Household Hardships during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Examining Household Vulnerability and Responses to Pandemic Related Shocks in Eastern Ethiopia

Jonathan A. Muir1†*, Merga Dheresa2†, Zachary J. Madewell3, Tamirat Getachew2, Gezahegn Mengesha2, Cynthia G. Whitney1, Nega Assefa2‡, and Solveig A. Cunningham1‡

1. Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States
2. Haramaya University, Harar, Ethiopia
3. Center for Global Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, United States

†Co-first authors
‡Co-senior authors
* Correspondence: Jonathan A. Muir, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States, jamuir@emory.edu

Abstract: COVID-19 is associated with one of the largest disturbances to life in the 21st century. To quell disease spread, governments implemented lockdowns that likely created hardships for households. To improve knowledge of consequences, we examine how the pandemic period was associated with household hardships and assess factors associated with these hardships. We conducted a cross-sectional study using quasi-Poisson regression to examine factors associated with household hardships. Data were collected between August and September of 2021 from a random sample of 880 households living in a Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) located in the Harari Region and the District of Kersa, both in Ethiopia. Having a head of household with no education, residing in a rural area, larger household size, lower income and/or wealth, and community responses to COVID-19 including lockdowns and travel restrictions were independently associated with experiencing household hardships. Our results identify characteristics of groups at-risk for food insecurity during the pan-demic; households that were already struggling prior to the onset of the pandemic were at greatest risk of adverse consequences during the pandemic period. These findings may inform future efforts to mitigate the consequences of COVID-19 and future disease out-breaks.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; Africa; Resilience; Vulnerability

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in one of the largest disturbances to life in the 21st century. Beyond direct health effects,[1] the pandemic had social and economic consequences as government-enforced lockdowns were implemented to stem the pace and severity of the disease.[2] To adhere to these lockdowns, many businesses closed their in-person offices temporarily; for some, business closure was permanent. Mitigation efforts also affected healthcare providers who had to restrict in-person access to patients and/or limit services. These efforts may have affected the health of young children, pregnant women, and mothers by limiting access to healthcare and sufficient food—especially in isolated regions of resource-limited countries.[3-16] These indirect effects, in return, would exacerbate direct effects of the SARS-CoV-2 virus by increasing risk for undernutrition and other conditions that heighten the danger of serious illness. [14,15] Knowledge on the extent to which households living in resource-limited countries have experienced resource restrictions and other hardships remains limited due to incomplete or nonexistent population surveillance.[17]

In sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), national governments undertook considerable efforts to quell the spread of COVID-19.[2,18] Mitigation efforts in Ethiopia included social distancing, lockdowns, and emphasizing hygiene protocols; these efforts were started on March 16th of 2020, intensified on March 20th, and ultimately a state of emergency was declared on April 10th.[19] Economic and social disparities across different sociodemographic groups and geospatial inequalities may have resulted in uneven

implementation of these efforts.[11] These disparities may also have resulted in differential household and community vulnerability to unintended consequences of these efforts.

Vulnerability is the collective effect of cultural, economic, institutional, political, and social processes that modify the experience of and recovery from a given hazard.[20] In the context of disasters, it is often not the hazard itself that creates the disaster; rather, the disaster is the impact on individual and community coping patterns and the inputs and outputs of social systems.[21-23] Social vulnerability is partially the result of social disparities that shape or influence the susceptibility of different groups to hazards while also controlling their capacity to respond.[24,25] Individual and household level factors often associated with vulnerability include demographic characteristics such as age, ethnicity, race, and sex; socioeconomic status (e.g., income, wealth, employment, and/or education); household composition (e.g., presence of children or elderly); and housing and transportation.[26] However, social vulnerability also involves place disparities stemming from characteristics of communities and the built environment. For example, differential availability of scarce resources between urban and rural areas may exacerbate individual and household level vulnerabilities to hazards.[27-29] To understand the broader consequences of the pandemic, it is important to consider economic, political, and social markers of vulnerability at the individual, household, and community level. [21-25]

In Ethiopia, those already burdened by social and economic disparities and limited in their ability to access resources are at greater risk for experiencing additional hardships during the pandemic.[7,11,18] Specific demographic groups disproportionately vulnerable include: older adults, people with disabilities or pre-existing medical conditions, the poor, people living in congested residences and/or slums, pregnant women, and the unemployed. Rural populations in Ethiopia are at elevated risk for food insecurity and agricultural hardships as climate change, severe drought, conflict, and environmental degradation have culminated in societal shocks affecting livelihoods, particularly for farmers.[30,31] Populations lacking access to safe drinking water and/or sanitary environments, reliant upon emergency food aid, or with limited access to media or other communication technologies are also at greater risk of adverse consequences of the pandemic.[18] Differential vulnerability requires context specific interventions to address indirect costs of the pandemic.[32]

We used data from an existing Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) in Eastern Ethiopia to analyze the prevalence of household level hardships experienced during the pandemic and examine factors associated with vulnerability to these hardships. We further explore household responses to these hardships and analyze factors associated with households using these coping strategies.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study setting

The setting for this study is a predominantly rural area in the district of Kersa and an urban area in the Harari People's National Regional State in Eastern Ethiopia.[33,34] The rural area consists of 24 kebeles (a neighborhood or ward), and covers 353 km2 with a population of 135,754 in 25,653 households. The urban area consists of 12 kebeles, a population of 55,773 in 14,768 households, across 25.4 km2. The population has been followed through a Health and Demographic Surveillance System since 2012, with demographic and health-related information regularly collected (see Figure 1).



Figure 1. The Harar and Kersa Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) in Eastern Ethiopia. The smaller map panels on the right identify the location of the HDSS catchment areas within Eastern Ethiopia.

2.2. Study design

This study is part of a larger examination within the Child Health and Mortality Prevention Surveillance (CHAMPS) network to understand the consequences of COVID-19 lockdowns for child health and mortality.[34] We administered a short data collection questionnaire designed to understand how the pandemic and related lockdowns may have affected the livelihood, food availability, and healthcare of households. Households were selected using simple random sampling to achieve a sample size of 440 from the rural (Kersa) and from the urban (Harar) catchment areas (total sample size of 880). The sample size was specified to detect prevalence of changes in accessing healthcare. A priori specifications were 50% of the population experiencing changes, 95% CI, precision of 0.05 and non-response adjustment of 10%.

The survey questionnaire was structured into five sections: knowledge regarding the spread of COVID-19; food availability; COVID-19 related shocks/coping; under-five child healthcare services; and healthcare services for pregnant women. Questions in the survey instrument related to hardships associated with the pandemic period asked respondents to consider whether a given hardship had occurred since March of 2020. Data collectors were drawn from the fieldwork teams of HDSS enumerators already trained and working in the HDSS. Data collection occurred between August and September of 2021 and was carried out through tablet-based in-person interviews with adult household members. Survey data from the questionnaire were linked with data from the most recent HDSS round to incorporate additional demographic data about the respective household: specifically, age,

sex, occupation, and education of the head of household; the number of children under 5 years of age and the number of adults over age 60 in the household; and household assets and residence construction materials. Data quality assurance and cleaning followed standard procedures for the HDSS.[33,35] Inconsistent or missing data were flagged for data collectors to correct. Field supervisors and the field coordinator selected a random sample of questionnaires for re-visits to validate the recorded information. Implementation of the module was approved by an Institutional Health Research Ethics Review Committee (IHRERC); approval reference number Ref.No.IHRERC/127/2021.

2.3. Measures

The variable of interest *Household Hardships* was generated as an additive index of the number of hardships a household reported experiencing during the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., since March of 2020); it was coded as a count variable ranging from 0 to 9. Information on household hardships were gathered from the following survey question: *"Has your household been affected by any of these events since mid-March?"* Responses included: job loss; nonfarm business closure; disruption of farming; disruption of livestock activities; disruption of fishing activities; increased price of farming or business inputs; decreased price of farming or business outputs, increased price of major food items consumed; and illness, injury, or death of any household member. The percentage of households that reported a given hardship is presented in Figure 2. The additive index had a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.77 signifying high internal consistency.[36]

Figure 2. Percentage of Households that Reported a Given Hardship. Represents the distribution of hardships used in the additive index *Household Hardships* (n = 880).

To create an alternative representation of hardships, we used principal components analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation to extract orthogonal factors from the variables in *Household Hardships*. The eigenvalues of the correlation matrix from PCA demonstrated that the first factor explained 40% of the variability in the data and the second explained 20%. Subsequent factors explained little variability. We opted to retain the first factor, which included job loss, nonfarm business closure, farm disruption,

livestock disruption, fishing disruption, and output inflation, as an index we termed *Household Disruptions*. Variables highly correlated with the factor were weighted against their eigenvector coefficients. Details related to the PCA results for the *Household Disruptions* are presented in Appendix A.

Right-hand side variables in our analyses included information on the head of household, characteristics of the household and its homestead, and COVID-19 response variables. Head of household variables were *age* (coded as 1 = less than 40 years, 2 = 41 to 44 years, 3 = 45 to 60 years, and 4 = sixty years and above); *sex* (coded as male = 0 and female = 1); *ethnicity* (coded as Amhara = 1 (reference) and other = 2, which included Oromo, Somali, Gurage, Harari and Tigray); *education* (coded as no formal education = 0 (reference), any level of education = 1); *occupation* (coded as 1 = farmer/domestic (reference), 2 = student, 3 = professional, 4 = sales, 5 = daily laborer, 6 = other employment, 7 = unemployed/retired). Household variables were *urbanicity* (coded as urban (Harar) = 1 and rural (Kersa) = 0); *household size* (coded as 1 = 1-2 individuals (reference), 2 = 3-4 individuals, 3 = 5-6 individuals, 4 = 7-8 individuals, 5 = 9+ individuals); *children under age 5* (coded as 0 = no, 1 = yes); *adults over age 60* (coded as 0 = no, 1 = yes); monthly *income* (coded as 1 = 0-1,200 Birr Ethiopia Birr (reference), 2 = 1,201-2,000 Birr, 3 = 2,001-3,000 Birr, 4 = 3,001-4,600 Birr, and 5 = 4,600+) ; and a *wealth index* based on a list of household assets (coded as an 1 = poorest (reference), 2 = poorer, 3 = middle, 4 = richer, 5 = richest). For information on the principal components analysis used to compute the wealth index see Appendix B. Covid response variables were used to analyze associations between household hardships and community/government interventions that were implemented to stem the severity of COVID-19. Responses were gathered from the following survey question: *"What steps has your community/government taken to curb the spread of the coronavirus in your area?"* Intervention variables analyzed include: *lockdowns*, *travel restrictions*, *business closures*, and *intervention centers*. Each of these variables were coded Yes = 1 and No = 0.

2.4. Analytic Strategy

Data cleaning and analysis was performed using R version 4.2.0.[37] Education and occupation related data from the HDSS were missing for nine household heads; these households were removed from analyses that included these variables. A series of unadjusted quasi-Poisson regression models were used to analyze associations with the additive index *Household Hardships* and also with the PCA based index *Household Disruptions* (results from the unadjusted analyses are available upon request). Adjusted quasi-Poisson regression models were then used to control for additional variables. Variables were included in the final adjusted model if their inclusion had theoretical justification. We assessed model fit with comparison of AIC and BIC scores—both scores were the smallest for the fully adjusted model, indicating that this model had superior fit compared to simpler or pathway specific models. Results are reported as Adjusted Incidence Rate Ratios (AIRR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) and visualized with forest plots.[38,39] Given anticipated differences in demographic, economic, and social characteristics between populations living in urban vs. rural areas, effect modification was evaluated using interaction terms and visualized as predicted probabilities. A secondary analysis was conducted for those households that reported experiencing at least one hardship during the pandemic. This analysis used adjusted logistic regression to examine factors associated with household responses to pandemic hardships. We present results for the response strategies that were used by at least 10% of households.

3. Results

Only 13% of households reported not experiencing any of the measured hardships; the remaining 87% experienced at least one hardship (see Figure 3). The average number of hardships experienced during the pandemic was 2.86 with a standard deviation of 2.31; the interquartile range spanned 1 to 4 hardships. A majority of households (59.5%) observed an increase in local food prices (see Figure 2). Other common hardships included a household member losing their job (55.5%), observing increases in the cost of inputs for businesses or farms (49.8%), nonfarm business closures (30.2%), and reductions in the value of business or farming outputs (27.8%).





b.

Figure 3. Number of Hardships Experienced during the COVID-19 Pandemic (n = 880). Figure 3a. presents a heat map of the number of hardships reported by the 880 sampled households. Figure 3b. presents the distribution of the additive index *Household Hardships*.

A majority of households (66%) were headed by a male household member (Table 1). Average age of the household head was 43 years with a standard deviation of 15. Roughly a quarter of household heads were from the Amhara ethnic group. A majority (58%) of household heads had obtained some level of education; their most common occupations were farmer (46%) and professional (27%). The median number of household members was 5 with a standard deviation of 2.4. Roughly a third of households reported having at least one child under the age of 5 and 27% of households had at least one adult family member over the age of 60. The most commonly reported government/community

responses to the pandemic were business closures (48%) followed by travel restrictions (46%) and the establishment of isolation centers (44%).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (n = 880)

				Urbanicity				χ^2	p-value
		Total	%	Urban	%	Rural	%		
Head of Household Characteristics									
Age	<40	218	25%	105	24%	113	26%	0.8	0.853
	41-50	265	30%	136	31%	129	29%		
	51-60	179	20%	87	20%	92	21%		
	60+	218	25%	112	25%	106	24%		
Sex	Female	303	34%	192	44%	111	25%	33.0	<0.001
	Male	577	66%	248	56%	329	75%		
Ethnicity	Amhara	222	25%	192	44%	30	7%	158.1	<0.001
	Other	658	75%	248	56%	410	93%		
Education	Some Eduation	510	58%	78	18%	283	65%	201.0	<0.001
	No Education	361	41%	360	82%	150	35%		
Occupation	Farmer/Domestic	401	46%	89	20%	312	72%	255.2	<0.001
	Student	59	7%	34	8%	25	6%		
	Professional/Sales	236	27%	186	42%	50	12%		
	Daily Laborer	67	8%	53	12%	14	3%		
	Other work	21	2%	8	2%	13	3%		
	Unemployed/Retire	87	10%	68	16%	19	4%		
Household Characteristics									
Household Size	1-2	146	17%	94	21%	52	12%	99.0	<0.001
	3-4	257	29%	168	38%	89	20%		
	5-6	247	28%	122	28%	125	28%		
	7-8	171	19%	37	8%	134	30%		
	9+	59	7%	19	4%	40	9%		
Children Under Age 5	No	578	66%	322	73%	256	58%	22.0	<0.001
	Yes	302	34%	118	27%	184	42%		
Adults Over Age 60	No	644	73%	306	70%	338	77%	6.0	0.015
	Yes	236	27%	134	30%	102	23%		
Income (Birr)	4,600+	172	20%	125	28%	49	11%	55.1	<0.001
	3,001 - 4,600	132	15%	71	16%	63	14%		
	2,001 - 3,000	165	19%	75	17%	93	21%		
	1,201 -2,000	209	24%	73	17%	137	31%		
	0 - 1,200	192	22%	96	22%	97	22%		
Wealth Index	Richest	180	20%	95	22%	85	19%	13.4	0.009
	Richer	174	20%	87	20%	87	20%		
	Middle	174	20%	72	16%	102	23%		
	Poorer	176	20%	81	18%	95	22%		
	Poorest	176	20%	105	24%	71	16%		
Covid Response									
Business Closures	No	461	52%	228	52%	233	53%	0.1	0.736
	Yes	419	48%	212	48%	207	47%		
Isolation Centers	No	497	56%	253	58%	244	55%	0.4	0.541
	Yes	383	44%	187	43%	196	45%		
Lockdowns	No	502	57%	264	60%	238	54%	3.1	0.077
	Yes	378	43%	176	40%	202	46%		
Travel Restrictions	No	474	54%	227	52%	247	56%	1.8	0.176
	Yes	406	46%	213	48%	193	44%		

n= 880.

Data source: CHAMPS Ethiopia Lockdown Module data and CHAMPS Ethiopia Health and Demographic Surveillance data.

Notes: Nine observations were missing for head of household's education and occupation. One observation was missing for whether a household had experienced food insecurity prior to the onset of COVID-19. The "other" category for ethnicity included: Oromo, Somali, Gurage, Harari, Tigray, and "other". One observation was missing for whether a household had experienced food insecurity prior to the onset of COVID-19.

3.1. Factors Associated with Household Hardships

After adjusting for other variables (see Figure 4), households were more likely to report hardships during the pandemic if the household resided in a rural compared to an urban area (AIRR = 1.34, 95% CI [1.20, 1.49]). Compared to households with 1 to 2 household members, larger households were also more likely to report hardships during the pandemic; for example, for households with 7-8 members, the AIRR for experiencing hardships during the pandemic was 1.42 (95% CI [1.24, 4.65]). In contrast, households were less likely to report experiencing hardships during the pandemic if the household head had at least some education compared to none (AIRR = 0.87, 95% CI [0.79, 0.96]); was employed in a professional occupation (AIRR = 0.75, 95% CI [0.66, 0.84]) or as a day laborer (AIRR = 0.74, 95% CI [0.62, 0.88]) compared to employment in agriculture; had a monthly household income greater than 1,200 Birr (for example, the AIRR for experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households with a monthly income greater than 4,600 Birr was 0.57 (95% CI [0.49, 0.66])); or were wealthier compared to the poorest households. Households were also more likely to report experiencing hardships during the pandemic if they also reported local community/government implementation of lockdowns (AIRR = 1.29, 95% CI [1.14, 1.46]), travel restrictions (AIRR = 1.38, 95% CI [1.23, 1.56]), and the establishment of isolations centers (AIRR = 1.17, 95% CI [1.03, 1.33]). The age, sex, and ethnicity of the household head as well as the presence of children under the age of 5 or adults older than age 60 in the household were not associated with household hardships after adjusting for other variables. Results from the analysis of the *Household Disruptions* index (Figure 5) were generally consistent with the results from analyzing the *Household Hardships* index.

Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on *urbanicity* (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between *urbanicity* and other variables associated with *Household Hardships* while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. Dramatic dose responses of higher probability for experiencing hardships are seen for larger households, households with lower income, and households with lower wealth that were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. In contrast, while the overall probability of experiencing hardships was higher for households living in a rural area, local implementation of lockdowns and business closures as a response to the pandemic were only associated with higher probability of experiencing hardships for those households living in an urban area.



Figure 4. Adjusted Association with *Household Hardships* presented as Adjusted Incidence Rate Ratios (AIRR). The forest plot presents AIRRs with 95% confidence intervals from a multivariate quasi-Poisson regression model. The AIRRs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=870)



Figure 5. Adjusted Associations with *Household Disruptions* presented as Adjusted Incidence Rate Ratios (AIRR). The forest plot presents AIRRs with 95% confidence intervals from a multivariate quasi-Poisson regression model. The AIRRs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=870)



Figure 6. Evaluating Effect Modification between Urbanicity and other Factors Associated with *Household Hardships*. The figure presents a facet grid of predicted probabilities from multiple analytic models. The top facet presents the predicted probabilities for household residence in an urban (represented in green) vs. rural (represented in yellow) area, holding all other variables at their mean, to establish the baseline probabilities for households living in either of the two communities. The probabilities for this baseline were estimated using the results from the model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included interaction terms between urbanicity and other variables associated with *Household Hardships* while holding all adjusting variables at their mean.

3.2. Factors Associated with Household Responses to Hardships

The most common household response to experiencing at least once hardship during the pandemic was reducing food consumption, which was reported by 24.4% of affected households (see Figure 7). Other common responses included selling household assets (21.4%), seeking means to generate additional income (20.5%), seeking help from family or friends (14.0%), and borrowing from family or friends (10.6%).



Figure 7. Percentage of Households that Experienced a Given Hardship during the COVID-19 Pandemic (n = 766).

Comprehensive results for the analyses examining factors associated with household responses to pandemic related hardships are presented in Figures A1 – A5 (see Appendix C). After adjusting for other variables, including other potential hardships, households that had a member lose their job were more likely to report reducing food consumption (AOR = 1.75, 95% CI [1.06, 2.92]); selling assets (AOR = 3.19, 95% CI [1.30, 8.41]); seeking to generate additional income (AOR = 2.82, 95% CI [1.55, 5.25]); seeking help from family and friends (AOR = 2.20, 95% CI [1.28, 3.83]); and borrowing from family or friends (AOR = 5.80, 95% CI [2.61, 13.82]). Households that observed increases in the costs of business or farming inputs were more likely to report reducing food consumption (AOR = 2.77, 95% CI [1.51, 5.20]); selling assets (AOR = 9.24, 95% CI [3.82, 23.96]); seeking help from family and friends (AOR = 3.45, 95% CI [1.80, 6.82]); and borrowing from family or friends (AOR = 5.54, 95% CI [2.30, 14.06]). Observing increased food prices was associated with households selling assets (AOR = 2.36, 95% CI [1.12, 4.96]). Households that had a member close their business during the pandemic were less likely to report selling assets (AOR = 0.08, 95% CI [0.02, 0.29]). Households that experienced farming disruptions were more likely to report seeking to generate additional income (AOR = 24.79, 95% CI [7.26, 97.71]). Households residing in a rural vs. an urban area were more likely to use all of the measured strategies to mitigate experiencing hardships associated with the pandemic—these associations were robust to adjusting for other variables.

4. Discussion

In this study, we examined the prevalence of household hardships during the COVID-19 pandemic in a rural and an urban community in Eastern Ethiopia. We further examined demographic, economic, and social characteristic associated with these hardships as well as strategies households used to mitigate the severity of these hardships. Almost 90% of households reported experiencing at least one hardship since the onset of the pandemic; 75% of households reported experiencing at least 4 distinct hardships. Risk factors for experiencing these hardships included inequalities across demographic, economic, and social characteristics, but also place inequalities. Households that were already struggling prior to the onset of the pandemic were at greatest risk for experiencing additional hardships—residing in a rural area magnified the strength of the associations for several household level risk factors.

Households were more likely to report hardships if the head of household had no education or worked as a farmer or in a domestic/subsistence occupation. Households were also more likely to report experiencing hardships if they resided in a rural vs. an urban area, had a larger number of household members, had less monthly income, and were poorer compared to other households in the community. The pattern of association for both monthly income and household wealth is suggestive of a dose response; households with less wealth and less monthly income were at significantly higher risk for experiencing hardships. These associations are consistent with risk factors reported in studies from other resource limited countries and early stage research from Ethiopia.[6,10-13,18] Community responses to the pandemic associated with hardships included lockdowns and travel restrictions; business closures were only associated with experiencing hardships for households residing in an urban area. Future interventions that seek to mitigate negative consequences associated with pandemics mitigation efforts should anticipate these characteristics as important risk factors and target interventions to aid vulnerable groups.

Loss of employment for a household member and observation of increasing costs of business or farming inputs were both associated with the broadest combination of household responses to pandemic hardships. Patterns of association between demographic, economic, and social characteristics and household response strategies were inconsistent; however, compared to urban households, rural households were more likely to implement each of the measured response strategies, even after adjusting for demographic, economic, and social characteristics as well as the various pandemic related hardships.

The empirical findings from this study are not generalizable outside of the communities under study; while we acknowledge this limitation, we note that it is common to studies using HDSS data.[17] As an observational study, other potential limitations include unmeasured variable bias (for example, having data on household participation in Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) may have helped contextualize our results) or recall bias due to the extended length of time considered in the study (i.e., some respondents may have forgotten hardships that occurred closer to onset of the pandemic). As a cross-sectional study, we cannot draw causal inferences. Results from other studies suggest hardships associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are temporary.[7] Looking forward, scholars should collect and analyze longitudinal data to evaluate hardship events over time. In the context of demographic surveillance systems, follow-up data collection using the same survey instrument is easy to attach to subsequent rounds of data collection already being fielded. A further limitation, common to studies involving humanitarian crises, is that we are unable to differentiate between the effects of the pandemic and that of the political tension in the northern region of Ethiopia.[27] However, it is noteworthy that the northern region is more than 400 km away from the study communities.

5. Conclusions

Households living in the rural area of Kersa were at greater risk of experiencing a variety of hardships during the COVID-19 pandemic, even after adjusting for demographic, economic, and social risk fac-

tors. Moreover, the strength of the associations between household hardships and demographic, economic, and social risk factors was greater for households residing in the rural area of Kersa compared to the urban area of Harar. These results suggest an enduring urban vs. rural divide that amplifies the effects of household level socioeconomic inequalities. Interventions seeking to ameliorate consequences of lockdowns and other efforts implemented to stem disease spread should seek to address place inequalities associated with rural areas as distinct from, but also interacting with, household level risk factors. These finding may inform future policies and practices aiming to mitigate negative consequences of COVID-19 and future disease outbreaks.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at: www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1, Figure S1: title; Table S1: title; Video S1: title.

Author Contributions: For research articles with several authors, a short paragraph specifying their individual contributions must be provided. The following statements should be used "Conceptualization, J.M., S.C., N.A., and M.D.; methodology, J.M., S.C., N.A., and M.D.; software, J.M.; validation, J.M., N.A., and M.D.; formal analysis, J.M. and Z.M.; investigation, J.M., Z.M., S.C., N.A., T.G., G.M., and M.D.; resources, J.M., Z.M., C.M., S.C., N.A., T.G., G.M., and M.D.; data curation, N.A., T.G., G.M., and M.D.; writing—original draft preparation, J.M.; writing—review and editing, J.M., Z.M., C.M., S.C., N.A., and M.D.; visualization, J.M. and Z.M.; supervision, C.M., S.C., and N.A.; project administration, J.M. and M.D.; funding acquisition, C.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript."

Funding: This work was supported, in whole or in part, by grant OPP1126780 from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to Dr Cynthia Whitney. Under the grant conditions of the Foundation, a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Generic License has already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript version that might arise from this submission.

Institutional Review Board Statement: This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by the human subjects ethical committee of Haramaya University.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to restrictions.

Acknowledgments: In this section, you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered by the author contribution or funding sections. This may include administrative and technical support, or donations in kind (e.g., materials used for experiments).

Conflicts of Interest: None.

Disclaimers: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Appendix A

Table S1. Principal components factor analysis of hardship variables

Variable	Factor Pattern
Job loss	0.60
Nonfarm business closure	0.87
Farm disruption	0.79
Livestock disruption	0.92
Fishing disruption	0.80
Output deflation	0.87
Eigenvalue	4.00
Explained variance	40%

Appendix B

Wealth Index Generation

A wealth index was generated based on a collection of assets and construction materials for the main dwelling of a given household. To generate the index, we followed recommendations from the DHS and the World Food Programme (WFP) that summarize steps for calculating an asset based wealth index,[42-44] including coding instructions for Stata,[45] and an adaptation of this coding process implemented in R.[29,46] Using these documents to guide us, we generated our wealth index by identifying a list of household assets for inclusion in our index computation, recoded all household assets into dichotomous variables; recoded dwelling materials into improved vs. non-improved dichotomous variables; divided our sample into rural and urban subsamples and assessed level of representation of a given variable within the rural and urban subsamples (per WFP recommendations, a given variable was included in further calculations if percent ownership ranged between 5 and 95 percent); employed principal components analysis with varimax rotation to calculate component scores for those households living in either rural or urban areas, which explained 45% of the variation in both subsamples; extracted and combined the PCA scores of the first component from the urban and rural subsamples; and finally organized the scores into wealth quintiles to generate a composite asset index. The resulting wealth quintiles are presented in Figure (4). The distribution of assets owned by households as well as the materials used for constructing a household's residence are presented as percentages in Figure (5).



Figure 7. Household Wealth Index Distribution





Figure 8. Households Asset Ownership and Dwelling Construction Materials included in Wealth Index

Appendix C



Figure A1. Adjusted Associations with *Reduced Food Consumption* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)



Figure A2. Adjusted Associations with *Sold Assets* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)



Figure A3. Adjusted Associations with *Sought to Generate Additional Income* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)



Figure A4. Adjusted Associations with *Sought Help from Family or Friends* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)



Figure A5. Adjusted Associations with *Borrowed from Family or Friends* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)

References

1. Wang, H.; Paulson, K.R.; Pease, S.A.; Watson, S.; Comfort, H.; Zheng, P.; Aravkin, A.Y.; Bisignano, C.; Barber, R.M.; Alam, T. Estimating excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic analysis of COVID-19-related mortality, 2020–21. *The Lancet* **2022**.
2. Baldwin, R.E.; Weder, B. *Mitigating the COVID Economic Crisis: Act Fast and Do Whatever It Takes*; CEPR press: 2020.
3. Picchioni, F.; Goulao, L.F.; Roberfroid, D. The Impact of COVID-19 on Diet Quality, Food Security and Nutrition in Low and Middle Income Countries: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. *Clinical Nutrition* **2021**.
4. Osendarp, S.; Akuoku, J.K.; Black, R.E.; Headey, D.; Ruel, M.; Scott, N.; Shekar, M.; Walker, N.; Flory, A.; Haddad, L. The COVID-19 Crisis Will Exacerbate Maternal and Child Undernutrition and Child Mortality in Low-and Middle-Income Countries. *Nature Food* **2021**, *2*, 476-484.
5. Akseer, N.; Kandru, G.; Keats, E.C.; Bhutta, Z.A. COVID-19 Pandemic and Mitigation Strategies: Implications for Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* **2020**, *112*, 251-256, doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqaa171.
6. Onyango, E.O.; Crush, J.; Owuor, S. Preparing for COVID-19: Household Food Insecurity and Vulnerability to Shocks in Nairobi, Kenya. *PLoS ONE* **2021**, *16*, e0259139.
7. Hirvonen, K.; de Brauw, A.; Abate, G.T. Food Consumption and Food Security During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Addis Ababa. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **2021**, *103*, 772-789.
8. Ayanlade, A.; Radeny, M. COVID-19 and Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa: implications of Lockdown during Agricultural Planting Seasons. *npj Science of Food* **2020**, *4*, 1-6.
9. Hirvonen, K.; Abate, G.T.; de Brauw, A. Survey Suggests Rising Risk of Food and Nutrition Insecurity in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, as COVID-19 Restrictions Continue. *IFPRI book chapters* **2020**, 46-49.
10. Chitiga, M.; Henseler, M.; Mabugu, R.E.; Maisonnave, H. How COVID-19 pandemic worsens the economic situation of women in South Africa. *The European Journal of Development Research* **2021**, 1-18.
11. Fikire, A.H.; Zegeye, M.B. Determinants of Rural Household Food Security Status in North Shewa Zone, Amhara Region, Ethiopia. *The Scientific World Journal* **2022**, *2022*.
12. Manfrinato, C.V.; Marino, A.; Condé, V.F.; Maria do Carmo, P.F.; Stedefeldt, E.; Tomita, L.Y. High prevalence of food insecurity, the adverse impact of COVID-19 in Brazilian favela. *Public health nutrition* **2021**, *24*, 1210-1215.
13. Banna, M.; Al, H.; Sayeed, A.; Kundu, S.; Kagstrom, A.; Sultana, M.; Begum, M.R.; Khan, M.S.I. Factors associated with household food insecurity and dietary diversity among day laborers amid the COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh. *BMC nutrition* **2022**, *8*, 1-11.
14. Roberton, T.; Carter, E.D.; Chou, V.B.; Stegmuller, A.R.; Jackson, B.D.; Tam, Y.; Sawadogo-Lewis, T.; Walker, N. Early Estimates of the Indirect Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Maternal and Child Mortality in Low-Income and Middle-Income Countries: A Modeling Study. *The Lancet Global Health* **2020**, *8*, e901-e908.
15. Chen, J.; Vullikanti, A.; Santos, J.; Venkatramanan, S.; Hoops, S.; Mortveit, H.; Lewis, B.; You, W.; Eubank, S.; Marathe, M. Epidemiological and Economic Impact of COVID-19 in the US. *Scientific reports* **2021**, *11*, 1-12.

16. Muir, J.A.; Deresa, M.; Madewell, Z.J.; Getachew, T.; Mengesha, G.; Whitney, C.G.; Assefa, N.; Cunningham, S.A. Food Insecurity amid COVID-19 Lockdowns: Assessing Sociodemographic Indicators of Vulnerability in Harar and Kersa, Ethiopia. *medRxiv* **2023**, 2023.2001. 2031.23284545.
17. Clark, S.; Wakefield, J.; McCormick, T.; Ross, M. Hyak Mortality Monitoring System: Innovative Sampling and Estimation Methods–Proof of Concept by Simulation. *Global Health, Epidemiology and Genomics* **2018**, *3*.
18. Goshu, D.; Ferede, T.; Diriba, G.; Ketema, M. *Economic and Welfare Effects of COVID-19 and Responses in Ethiopia: Initial Insights*; Ethiopian Economic Policy Research Institute: 2020.
19. Shigute, Z.; Mebratie, A.D.; Alemu, G.; Bedi, A. Containing the Spread of COVID-19 in Ethiopia. *Journal of Global Health* **2020**, *10*.
20. Spielman, S.E.; Tuccillo, J.; Folch, D.C.; Schweikert, A.; Davies, R.; Wood, N.; Tate, E. Evaluating Social Vulnerability Indicators: Criteria and Their Application to the Social Vulnerability Index. *Natural Hazards* **2020**, *100*, 417-436.
21. Muir, J.A.; Cope, M.R.; Angeningsih, L.R.; Jackson, J.E.; Brown, R.B. Migration and Mental Health in the Aftermath of Disaster: Evidence From MT. Merapi, Indonesia. *International journal of environmental research and public health* **2019**, *16*, 2726.
22. Muir, J.A.; Cope, M.R.; Angeningsih, L.R.; Jackson, J.E. To Move Home or Move On? Investigating the Impact of Recovery Aid on Migration Status as a Potential Tool for Disaster Risk Reduction in the Aftermath of Volcanic Eruptions in Merapi, Indonesia. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **2020**, *46*, 101478.
23. Perry, R.W. What is a Disaster? In *Handbook of Disaster Research*; Springer: 2007; pp. 1-15.
24. Cutter, S.L.; Barnes, L.; Berry, M.; Burton, C.; Evans, E.; Tate, E.; Webb, J. A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. *Global environmental change* **2008**, *18*, 598-606.
25. Cutter, S.L.; Boruff, B.J.; Shirley, W.L. Social vulnerability to environmental hazards. In *Hazards vulnerability and environmental justice*; Routledge: 2012; pp. 143-160.
26. Flanagan, B.E.; Gregory, E.W.; Hallisey, E.J.; Heitgerd, J.L.; Lewis, B. A Social Vulnerability Index for Disaster Management. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* **2011**, *8*.
27. Muir, J.A. *Societal Shocks as Social Determinants of Health*; The Ohio State University: 2021.
28. Muir, J.A. *Indicators of Fertility Change in a Developing Nation: Examining the Impact of Motorcycles as a Distance Demolishing Technology on Fertility Change in Rural Indonesia*; Brigham Young University: 2012.
29. Sanders, S.R.; Muir, J.A.; Brown, R.B. Overcoming Geographic Penalties of Inequality: The Effects of Distance-Demolishing Technologies on Household Well-Being in Vietnam. *Asian Journal of Social Science* **2018**, *46*, 260-280.
30. Gebru, M.; Remans, R.; Brouwer, I.D.; Baye, K.; Melesse, M.B.; Covic, N.; Habtamu, F.; Abay, A.H.; Hailu, T.; Hirvonen, K. Food systems for healthier diets in Ethiopia: Toward a research agenda. *IFPRI Discussion Paper* **2018**.
31. Haile, D.; Seyoum, A.; Azmeraw, A. Food and nutrition security impacts of resilience capacity: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research* **2022**, *8*, 100305.
32. Juntunen, L. Addressing Social Vulnerability to Hazards. University of Oregon Eugene, 2004.
33. Assefa, N.; Oljira, L.; Baraki, N.; Demena, M.; Zelalem, D.; Ashenafi, W.; Dedefo, M. HDSS profile: the Kersa Health and Demographic Surveillance System. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **2016**, *45*, 94-101.

34. Cunningham, S.A.; Shaikh, N.I.; Nhacolo, A.; Raghunathan, P.L.; Kotloff, K.; Naser, A.M.; Mengesha, M.M.; Adedini, S.A.; Misore, T.; Onuwchekwa, U.U. Health and Demographic Surveillance Systems within the Child Health and Mortality Prevention Surveillance Network. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2019**, *69*, S274-S279.
35. Cunningham, S.A.; Muir, J.A. Data Cleaning. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Research Methods and Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences: Volume 1: Building a Program of Research*; Cambridge University Press: In Press; Volume 1.
36. Cho, E. A comprehensive review of so-called Cronbach's alpha. *Journal of Product Researcg* **2020**, *38*, 9-20.
37. R Core Team *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, 2022.
38. Yeh, J.; D'Amico, F. Forest plots: data summaries at a glance. *Journal of Family Practice* **2004**, *53*, 1007-1008.
39. Lewis, S.C.; Keerie, C.; Assi, V. Forest Plot. In *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online*; pp. 1-6.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Likewise, the statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.