Original Research Article

Evaluating factors influencing smallholder farmers willingness to pay for Climate change adaptation information access in South-Eastern Kenya

Abstract

Farmers' adaptation to climate change is crucial in ensuring agricultural production and improving food insecurity. Farmers needed access to climate change adaptation information to enable them to plan their agricultural investments. This study sorts to assess farmers' willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information as they sort to achieve resilience in the face of changing climatic conditions. Qualitative research approach was adopted where data was collected firsthand by interviewing 443 smallholder farmers. The Probit Regression Analysis Model was applied to analyze the factors that influenced farmers' willingness to Pay. From the findings, 77.2% of the farmers were willing to pay for climate adaptation information.The mean willingness to pay in Cash was 12.78 USD per year whereas payment in Kind was dominantly through giving of maize yield from the production of 66.97 kgs per year which translated to 18.40 USD at current market price. The climate change adaptation information effectiveness, knowledge, and access to information were the leading factors that influenced farmers' WTP. Age and main source of income significantly influenced WTP negatively. Dissemination of this information through effective channels is encouraged to enable farmers to access and improve their WTP.

Keywords: Willingness to Pay, Climate change adaptation, climate change adaptation information

Comment [O1]: Insert s

Comment [O2]: Delete and insert and

Comment [O3]: Use lower case c

Comment [O4]: Delete s

Comment [O5]: Delete and insert lower case letter c

1. Introduction

Climate change has been demonstrated over a long time as being one of the leading challenges to agricultural production in not only Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) but the whole world (IPCC, 2019). These challenges are more ravaging in SSA especially in the Kenyan Arid and Semi-Arid Regions. This was because agriculture in the region predominantly relied on rainfall for production (D'Alessandro et al., 2015; World Bank, 2019). World over, several initiatives had been undertaken to curb climate change impacts, however, little gains could be quantified. Some of these measures included climate change mitigation through reduced greenhouse gas emissions and agroforestry, crop and livestock insurance, and climate change adaptation (Burton, 2006; Locatelli et al., 2020; Roggero & Thiel, 2018; Sarwary et al., 2020; Zolnikov, 2019).

The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and World Meteorological Organization (WMO) prediction of the future climate in Eastern Africa, especially the ASALs appeared to benefit from enhanced rainfall (Donnelly et al., 2017; WMO, 2021). This implied that proper farmer investment decisions were keys for farmers to take up and benefit from these opportunities which were presented by climate change. Although measures had been taken to try and combat climate change vagaries, climate change mitigation was a long-term initiative that could not be feasible in terms of solving the food crisis which was and still is eminent world over. Similarly, based on smallholder farmers' financial muscle, crop and livestock insurance was not financially feasible. This left the farmers with the option of adapting to the vagaries of climate change. As noted by IPCC (2014), to minimize the impacts of climate change that could not be reduced through mitigation actions, adaptation was key since it brought benefits both then and in the future.

As evident from numerous studies, (Gebru et al., 2015, 2018; Lumosi et al., 2016; McGahey & Lumosi, 2018; Otitoju & Enete, 2016), climate change adaptation was an information-intensive venture that required the farmer to be updated on what, when and how to invest in agricultural production for lucrative returns on their investments. The information needed to be communicated in a user-friendly format and within an acceptable lead time to enable the farmers to make informed decisions aimed at minimizing losses and maximizing the opportunities presented by climate variability and change. As presented by literature, access and implementation of these climate change adaptation advisories were key in promoting agricultural

Comment [O6]: Reaarange from older year i.e 2006 to more recent i.e 2020

Comment [O7]: Insert s

Comment [O8]:

Comment [O9]: Rearrange from older years to recent years

production and in enhancing farmers' resilience to climate changes (DEE, 2017; Dutta et al., 2020; Lumosi et al., 2016; McGahey & Lumosi, 2018; Mugi-ngenga et al., 2016; Otitoju & Enete, 2016; Sarwary et al., 2020). As it had been demonstrated through research, the use of appropriate information when making agricultural investments decision yielded good results even under infringed climatic conditions (Cooper et al., 2008; Gebru et al., 2018; Kwena et al., 2018; Luseno et al., 2003; Rao et al., 2011). Therefore, farmers needed to access information on how to adapt to the changing climate and more specific information which was specific to their regions and/or location (Otitoju & Enete, 2016).

Comment [O10]: Rearrange from older years to recent years

Comment [O11]: Rearrange from older years to recent years

In most developing countries such as Kenya, dissemination of this information was mostly done by government agencies (21%) through funded projects, private organizations (27%), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) (21%), Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), and Self-Help groups (17%) and International Organizations (14%) (World Bank, 2019, 2021a, 2021b). This insinuates that the project life expectancy was low since the projects phased out when funding was terminated.

Based on this background, For the period between 2018 and 2020, a regional project on "The last mile: Up-scaling Climate Information Services to Build Community Resilience in Uganda and Kenya" funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada had endeavored to provide downscaled climate change adaptation information to farmers in Machakos, Makueni and Kitui Counties using Information Communication Technologies (ICTs). The Climate Change Adaptation and ICT (CHAI) project was designed to seek a better understanding of how the ability of individuals and communities could be enhanced to improve farmers' response to climate-based challenges using ICT tools. To achieve this goal, the project deployed an information delivery mechanism that leverages the use of various dissemination channels such as Climate Field Schools, mobile phones, print media including farmer magazines, pamphlets, and traditional methods such as the use of agricultural extension service providers and Local FM radios within the three counties of Kitui, Machakos, and Makueni.

This study sort to determine smallholder farmers' willingness to pay (WTP) to access this information and factors that influenced their WTP. This was because a majority of the studies linked with climate change and WTP had focused on WTP for various technologies aimed at addressing challenges as a result of climate change (Lagoon et al., 2019; Moranga, 2016), or

Comment [O12]: Rearrange from older years to recent years

specific value chain (Bhandari et al., 2016; Zongo et al., 2015). Little was known on the value associated by smallholder farmers to access climate change adaptation information especially in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) of Kenya. This can be achieved through assessing their WTP.

Comment [O13]: Rearrange from older years to recent years

In this study, the WTP for smallholders in South-Eastern Kenya counties of Kitui, Machakos, and Makueni was estimated. The contingent valuation (CV) method was used to provide necessary data. Demographics, socio-economic, and institutional factors that influenced smallholder farmers' WTP to access climate change adaptation information were identified and explored. This paper aimed at contributing to an understanding of how the communities could embrace an initiative on climate change adaptation and hunger reduction to achieve sustainable access to information and enhance their farm investment decisions.

2. Materials and methods

2.1.Description of the study area

The study was carried out in three counties as shown in table 1 below. Kitui county is located in the South-Eastern part of Kenya lying between latitude 0°10´ and 3°0´ south and longitudes 37°50´ and 39°0´ east. This county is predominantly arid and semi-arid receiving annual rainfall of between 500- 1050mm. Kitui County covers approximately 30, 570 km^2 with an estimated population of 1,130,134 from 262,942 households.

Machakos county is the smallest of the three counties with a total land area of 6,208 Km^2 and an approximate population of 1,414,022 persons (KNBS, 2019) based on the projections from the 2019 census. Machakos county is largely arid and semi-arid (ASAL), receiving annual rainfall of about 500mm-1300 mm (MoALF, 2017).

Makueni County, on the other hand, covers an approximate land mass of 8034.7km^2 with an estimated population of 977,015 from 244,669 households. Makueni receives between 300 mm to 1200 mm of rainfall annually (MoALF, 2016).

All three counties experience a bimodal rainfall pattern with long rains in March-May and short rains in October to December. The average temperatures range between 18- 29, 20.2 – 35.8, and 14 – 34^{o}c for Machakos, Makueni, and Kitui Counties respectively.

2.2.Research Design and Data analysis

The study adopted a multistage sampling technique to arrive at the desired sample size. In the first stage, Kitui, Machakos, and Makueni counties were purposively selected. The counties were selected based on their geographical situation in the Arid and Semi-Arid areas which are more vulnerable to vagaries of climate instability and transition, along with other areas (Birch, 2018; GoK, 2013, 2016). Besides, the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO) in partnership with a regional project on "The last mile: Up-scaling Climate Information Services to Build Community Resilience in Uganda and Kenya" funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada had endeavored to provide downscaled climate change adaptation information to farmers in the region.

In the second stage, two sub-counties from each county were randomly selected. In the third stage, two wards were randomly selected from each sub-county, and finally, 443 respondents were randomly selected from all the villages proportionately.

Primary data was collected using a semi-structured questionnaire developed through the Kobo toolbox application. The questionnaire was pretested and necessary adjustments were made before being administered to capture climate change adaptation information, channels for access, and factors that influenced farmers' access to the information. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze and present qualitative and categorical data using the statistical package for social science (SPSS) application version 26.

The contingent valuation method (CVM) was adopted to measure an individual's willingness to pay. According to Hynes & Howley (2011), CVM takes a more holistic approach by focusing on the value of moving from the status quo to an alternative status of the goods and services. This study's design was based on Lancaster consumer theory which states that consumers gain utility, not from the real contents of the basket (good or service), but the characteristics/attributes of the items in it (Hendler, 2007; Lancaster, 1966; Wierenga, 1984). The WTP philosophy originates

Comment [O14]: Rearrange from older years to recent years

from the economic theory which reflects the maximum amount of money or service an individual is willing to give up to obtain more of the goods or services (Garra & Mourato, 2016).

2.2.1. Justification of the use of Contingent Valuation Method

CVM is used to assign value to a commodity that cannot normally be assigned market value, for instance, environmental resources such as conserving the environment, climate change mitigation, access to climate change adaptation information among other goods and services (Carson, 2000; Carson et al., 2001). In the CV survey, an individual's perception, attitude, and preferences regarding climate change adaptation information and its non-market value are elicited. A hypothetical market in which no actual transactions are made is created (Kafy et al., 2018; Lee & Heo, 2016). The CV survey asked farmers to report their willingness to pay to have continued access to climate change adaptation information.

Comment [O15]: Rearrange from older years to recent years

This technique emphasizes the stated preferences of respondents and stands in contrast to those approaches that use revealed preferences (Chatterjee et al., 2017). CVM provides a wide spectrum of both applied and methodological case studies dealing with a huge variety of different public assets and natural resources (Loomis, 1990). In estimating WTP, different CVM designs are used (Alvarez-Farizo, 1999). Loomis (1990) indicated that open-ended (OE) and dichotomous choice (DC) are the most common designs. However, Loomis (1990) recommended OE designs and further explained that OE designs outperform DC on temporal stability grounds. The value of the farmer's willingness to pay was used to determine the value they place on climate change adaptation information which enabled the estimating of its value (Hoyos & Mariel, 2010; Zainudin et al., 2016). The payment for farmers willing to pay was through annual contribution to an organization in charge of disseminating this information to farmers. This payment would be made through periodic contributions in the course of the period of dissemination.

Comment [O16]: Change this to Time New Roman

2.2.2. Data Analysis

Farmers' perceptions were used to calculate the effectiveness of climate change dissemination channels. Effectiveness (*y)* was calculated as:

$$Effectiveness(y) =$$
$$timeliness\ (x1) + accuracy(x2) + reliability\ (x3) + comprehensablity\ (x4) +$$
$$user\ friendliness\ (x5) + credibility(x6) + informativeness(x7) + availability(x8).$$

The Ordinary List Squares (OLS) model was used to analyzed the factors that influenced the amount the farmers were willing to pay to access climate change adaptation information. The OLS model can be represented by the following formula:

$WTP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + ... + \beta_p X_p + \varepsilon$

From this formula: WTP represents the dependent variable, i.e., the willingness to pay for climate change adaptation information. β_0 is the intercept term, representing the constant or baseline value of WTP when all explanatory variables are zero. X_1, X_2, ..., X_p represent the p explanatory variables (also known as independent variables or predictors). β_1, β_2, ..., β_p are the respective regression coefficients that quantify the impact of each explanatory variable on WTP. ε represents the error term, accounting for the unexplained variation in WTP not captured by the explanatory variables.

The following independent variables were hypothesized to impact the smallholder farmers WTP:
Farm characteristics: Variables such as farm size, farm type (e.g., crop farming, livestock farming), and years of farming experience.
Socio-economic variables: Variables related to farmers' socio-economic status, such as income, education level, and access to credit or financial resources.

Perceptions and attitudes: Factors influencing how farmers feel about climate change, including perceived dangers, awareness of its effects, and the efficacy of adaptation strategies.

Information sources: Availability of agricultural extension services, participation in farmer networks, or exposure to climate change training programs are examples of factors related to the source of information about climate change that farmers can access.

Comment [O17]: Insert e

External factors: Variables related to external factors that may influence WTP, such as government policies or support programs, the availability of adaptation technologies or infrastructure, and the presence of market incentives.

3. Results

3.1.Socio-Economic Characteristics of Sampled households

Table 1: Household Socio-Economic Characteristics

Variable	Unit	Kitui ($n = 160$)	Machakos ($n = 147$)	Makueni ($n = 136$)	Whole sample ($n = 443$)
Male-headed households	Percentage	73.1	71.4	80.9	**74.9**
Farm size	Acres	4.99	2.04	3.99	**3.99**
Household Size	Number	5.61	4.96	5.68	**5.42**
Marital Status	Percentage				
Married		75.6	81.0	82.4	**79.5**
Single		4.4	4.1	3.7	**4.1**
Widowed		18.8	15.0	11.8	**15.3**
Divorced		1.3	0.0	2.2	**1.1**
Age of Household Head	Years	51.81	54.68	52.31	**52.92**
Farming experience	Years	21.58	24.29	20.70	**22.22**
Education Level	Percentage				
None		6.9	4.8	4.4	**5.40**
Primary		53.8	42.2	53.7	**49.90**
Adult education		0.0	0.0	0.7	**0.20**
Secondary		25.6	37.4	29.4	**30.7**
College/University		13.8	15.6	11.8	**13.8**
Main Income	Percentage				
Salaried Employment		9.4	21.8	12.5	**14.40**
Farming		48.8	47.6	60.3	**51.9**
Business		14.4	10.9	4.4	**10.2**
Casual Labor		25.6	19.7	22.8	**22.8**
Child Support		1.3	0.0	0.5	**0.50**
Remittances		0.6	0.0	0.2	**0.20**
Source of Labor	Percentage				
Family		56.9	53.1	57.4	**55.8**
Hired		3.8	12.9	4.4	**7.0**
Family & Hire		39.4	34.0	38.2	**37.2**
Land Ownership	Percentage				
With Title deed		34.4	34.0	28.7	**32.5**
Without Title Deed		35.6	27.9	39.7	**34.3**
Leased		0.6	0.0	3.7	**1.4**
Inherited		29.4	38.1	27.9	**31.8**
Group Members	Percentage				
Farmer Association		72	63	58	**65.0**
Credit Association		90	40	57	**66.0**
Climate Field School		18	36	27	**26.0**
Self Help Groups		89	41	56	**65.0**
Business Cooperatives		05	00	03	**3.0**

Source: Author (2021)

The results in the table above are a summary of the households' socio-economic characteristics. The results indicate that the households were predominantly male-headed at 74.9%. The average age of the household head was 52.92 years with 22.22 years of farming experience. The average household size was 5.42 people.

The households in the region depended on agriculture as the main source of labor at 51.9%. The average farm size of the households was 3.99 acres, which were owned through inheritance at 31.8%, with title deeds, and without title deeds at 32.5% and 34.3% respectively.

The majority of the household heads had attained at least primary school education at 49.90%. The farmers participated in group membership, especially farmer associations, credit & loans associations (Table-Banking), and self–help groups at 65%, 66%, and 65% respectively.

3.2. Smallholder farmers' willingness to pay (WTP) to access climate change adaptation information

Table 2: Smallholder farmers willingness to pay (WTP)

Variable	Unit	Kitui (n=160)	Machakos (n=147)	Makueni (n=136)	Total (n=443)
Willingness to Pay (WTP)	Percent	73.8	82.3	75.7	**77.2**
Mode of Payment	Percent				
Cash		51.9	41.5	50.0	**47.9**
Kind		21.9	40.8	25.7	**29.3**
Payment in Cash	Kenyan shillings (Ksh)	1,203.37	1,716.39	1,498.53	**1,445.66**
Payment in Kind	Percentage				
Maize					**51.6**
Beans					**7.1**
Green grams					**32.5**
Tomatoes					**1.6**
Pigeon Peas					**0.8**
Cowpeas					**5.6**
Sorghum					**0.8**

Crop Yield	**Percentage of WTP**	**Average (Kilograms)**
Maize	**51.6**	**66.97**
Beans	**7.1**	**58.89**
Green grams	**32.5**	**38.51**
Tomatoes	**1.6**	**70.00**
Pigeon Peas	**0.8**	**50.00**
Cowpeas	**5.6**	**39.14**
Sorghum	**0.8**	**50.00**

Source: Author (2021)

The majority of the smallholder farmers (77.2%) were willing to pay to access climate change adaptation information in South-Eastern Kenya. Out of these farmers, 62.05% were willing to pay in monetary form while 37.95% in kind, through the provision of farm produce (Livestock

and farm crop produce). The average amount in cash farmers were willing to pay was Kenyan Shillings (Ksh.) 1445.56 per year. WTP in kind was distributed among different crop yields that the farmers were willing to offer as their mode of payment. Fifty-one-point six percent of the farmers were willing to pay through offering maize yield in facilitating the dissemination of climate change adaptation information. Farmers were willing to contribute an average of 66.97 kg of maize which translated to Ksh. 2013.56 per year based on the current market wholesale price of Ksh. 2,706 per 90 kg bag of maize according to (NCPB, 2021).

The farmers were asked about their reasons for willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information. Fifty-eight percent of farmers who were willing to pay indicated that the information was beneficial in supporting their farm investment decisions. The farmers' unwillingness to pay primary reason was that they believed such information to be a public good that should be provided free by the government. This was constituted by 12.6% of the farmers. Similarly, Farmers claimed to be unable to pay for such information at 19.4%. This can be associated with the limited amount of income generated by farmers who depend mostly on farming as their only source of income.

Table 3: Farmers' reasons for their willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information

Reasons for willingness to pay	**Kitui**	**Machakos**	**Makueni**	**Average**
Beneficial information	59.4	47.6	67.6	58.2
It should be provided free	14.4	10.9	12.5	12.6
Unable to afford	15.0	34.7	8.1	19.2

Source: Author (2021)

3.3. Factors influencing smallholder farmers' willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information in South – Eastern Kenya

Table 4: Factors that influence farmers WTP to access climate change adaptation information in South Eastern Kenya

Dependent Variables: Smallholder farmers' willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information			
Independent Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Err (θ)	P
Household Head, Education Level	0.398	0.2073	0.051 **
Gender	0.105	0.1634	0.521
Age	-0.030	0.0075	0.000 ***
Household Size	-0.018	0.0129	0.531
Farm Size	-0.004	0.0137	0.746
Income source	-0.139	0.0723	0.052 **
Farming Experience	0.010	0.0069	0.135
Understanding Climate Change Adaptation	0.761	0.1608	0.000 ***
Access to Climate change Adaptation Information	1.027	0.4748	0.031 **
Information Access Period	0.024	0.0118	0.042 **
Climate Change Adaptation Information Usage	0.753	0.1708	0.000 ***
Group Membership	- 0.285	0.1891	0.132
Access to Market	0.480	0.1550	0.002 ***
Effective Dissemination of Information	0.164	0.0434	0.000 ***

*Note: Number of observations: 443 households, Omnibus test: Likelihood Ratio χ^2 = 69.283, significant at 1% level (p = 0.000). ***, ** and * represents 1%, 5% and 10% significance level respectively.*

The empirical results indicated in Table 4 above reveal that education level, age, the main source of income, understanding, and access to climate change adaptation information, the period of access, access to market, and the effectiveness of the climate change adaptation information had a statistical significance in determining farmers' WTP. Education level was significant at 10% level, had a positive correlation with the farmers WTP. Farmer's age at a significance level of 1%, influenced smallholder farmers' WTP, however, it had a negative correlation with WTP. The household's main source of income was significant at 10% with a negative correlation to WTP for climate change adaptation information. As evident from the findings of the study, 19.4% of the respondents stated that they were unable to afford in support to their non-willingness to pay for climate change adaptation information. Based on the annual per capita income of households in the region of 2,898 US Dollars (World Bank Group, 2019), households tend to use this income on consumption rather than production. Significant at 1%, understanding and use of climate change adaptation information which was positively correlated with WTP, demonstrated that increased awareness and utilization of climate change information by smallholder farmers increased their WTP. Effective dissemination of Climate change Adaptation Information was significant at a 1% significance level. This implied that increased effectiveness of climate change

adaptation information increased farmers' willingness to pay. The period of access to climate change adaptation information was significant in explaining farmers' WTP. Together with information utilization, which was significant at a 1% significance level with a positive correlation to WTP, it illustrated that experience in access and utilization of the information had a great role in influencing farmers' WTP.

4. Discussion

From the descriptive results of the study, farmers stated their willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information. This shows that the farmers are generally aware of climate change and the need to adapt to the changes as shown by Kitinya (2012); Lumosi et al., (2016); McGahey & Lumosi, (2018); Onyango et al. (2021) that found out that farmers are perceptive of the climate variability and pursue means to adapt to the new climatic conditions. The results also revealed the extend of value the farmers accorded the information received based on their willingness to pay amount.

From the empirical results, education level, age, the main source of income, understanding, and access to climate change adaptation information, the period of access, access to market, and the effectiveness of the climate change adaptation information had a statistical significance in determining farmers' WTP. These findings were similar to the findings by (Ouédraogo et al., (2018) who found that several socioeconomic and motivational factors such as gender, age, education level, and awareness of climate change information affected the farmers' WTP for Climate information service in Burkina Faso.

Comment [O18]: Delete this

Comment [O19]: Insert it here

Similar to the findings by Devkota et al. (2014); Ouédraogo et al. (2018); Zongo et al. (2015), an increase in farmers' education levels influenced farmers' WTP for climate change adaptation information. It may be understood that with the number of years of education increasing, it increases the ability of farmers to understand the importance of climate change adaptation information in agricultural decision-making.

As farmers increase in years, the study findings have shown that they tend to be risk-averse and desist from taking up new challenges to tackle climate change variability, hence would rather not invest in paying for climate change adaptation information. This finding corresponded to those of Ouédraogo et al. (2018) which implied that the older the farmer, the less willing they were to pay

for climate change adaptation information but contradicted with (Mabe et al., 2014; Zongo et al., (2015) in Ghana and Burkina Faso which stated that WTP tends to increase with an increase in farmer's years. The household's main source of income was significant at 10% with a negative correlation to WTP for climate change adaptation information. This finding contradicted findings by (Aydoğdu et al., 2020; Doğan et al., 2020; Mabe et al., 2014), whose conclusion was that farmers with non-agricultural income tend to have a lower WTP probability. Instead, this study showed that farmers' over-reliance on farming as a source of income reduces their WTP. It may be that farmers with alternative sources of income would have more to spare for climate change adaptation information to strengthen farming and increase their food security situation. Whereas, farmers relying on farming as the only source of income had a low discretional income to invest in climate change adaptation information. As evident from the findings of the study, 19.4% of the respondents stated that they were unable to afford in support to their non-willingness to pay for climate change adaptation information. Based on the annual per capita income of households in the region of 2,898 US Dollars (World Bank Group, 2019), households tend to use this income on consumption rather than production. Significant at 1%, understanding and use of climate change adaptation information which was positively correlated `with WTP, demonstrated that increased awareness and utilization of climate change information by smallholder farmers increased their WTP. Thus, to improve farmers' WTP, their awareness of what climate change adaptation was and its importance was crucial, and so was promoting the application of the information on-farm decision making. As illustrated by Kibue et al. (2016), awareness and recognition of variabilities in climate are crucial for adaptation and adoption of adaptation initiatives by farmers. Similarly, Devkota et al. (2014); Mabe et al. (2014); Zongo et al. (2015) all agreed that farmers who had access to climate change adaptation information and for a long time were more willing to pay. Effective dissemination of Climate change Adaptation Information was significant at a 1% significance level. This implied that increased effectiveness of climate change adaptation information increased farmers' willingness to pay. The period of access to climate change adaptation information was significant in explaining farmers' WTP. Together with information utilization, which was significant at a 1% significance level with a positive correlation to WTP, it illustrated that experience in access and utilization of the information had a great role in influencing farmers' WTP. Just as evident by findings from

Comment [O20]: Delete from here

Comment [O21]: Insert it here

Comment [O22]:

Comment [O23]: Delete this from here and put the years in brackets for each authors

Devkota et al., (2014); Mabe et al. (2014), farmers need to experience and experiment with the information to gain the confidence to pay.

Comment [O24]: Insert (here

Comment [O25]: And close it here.

5. Conclusion

Farmers' adaptation to climate change is crucial to combating food security-related challenges as well as eradication of poverty among smallholder farmers. But adaptation may prove to be futile if farmers lack access to reliable climate change adaptation information specific to their locale on time and in a user-friendly manner. Currently, the majority of the initiatives responsible for the dissemination of climate change adaptation information are project-supported. Incentives that are will phase off once the projects wind up. Against this background, this study assessed farmers' willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information and establish the value farmers have allocated to this information.

Comment [O26]: Are what? What will faced off?

The results reveal that the farmers in South-Eastern Kenya are characterized by high farming experience, moderate household sizes, low level of formal education, small farm sizes, knowledgeable on climate change adaptation with a good social capital. With regards to farmers' perception of climate change adaptation information, most of the farmers agree that the information disseminated through the various channels was effective. The results revealed a high level of willingness to pay for climate change adaptation information. From the Probit regression analysis on factors influencing farmers willingness to pay, the age, level of education, source of income, access to the information, access to market, and the information and dissemination channels' effectiveness were significant predictors of the probability to pay for the climate change adaptation information.

An analysis of the total cost of ownership reveals that with the amount and value farmers have attributed to this information, this amount will be sufficient to enable setup systems for dissemination of information. But this will require interventions from national and county governments to support the initiative and foster sustainability. Farmers need more training on climate change adaptation since it is a positive and significant predictor of farmers' willingness to pay. Similarly, effective dissemination and effectiveness of the climate change adaptation information need to be encouraged among the main sources of climate change adaptation information as it also is a positive predictor of the probability to pay for the information. Farmers should also be encouraged to seek other alternative sources of income to complement farming.

This is since farming as a main source of income negatively influences the farmers' willingness to pay for climate change adaptation information.

6. Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made: -

Incentives to create awareness and enhance access to climate change adaptation information among the smallholder farmers should be adopted by the county government. Programs such as Climate Field schools should be set up and facilitated to increase farmers' access and understanding of climate change adaptation information. Besides, farmers should be encouraged to organize themselves into groups to enable easy and cheap access to this information.

The level of education had a significant influence on farmers' willingness to pay to access climate change adaptation information. With the majority of smallholder farmers having up to primary level of education, initiatives that encourage more educated persons to venture into agriculture should be enacted.

The majority of the smallholder farmers valued the climate change adaptation information received at a monetary value of KSHS. 1,445.56 an equivalent of 13.21 USD, with 18.40 USD willingness to pay in Kind. This yielded a Total Ownership Cost (TCO) of 752, 539.72 US Dollars. The national and County government should set up a system to enable farmers to contribute and while being supported by the government to set up and sustain a stable climate change adaptation dissemination system.

Access and effectiveness of access to the climate change adaptation information are significant in determining farmers' willingness to pay to access this information. The information service providers should be encouraged to communicate climate change adaptation information through channels that can reach the majority of the farmers. The effectiveness of these channels should be factored in when delivering this information to smallholder farmers.

7. Reference

Alvarez-Faris, B. (1999). Estimating the Benefits of Agri-environmental Policy: Econometric Issues in Open-ended Contingent Valuation Studies. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, 42*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/09640569911280

Aydoğdu, M. H., Sevinç, M. R., Cançelik, M., Dogğan, H. P., & Şahin, Z. (2020). Determination of farmers' willingness to pay for sustainable agricultural land use in the GAP-Harran plain of Turkey. *Land*, *9*(8). https://doi.org/10.3390/LAND9080261

Bhandari, P., Kc, M., Shrestha, S., & Aryal, A. (2016). Assessments of ecosystem service indicators and stakeholders' s willingness to pay for selected ecosystem services in the Chure region of Nepal. *Applied Geography*, *69*, 25–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2016.02.003

Birch, I. (2018). *Economic growth in the arid and semi-arid lands of Kenya Question What recommendations have been made by reputable experts to support long-term sustainable economic growth in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands of Kenya? November*.

Burton, I. (2006). Adapt and thrive: options for reducing the climate-change adaptation deficit. *Policy Options*, *27*(1), 33–38.

Carson, R. T. (2000). Contingent valuation: A user's guide. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *34*(8), 1413–1418. https://doi.org/10.1021/es990728j

Carson, R. T., Flores, N. E., & Meade, N. F. (2001). *Contingent Valuation : Controversies and Evidence*. 173–210.

Chatterjee, C., Triplett, R., Johnson, C. K., & Ahmed, P. (2017). Willingness to pay for safe drinking water : A contingent valuation study in Jacksonville, FL. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *203*, 413–421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.08.008

Cooper, P. J. M., Dimes, J., Rao, K. P. C., Shapiro, B., Shiferaw, B., & Twomlow, S. (2008). Coping better with current climatic variability in the rain-fed farming systems of sub-Saharan Africa: An essential first step in adapting to future climate change? *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *126*(1–2), 24–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2008.01.007

D'Alessandro, S., Caballero, J., Lichte, J., & Simpkin, S. (2015). *Kenya agricultural sector risk assessment* (Issue 96289).

DEE. (2017). *Adapting to climate change | Department of the Environment and Energy*. https://www.environment.gov.au/climate-change/adaptation

Devkota, R. P., Maraseni, T. N., & Cockfield, G. (2014). An assessment of willingness to pay to avoid climate change-induced floods. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*, *5*(4), 569–577. https://doi.org/10.2166/wcc.2014.134

Doğan, H. P., Aydoğdu, M. H., Sevinç, M. R., & Cançelik, M. (2020). Farmers' willingness to pay for services to ensure sustainable agricultural income in the GAP-Harran plain, Şanlıurfa, Turkey. *Agriculture (Switzerland)*, *10*(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture10050152

Donnelly, C., Greuell, W., Andersson, J., Gerten, D., Pisacane, G., Roudier, P., & Ludwig, F. (2017). Impacts of climate change on European hydrology at 1.5, 2 and 3 degrees mean global warming above the preindustrial level. *Climatic Change*, *143*(1–2), 13–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-1971-7

Dutta, S., Maiti, S., Garai, S., & Bhakat, M. (2020). *Adaptation Strategies to Climate Change among the Farming Community of the Indian Sundarbans Adaptation Strategies to Climate Change among the Farming*. *February*.

Garra, T. O., & Mourato, S. (2016). *Are we willing to give what it takes? Willingness to pay for climate change adaptation in developing countries. 6544*(March). https://doi.org/10.1080/21606544.2015.1100560

Gebru, B., Kibaya, P., Ramahaleo, T., Kwena, K., & Mapfumo, P. (2015). *Improving access to climate-related information for adaptation* (pp. 1–4).

Gebru, B., Mworozi, E., Kibaya, P., & Kaddu, J. (2018). *ENHANCING RESILIENCE TO WATER-RELATED IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN UGANDA'S S CATTLE CORRIDOR (CHAI LL)* (Issue adaptation and ICT).

GoK. (2016). *Kenya National Adaptation Plan 2015-2030. Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources*.

Hendler, R. (2007). *Lancaster's New Approach to Consumer Demand and Its Limitations Reuven Hendler*. *65*(1), 194–199.

Hynes, H., & Howley, P. (2011). Holistic vs. an Attribute-based Approach to Agri-Environmental Policy Valuation: Do Welfare Estimates Differ? *Agric Econ*, *62*, 300–329.

IPCC. (2019). *The IPCC's s Special Report on Climate Change and Land What's in it for Africa ?*

Kafy, A. A., Ali, S., Ferdous, L., & Sheel, P. K. (2018). Using Contingent Valuation Method to Determine Economic Value of Padma River Wetland in Rajshahi District, Bangladesh. *1st National Conference on Water Resources Engineering (NCWRE 2018), March*, 21–22.

Kwena, K. M., Ayuke, F. O., Karuku, G. N., & Esilaba, A. O. (2018). *No rain but bumper harvest : the magic of pigeonpea in semi-arid Kenya*. *14*(2), 181–203.

Lagoon, C., Makwinja, R., Bobby, I., & Kosamu, M. (2019). Determinants and Values of Willingness to Pay for Water Quality Improvement : Insights from Chia Lagoon, Malawi. *Sustainability*, *11*(460), 1–26. https://doi.org/doi:10.3390/su11174690

Lee, C., & Heo, H. (2016). Estimating willingness to pay for renewable energy in South Korea using the contingent valuation method. *Energy Policy*, *94*, 150–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2016.03.051

Locatelli, B., Pramova, E., Di Gregorio, M., Brockhaus, M., Chávez, D. A., Tubbeh, R., Sotés, J., & Perla, J. (2020). Climate change policy networks: connecting adaptation and mitigation in multiplex networks in Peru. *Climate Policy*, *20*(3), 354–372. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2020.1730153

Loomis, J. B. (1990). *Comparative Reliability of the Dichotomous Choice and Open-Ended Contingent Valuation Techniques*.

Comment [O27]: Why this? Re-write this

Lumosi, C., McGahey, D., Harvey, B., & Hoffman, T. (2016). *COMMUNICATING CLIMATE CHANGE FOR ADAPTATION : Challenges, successes, and future priorities.*

Luseno, W. K., McPeak, J. G., Barrett, C. B., Little, P. D., & Gebru, G. (2003). Assessing the Value of climate forest information for Pastoralists: Evidence from Southern Ethiopia and Northern Kenya. *World Development*, *31*(9), 1477–1494. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(03;00113-X

Mabe, F. N., Nketiah, P., & Darko, D. (2014). FARMERS' WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR WEATHER FORECAST INFORMATION IN SAVELUGU-NANTON MUNICIPALITY OF THE NORTHERN REGION. In *RJOAS* (Vol. 12, Issue 36).

McGahey, D. J., & Lumosi, C. (2018). CLIMATE CHANGE COMMUNICATION FOR ADAPTATION : MAPPING COMMUNICATION PATHWAYS IN SEMI-ARID REGIONS TO IDENTIFY. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, *20*(1), 87–107. https://doi.org/1520-5509

MoALF. (2017). *Climate risk Profile for Machakos County. Kenya County Climate Risk Profile Series*.

Moranga, L. O. (2016). *Analysis of Factors Influencing Tomato Farmers' Willingness to Adopt Innovative Timing Approaches for Management of Climate Change Effects in Taita Taveta County, Kenya*. The University of Nairobi.

Muema, E., Mburu, J., Coulibaly, J., & Mutune, J. (2018). Determinants of access and utilization of seasonal climate information services among smallholder farmers in Makueni County, Kenya. *Heliyon*, *4*(e00889), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00889

Mugi-ngenga, E. W., Mucheru-muna, M. W., Mugwe, J. N., & Ngetich, F. K. (2016). Household socio-economic factors influencing the level of adaptation to climate variability in the dry zones of Eastern Kenya. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *43*, 49–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2015.11.004

Muriithi, L. N., Onyari, C. N., Mogaka, H. R., Gichimu, B. M., Gatumo, G. N., & Kwena, K. (2021). Adoption Determinants of Adapted Climate-Smart Agriculture Technologies Among Smallholder Farmers in Machakos, Makueni, and Kitui Counties of Kenya. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, *25*(2). https://doi.org/10.4314/jae.v25i2.7

Mutunga, E. J., Ndungu, C. K., & Muendo, P. (2018). Factors Influencing Smallholder Farmers ' Adaptation to Climate Variability in Kitui County, Kenya. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Natural Resources*, *8*(5). https://doi.org/10.19080/IJESNR.2018.08.555746

Onyango, D. A., Mogaka, H. R., Ndirangu, S. N., & Kwena, K. (2021). Household socio-economic factors influencing the choice of agro-advisory dissemination pathways for climate change in semi-arid areas of Kenya. *Information Development*. https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669211026005

Comment [O28]: Why this? Re-write this

Comment [O29]: Why this? Re-write this

Comment [O30]: Why this? Re-write this

Otitoju, M. A., & Enete, A. A. (2016). *Climate change adaptation : Uncovering constraints to the use of adaptation strategies among food crop farmers in South-west, Nigeria using principal component analysis (PCA). February*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2016.1178692

Ouédraogo, M., Barry, S., Zougmoré, R. B., Partey, S. T., Somé, L., & Baki, G. (2018). Farmers' willingness to pay for climate information services: Evidence from Cowpea and Sesame producers in Northern Burkina Faso. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *10*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/su10030611

Rao, B. K. P. C., Ndegwa, W. G., Kizito, K., & Oyoo, A. (2011). Climate Variability and Change: Farmer perceptions and understanding of Intra-Seasonal variability in Rainfall and Associated Risk in Semi-Arid Kenya. *Expt Agric*, *47*(2), 267–291. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479710000918

Roggero, M., & Thiel, A. (2018). Adapting as usual: Integrative and segregative institutions shaping adaptation to climate change in local public administrations. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, *14*(3), 557–578. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744137417000418

Sarwary, M., Senthilnathan, S., Vidhyavathi, A., & Kokilavani, S. (2020). Socio-economic Impact of Climate Change, Adaptation and Determinants of Willingness to Pay for Crop Insurance in Central Agro-climatic Zone of Afghanistan. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, *39*(16), 83–92. https://doi.org/10.9734/cjast/2020/v39i1630739

Wierenga, B. (1984). An empirical test of the Lancaster characteristics model. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *1*(4), 263–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8116(84)90016-8

World Meteorological Organization. (2021). *State of the Global Climate 2020* (Issue 1264).

Yohannis, M. A., Wausi, A. N., Hutchinson, M. J., & Waema, T. M. (2019). *Enhancing Access and Use of Climate Information through ICTs*. *3*(1), 1–12.

Zolnikov, T. R. (2019). *Global Adaptation and Resilience to Climate Change. March*, 1–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01213-7

Zongo, B., Diarra, A., Barbier, B., Zorom, M., Yacouba, H., & Dogot, T. (2015). Farmers' Perception and Willingness to Pay for Climate Information in Burkina Faso. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, *8*(1), 175. https://doi.org/10.5539/jas.v8n1p175