figures and estimates of our model reported below are based on the matched comparison groups.

4.3. Impact estimates

Our impact estimates rely on the common trend assumption holding true, and hence, as a test for this key assumption, we presented both estimates of the drought effect and the placebo intervention effect in Table 4. The latter was estimated using the two observations of the ESS data in the pre-drought period, i.e. the 2012 and 2014 ESS data. The non-significant impact of the placebo intervention (Table 4 column 3) reassured the valid drought impact estimate of our DID model (Table 4 column 2). Our outcome of interest is represented by natural logarithms of household consumption expenditure (adjusted to the 2014 real price). Our estimate confirms that the 2015 drought reduced household consumption by about 8% compared with the average consumption level of the matched comparison groups. This is robust evidence that mean consumption in 2016 would have been significantly higher in the absence of the drought that affected large parts of the country. The significant impact of the 2015 drought on consumption among affected groups is not surprising as it was one of the large-scale shocks that the country experienced. However, compared with our impact estimate, the estimated magnitude of drought impact in many observational studies appeared to be overestimated. For example, our estimate is about two-fifth of what was predicted

by Dercon et al. (2005b), and for severe drought, Hill and Porter (2017) also estimated a 33% loss in total consumption, which is four times larger than our estimate.

There are at least three reasons that the ex-ante predictions were too pessimistic compared with our estimate. First, these studies failed to consider shock resilience differences among affected and non-affected groups, which may bias impact estimates even in the absence of any external intervention or exposure. Second, both the aforementioned studies used ERHS panel datasets of 1998–2004 and 2005–2011, respectively, which are often criticized for limited sampling coverage and lacking data for some key household and community level indicators. Using reported shock occurrences in their estimation procedures may also overestimate the drought effect on consumption. Moreover, these datasets involve longer time ranges between the baseline and follow-up periods, which makes it more difficult to control confounding effects that may bias the estimation of the effect of a particular drought exposure. This may also present a challenge to define the time frame for measuring drought exposure, and the estimated impact may reflect the long-term impact of droughts unlike our study, which focuses on a specific drought episode and its short-term impact on household consumption. Early warning and emergency response system of the country has changed overtime, and the varied estimated impacts reported in this study and in both studies mentioned earlier may also reflect such key contextual differences.

However, a reduction of consumption among drought-affected population by 8% would have consequences more than just a temporary reduction in consumption. For instance, reference to a similar drought context (Dercon, 2004) demonstrates that covariates capturing the severity of the 1984–1985 drought-induced famine are causally related to the slower growth in household consumption in the 1990s. Our estimate of drought effect on consumption also includes non-food consumption and expenditure for education, which are often subject to household expenditure reduction during periods of shocks as a coping strategy for most of poor households. Such coping behaviour often implies long-term consequences. For example, studies by Hoddinott and Kinsey (2001) and Alderman et al. (2006) demonstrated that rainfall shocks are causally related to reduced human capital formation and that the magnitudes of these effects are meaningful. The later study estimates a 7% loss in lifetime earnings among children affected by the 1982–1984 drought shock in rural Zimbabwe.

4.4. Descriptions of change across consumption groups

We also examine the extent to which the negative effects of the 2015 drought was driven by changes in the lower and upper quantile groups of household consumption. For this reason, we ran quantile DID at the 25th and 75th percentiles of household consumption using a simplified estimation procedure developed by Villa (2016) for a combined method of PSM and DID. Table 5 presents our estimates using quantile DID regression. Since only the order of consumption level matters to the estimation procedure of our quantile DID regression, we use consumption expenditure in Ethiopian Birr as a measure of our outcome of interest instead of the transformed

Table 5. The 2015 drought effect estimated at the 25th and 75th consumption percentiles.

Variables	25th Percentile	75th Percentile
Diff-in-diff	−414.6*** (139.7)	−263.7 (322.3)
Observations	5257	5257
Mean control $t(0)$	2914	6645
Mean treated $t(0)$	3046	6056
Diff $t(0)$	132.3	−589.3
Mean control $t(1)$	3056	6455
Mean treated $t(1)$	2774	5603
Diff $t(1)$	−282.3	−853

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

* $p < 0.1$.

** $p < 0.05$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

value as reported in Table 4. The result confirmed that the 25th percentile of consumption declines significantly (Table 5, column 2) due to the 2015 drought, indicating that the estimated drought impact was largely driven from the lower tail of the consumption distribution.

However, the decline in the upper tail of the distribution appears to be non-significant (Table 5, column 3). The significant reduction in consumption among poor households may be largely due to the limited access to liquid assets that constrain their ability to meet the consumption gap caused by the drought shock. While the better-off households with wide range of coping options managed to maintain relatively high levels of food consumption during periods of shocks, the poor households tend to have gaps even in non-drought years. This implies a persistent effect of shocks on consumption of the poor.

The significant impact of the drought on consumption was largely expected given the previous literature on shocks and food security. Nonetheless, unlike ex ante predictions of previous studies, the findings of this study related to the estimated drought effect from a quasi-experimental impact estimation procedure may offer a more accurate estimated magnitude of drought impact liable to substantive policy implications. For example, the relatively large effect of the drought on consumption poor households may reveal the persistent effect of shocks that keep the poor to stay in a state of poverty traps. On the other hand, the non-significant impact of the drought on the better-off groups may reflect their ability to maintain food consumption during periods of stress. This is mainly because wealthy households tend to have wide range of coping options to maintain relatively high levels of food consumption. However, it is important to recognize that the observed distribution of a given shock's impact depends on the particular outcome of interest (Wisner, 2004). For example, in terms of livestock holdings Thiede (2014) found that wealthy households were more exposed to the effects of rainfall deficits than the poor. In his study, the relatively large effect of rainfall deficits on better-off households' livestock stores may represent the trade-off for increasing their ability to maintain relatively high levels of food consumption by liquidating their livestock wealth.

5. Concluding remarks

The result of this study is based on a quasi-experimental design informed by a robust theory of change represented by a risk

chain model by which the welfare impact of a particular shock could only be determined given the factors of resilience among exposure units against the shock. Hence, we employed a combined method of PSM and DID to estimate the impact of 2015 drought on consumption of affected groups by comparing their average consumption with that of non-affected groups given similar resilience characteristics between the two groups. This study exploits the advantage of the timeline of the 2015 drought crisis and the 2012–2016 unique Ethiopian Socioeconomic Survey to provide arguably among the most robust empirical evidence about the relationship between climatic shocks and consumption among rural households.

Although this study focuses on consumption as an outcome of concern, droughts often have a multitude of socioeconomic and environmental consequences. Given the importance of the 2015 drought and ESS data availability on other key indicators such as crop production and ownership of productive assets, further research that apply a similar methodology could generate policy relevant insights related to the management of drought risk and resilience building initiatives. With more waves of the ESS data to be available in the future, further studies with similar design may also quantify the persistent effect of shocks that determine the nature of poverty and vulnerability trajectories as a complementary line of inquiry to the more common focus on the social determinants of vulnerability or resilience to negative well-being outcomes (Celidoni, 2015; Chaudhuri & Datt, 2001; Demissie & Kasie, 2017)

The findings of this study and the further research indicated earlier are both theoretically and practically important. For example, theoretical explanation provided to shock-related short-term consumption gap and persistent effect of long-term well-being is still inadequate due to complicated shock response mechanisms adopted by affected communities. Some studies documented evidences that in hard times, some households may choose to protect their consumption today by depleting their productive assets or withdrawing their children from school, which may undermine future livelihoods (Devereux et al., 2008; Roncoli, Ingram, & Kirshen, 2001). In contrast, some household may also choose to reduce consumption today to protect their future livelihoods (Waal, 1989). This has also negative effect on health and nutritional status, which have persistent effects on labour capacity and health expenses subject to high vulnerability to future poverty (Roncoli et al., 2001; Webb & Harinarayan, 1999). Further research should build upon this study by using decomposition techniques and triple DID methodology to quantify how choice of certain shock response mechanisms contribute to the overall changes in consumption and productive assets including resulting inequality among affected communities in terms of resilience to future shocks.

Evidences about livelihood and food insecurity effects of shocks attributable to the various shock response mechanisms employed by affected people may provide new policy insights for the targeted strategic development focus and effective emergency response planning. This study and future research may support drought risk reduction investment decisions and enables to perform resilience tests of the overall response system against likely crisis to enhance emergency preparedness capabilities. This is particularly important in Ethiopia where

emergency needs projections are often made based on the analysis of past El-Niño events.

Notes

1. The ESS data are available through the CSA website: <http://www.csa.gov.et/> or through the LSMS website: <http://www.worldbank.org/ls>
2. Income diversification index is created through factor analysis. A list of variables assumes value 1 or 0 is used, depending on whether or not a household has been involved in farming activity; employment activities; self-employment activities; received transfers and earned income from rent.
3. Livestock diversification is also created through factor analysis. A list of variables assumes value 1 or 0 is used, depending on whether or not a household has been involved in rearing cattle, shoats, equine and camels.
4. Crop diversifications are created through factor analysis. A list of variables assumes value 1 or 0 is used, depending on whether or not a household has been involved in planting barely, beans, *chat* (local tree), coffee, *enset* (local crop type), maize, sorghum, *teff* (local crop type), and wheat in their agricultural field in the past cropping season.
5. TLU standardizes different types of livestock into a single unit of measurement. The conversion factor adopted is: 1 camel; 0.7 cattle; 0.55 donkeys /mules/horses; 0.1 shoats.
6. Wealth index- is created through factor analysis. A list of variables assumes value 1 or 0 is used, depending on whether or not a household has specific non-productive assets; such as a *gabi* (local cloth), bed, clock, phone, radio, *mofer* (traditional ploughing tool) *machid* (traditional crop harvesting tool) plough axe.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank World Bank and Ethiopian Central Statistical Authority for making the Ethiopian Socioeconomic Survey data available for research. We are also grateful to Bahir Dar University, Institute of Economic Research for providing the training on 'Impact Evaluation Design & Modelling' to the research team.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Tesfahun Asmamaw Kasie is an assistant professor of Institute of Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Studies, Bahir Dar University, Bahir-dar, Ethiopia.

Birhan Sisay Demissie is an assistant professor of Institute of Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Studies, Bahir Dar University, Bahirdar, Ethiopia.

Mihret Jember Bahry is a lecturer of Institute of Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Studies, Bahir Dar University, Bahirdar, Ethiopia.

Gashaw Mulu Gessesse is an assistant professor of Department of Development and Environmental Management, University of Gondar, Gondar, Ethiopia.

Letenah Ejigu Wale is an assistant professor of Institute of Economic Research, Bahir Dar University, Bahirdar, Ethiopia.

References

- Alderman, H., Hoddinott, J., & Kinsey, B. (2006). Long term consequences of early childhood malnutrition. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 58(3), 450–474. Retrieved from <http://oep.oxfordjournals.org/content/58/3/450.short>

- Alwang, J., Siegel, P. B., Jorgensen, S. L., et al. (2001). *Vulnerability: A view from different disciplines*. Social protection discussion paper series. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Social-Risk-Management-DP/0115.pdf>
- Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., Davis, I., & Wisner, B. (2014). *At risk: Natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=4M6AAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=twigg+disaster+vulnerability&ots=xkC99bL_qa&sig=HzCKmCmESsv6m0nc40fz6VFrKtE
- Bohle, H. G., Downing, T. E., & Watts, M. J. (1994). Climate change and social vulnerability: Toward a sociology and geography of food insecurity. *Global Environmental Change*, 4(1), 37–48. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0959378094900205>
- Bryan, E., Deressa, T. T., Gbetibouo, G. A., & Ringler, C. (2009). Adaptation to climate change in Ethiopia and South Africa: Options and constraints. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 12(4), 413–426. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901108001263>
- Campbell, B. M., Vermeulen, S. J., Aggarwal, P. K., Corner-Dolloff, C., Girvetz, E., Loboguerrero, A. M., ... Wollenberg, E. (2016). Reducing risks to food security from climate change. *Global Food Security*, doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2016.06.002
- Celidoni, M. (2015). Decomposing vulnerability to poverty. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 61(1), 59–74. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/roiw.12074/full>
- Central Statistical Authority & World Bank. (2013). *Ethiopia Rural Socioeconomic Survey (ERSS) Report*. Central Statistical Agency & the World Bank.
- Central Statistical Authority & World Bank. (2015). *Ethiopia Socioeconomic Survey (ESS)–2013/14 Report*. Central Statistical Agency & the World Bank.
- Central Statistical Authority & World Bank. (2017). *Construction of consumption aggregates for the Ethiopia socioeconomic survey*.
- Central Statistical Authority. (2015). *Country and regional level consumer price indices*. Ethiopia Central Statistical Agency. http://www.csa.gov.et/images/documents/pdf_files/CPI/cpi_decem_2014
- Central Statistical Authority, National Bank of Ethiopia, & World Bank. (2017). *Living standard measurement survey—integrated surveys on agriculture Ethiopia socioeconomic survey report 2015/2016*. A Report by the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia in Collaboration with the National Bank of Ethiopia (NBE) and the World Bank.
- Chaudhuri, S., & Datt, G. (2001). *Assessing household vulnerability to poverty: A methodology and estimates for the Philippines*. World Bank Draft. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.202.3980&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Demeke, A. B., Keil, A., & Zeller, M. (2011). Using panel data to estimate the effect of rainfall shocks on smallholders food security and vulnerability in rural Ethiopia. *Climatic Change*, 108(1–2), 185–206. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-010-9994-3>
- Demissie, B. S., & Kasie, T. A. (2017). Rural households' vulnerability to poverty in Ethiopia. *Journal of Poverty*, Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10875549.2017.1348425>
- Dercon, S. (2001). *Assessing vulnerability to poverty, report prepared for DfID*. Oxford: CSAE, University of Oxford. Retrieved from www.economics.ox.ac.uk/members/stefan.dercon/assessing%20vulnerability.pdf
- Dercon, S. (2004). Growth and shocks: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Journal of Development Economics*, 74(2), 309–329. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304387804000173>
- Dercon, S., Hoddinott, J., & Woldehanna, T. (2005a). *Shocks and consumption in 15 Ethiopian villages, 1999–2004*. *Journal of African Economies*, 14(4), 559–585.
- Dercon, S., Hoddinott, J., & Woldehanna, T. (2005b). *Shocks and consumption in 15 Ethiopian villages, 1999–2004*. *Journal of African Economies*, Retrieved from <http://jae.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2005/08/19/jae.eji022.full.pdf>
- Deressa, T. T. (2007). Measuring the economic impact of climate change on Ethiopian agriculture: Ricardian approach. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, (4342). Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1012474
- Deressa, T. T., & Hassan, R. M. (2009). Economic impact of climate change on crop production in Ethiopia: Evidence from cross-section measures. *Journal of African Economies*, eip002. Retrieved from <http://jae.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2009/04/16/jae.eip002.short>
- Devereux, S., Sabates-Wheeler, R., Tefera, M., & Taye, H. (2006). Ethiopia's productive safety net programme: Trends in PSNP transfers within targeted households. *Institute of Development Studies, Brighton*. Retrieved from <http://www.alnap.org/resource/9458>
- Devereux, S., Vaitla, B., Swan, S. H., & Hunger Watch (Organization), & Action Against Hunger (Association). (2008). *Seasons of hunger fighting cycles of quiet starvation among the world's rural poor*. London: Pluto Press in association with Action Against Hunger, ACF International Network. Retrieved from <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10480204>
- DRMFSS. (2015). *Food security and agricultural assessment report Meher 2015, Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: Disaster Risk Management and Food Security, Early Warning and Response Process.
- Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L. B., & Vermeersch, C. M. (2016). *Impact evaluation in practice*. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.
- Gray, C., & Mueller, V. (2012). Drought and population mobility in rural Ethiopia. *World Development*, 40(1), 134–145.
- Heitzmann, K., Canagarajah, R. S., & Siegel, P. B. (2002). Guidelines for assessing the sources of risk and vulnerability. *WB Social Protection Discussion Paper*, (218). Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Social-Risk-Management-DP/0218.pdf>
- Hill, R. V., & Porter, C. (2017). Vulnerability to drought and food price shocks: Evidence from Ethiopia. *World Development*, 96, 65–77.
- Hoddinott, J., & Kinsey, B. (2001). Child growth in the time of drought. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 63(4), 409–436. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-0084.t01-1-00227/abstract>
- Hoddinott, J., & Quisumbing, A. (2010). Methods for microeconomic risk and vulnerability assessment. In *Risk, shocks, and human development* (pp. 62–100). Springer. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9780230274129_4
- HRD. (2016). *Ethiopia: Humanitarian Requirements Document, 2016*. Joint Government and Humanitarian Partners' Document.
- Huete, A., Didan, K., Miura, T., Rodriguez, E. P., Gao, X., & Ferreira, L. G. (2002). Overview of the radiometric and biophysical performance of the MODIS vegetation indices. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 83, 195–213.
- Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B., & Samad, H. A. (2009). *Handbook on impact evaluation: Quantitative methods and practices*. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.
- Kogan, F. N. (1995). Droughts of the late 1980s in the United States as derived from NOAA polar-orbiting satellite data. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 76, 655–668.
- Little, P. D., Stone, M. P., Mogue, T., Castro, A. P., & Negatu, W. (2006). "Moving in place": drought and poverty dynamics in South Wollo, Ethiopia. *Journal of Development Studies*, 42(2), 200–225. doi:10.1080/00220380500405287
- McKee, T. B., Doesken, N. J., & Kleist, J. (1993). The relationship of drought frequency and duration to time scales. In *Proceedings of the 8th conference on applied climatology* (pp. 179–184). Boston, MA: American Meteorological Society.
- Michael, B. R., Lance, M. L., & Zewdu, T. S. (2016). Classifying drought in Ethiopia using Machine Learning. In Cihan H. Dagli (Ed.), *Procedia Computer Science* (Vol. 95, pp. 229–236). Los Angeles, CA: Elsevier.
- Palmer, W. C. (1965). Meteorological drought. *Nited States Department of Commerce. Weather Bur. Wash. DC*.
- Roncoli, C., Ingram, K., & Kirshen, P. (2001). The costs and risks of coping with drought: Livelihood impacts and farmers' responses in Burkina Faso. *Climate Research*, 19(2), 119–132. Retrieved from <http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/cr/v19/n2/p119-132/>
- Rosenbaum, P. (2002). *Observational studies* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Ruth, H., & Catherine, P. (2013). *Vulnerability Study to assist with assessment of potential caseload for next generation of PSNP & HABP* (PSNP/HABP Formulation Process). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

- Seaman, J. A., Sawdon, G. E., Acidri, J., & Petty, C. (2014). The household economy approach: managing the impact of climate change on poverty and food security in developing countries. *Climate Risk Management*, 4-5, 59-68. doi:10.1016/j.crm.2014.10.001
- Thiede, B. C. (2014). Rainfall shocks and within-community wealth inequality: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. *World Development*, 64, 181-193.
- Villa, J. M. (2016). Diff: Simplifying the estimation of difference-in-differences treatment effects. *Stata Journal*, 16, 52-71.
- Waal, A. d. (1989). *Famine that kills: Darfur, Sudan, 1984-1985*. Clarendon press. Retrieved from <http://www.cabdirect.org/abstracts/19891873070.html>
- Watts, M. J., & Bohle, H. G. (1993). The space of vulnerability: The causal structure of hunger and famine. *Progress in Human Geography*, 17(1), 43-67. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/030913259301700103>
- Webb, P., & Harinarayan, A. (1999). A measure of uncertainty: The nature of vulnerability and its relationship to malnutrition. *Disasters*, 23(4), 292-305. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-7717.00119/abstract>
- Wisner, B. (2004). *At risk natural hazards, people's vulnerability, and disasters*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://www.mylibrary.com?id=10961>
- Ziervogel, G., Bharwani, S., & Downing, T. E. (2006). Adapting to climate variability: Pumpkins, people and policy. In *Natural resources forum* (Vol. 30, pp. 294-305). Wiley Online Library. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2006.00121.x/full>