

EFFECT OF CLIMATE-SMART AGRICULTURE ON THE FOOD SECURITY STATUS OF CASSAVA FARMING HOUSEHOLDS IN KOGI STATE, NIGERIA

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the effects of climate-smart agriculture (CSA) on the food security status of cassava farming households in Kogi State, Nigeria. A multi-stage sampling technique was used to select 120 respondents for the study. Descriptive statistics, multivariate and probit regression models were used to analyze the data. Findings showed that 67.50% were male with a mean age of 46 years. About 60 % were married, with an average household size of 7. The mean farming experience is 11 years. Organic manuring, early planting, mixed cropping, minimum tillage and crop rotation were the major climate-smart agricultural practices adopted by the farmers. Multivariate regression analysis showed that household size, contact with extension service, education and membership of farmers' association were the significant factors influencing the utilization of CSA practices. The result further showed that 42.50%, 27.50%, 22.50% and 7.50% of the households were marginally, low, very low and highly food secure, respectively. Estimates of the Probit regression on the effect of CSA practices adoption on farming households' food security revealed that sex, household size, farm size and number of CSAs utilized significantly influenced households' food security. It is recommended that effective scaling of CSA is vital for the rural farming household's food security status.

Keywords: Climate-smart agriculture, Food security, Cassava, Multivariate Regression

Introduction

Climate change presents a significant challenge to agricultural production worldwide. However, its effects are particularly severe in developing regions such as sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where agriculture largely depends on rainfall (Zizingaet al., 2022; Mirón et al., 2023). The impacts of climate change are evident in the form of prolonged dry periods, meteorological droughts, flooding, erratic rainfall patterns, shifts in cropping calendars, and rising atmospheric temperatures (Franklin et al., 2021). To effectively mitigate these impacts and build resilience in the agricultural sector, it is essential to integrate local knowledge from smallholder farmers with scientific insights through collaborative knowledge co-production (Ayorinde et al., 2022). African smallholder farmers have long employed traditional farming techniques such as intercropping to enhance soil fertility and maximize income. Recently, these practices have been reframed as Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) strategies (Ogunyiolae et al., 2021). Encouraging the adoption of CSA is crucial for enhancing smallholder farmers' ability to adapt to climate change, mitigate its negative effects, and contribute to achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (Ma & Rahut, 2024).

CSA approaches incorporate location-specific indigenous innovations, technologies, and services, emphasizing their contextual nature. In Africa, particularly Nigeria, CSA implementation is still evolving. The prevailing technocratic approach to scaling up CSA strategies may not yield the expected outcomes in addressing climate change. However, adopting CSA practices, technologies, and services has the potential to boost agricultural productivity, optimize resource utilization, improve farmers' income and profitability, strengthen resilience, ensure food security, and enhance carbon sequestration both above and below ground. A systematic approach to adaptation, mitigation, and food security is essential to help farmers effectively respond to climate change (Saleemet et al., 2024). Smallholder farmers frequently encounter multiple climate-related risks such as floods, unpredictable rainfall, dry spells, and droughts, all of which significantly impact agricultural productivity. To cope with these challenges, they adopt one or more agricultural strategies (Belachew et al., 2020). CSA encompasses innovative farming techniques and technologies, including agroforestry systems and drought-resistant crop varieties, to address three major challenges of the 21st century: climate change adaptation, mitigation, and food security (Ayorinde et al., 2022).

CSA is designed to "sustainably increase agricultural productivity and incomes, enhance resilience in food and agricultural systems against climate change, and minimize or eliminate greenhouse gas emissions while ensuring

57 national food security” (Mohammed & Ullah, 2024). Despite the growing body of research on CSA, findings on its
58 effectiveness remain inconsistent. While some studies report its success across different agro-ecological zones and
59 socio-economic conditions, others indicate limited impact, and some findings present mixed results. . . . For instance,
60 Oyawoleet al. (2020) examined the impact of CSA adoption on food security among farm households in northern
61 Nigeria and found that adoption levels were generally low. This highlights the need for continued empirical research
62 on the effects of CSA practices on crop yields, household income, farmers' welfare, and overall food security. In
63 response to this research gap, this study was conducted to assess the impact of CSA practices on household food
64 security status among cassava farmers in Kogi State, Nigeria. The findings from this study will contribute to the
65 existing body of knowledge on agricultural adaptation to climate change while offering valuable insights for
66 policymakers in mainstreaming CSA in Nigeria’s agricultural sector. The study specifically aimed to: identify the
67 climate-smart agricultural practices; investigate factors influencing farmers’ decision to utilize CSA practices; assess
68 the food security status of cassava farming households; and determine the effect of CSA usage on the food security
69 status of cassava farming households in the study area.

70

71 **Methodology**

72 The research was conducted in Kogi State, Nigeria, which comprises 21 Local Government Areas. Geographically,
73 the state lies between latitudes 6°30'N and 8°05'N and longitudes 5°51'E and 8°00'E. The predominant ethnic groups
74 in the region are the Igala, Ebira, and Yoruba (Okun), with agriculture being the main economic activity. The
75 primary crops cultivated include cocoyam, maize, yam, and cassava. Additionally, most farming households engage
76 in some form of livestock rearing. Men in the region are involved in crafts such as basket weaving and wood
77 carving, while women primarily focus on processing farm produce. The state's economy and social structure are
78 largely centered on agriculture. This study relied on primary data collected through a structured questionnaire
79 administered to 120 cassava farmers in Kogi State. Both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were
80 employed for data analysis.

81 A multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select the study respondents. In the first stage, two Local Government
82 Areas (LGAs) were randomly selected from each of the four agro-ecological zones of the state using a Simple
83 Random Sampling (SRS) technique. The second stage involved randomly selecting two cassava farming
84 communities from each of the chosen LGAs, also using SRS. In the third stage, eight respondents were randomly
85 selected from each identified community using the same SRS technique. This resulted in a total sample size of 128
86 respondents, of which 120 questionnaires were completed and returned for analysis.

87 Primary data was gathered using a structured questionnaire administered to cassava farmers. A total of 128
88 questionnaires were distributed to the sampled respondents, with 120 completed and returned. The data collection
89 process was carried out by the researcher with the assistance of trained research assistants.

90 The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, multivariate analysis, and an Ordered Probit regression
91 model.

92

93

94

95 **Results and Discussion**

96 **Socio-economic characteristics of the farmers**

97 The distribution of the respondents according to their socioeconomic characteristics is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Age			
≤ 20	1	0.83	
21-30	22	18.33	
31-40	15	12.50	
41-50	35	29.17	46 years
51-60	32	26.67	
>60	15	12.50	
Gender			
Male	81	67.50	Male
Female	39	32.50	
Marital status			
Single	48	40.00	
Married	72	60.00	Married
Household size (Persons)			
1-5	38	31.67	
6-10	71	59.17	7 persons
>10	11	9.17	
Educational level			
No formal education	1	0.83	
Primary school education	14	11.67	
Secondary school	46	38.33	
Tertiary school education	59	49.17	Tertiary education
Farm size (Hectares)			
1-2	114	95.00	1.44 hectares
>2	6	5.00	
Farm experience (years)			
1-10	74	61.67	
11-20	24	20.00	11 years
21-30	14	11.67	
>30	8	6.67	
Annual income (Naira)			
≤ 100,000	18	15.00	
100,001-200,000	30	25.00	
200,001-300,000	8	6.67	
300,001-400,000	15	12.50	
400,001-500,000	21	17.50	₦406,916.7
>500,000	28	23.33	
Extension contacts			
Had contact	26	21.67	
Had no contact	94	78.33	Had no contact
Membership of Association			
Member	55	54.17	
Non-member	65	45.83	Non-member

98 **Source: Field survey, 2024**

99 The findings presented in Table 1 indicate that the respondents had an average age of 46 years, suggesting that they
100 were still within the productive age range for farming and capable of adopting improved agricultural technologies,
101 particularly Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices and other advanced farming methods. This aligns with the
102 studies conducted by Moses, Epko, and Ogah (2024), as well as Onya et al. (2019), which reported a mean age of 43
103 years among cassava farmers. Additionally, the results showed that a significant proportion (67.50%) of cassava
104 farmers were male. This finding is consistent with the research of Uzokwe&Ofuoku (2022) and Moses, Epko, &
105 Ogah (2024), who observed that cassava and smallholder farming are predominantly practiced by men. Furthermore,
106 60.00% of the surveyed farmers were married, indicating that a majority had family responsibilities and could rely

107 on family labour for cassava farming. This observation corroborates the study by Uzokwe&Ofuoku (2022), which
 108 also identified marriage as a common characteristic among cassava farmers.
 109 The analysis further revealed that the average household size was seven individuals, signifying a relatively large
 110 household composition. This finding is consistent with the study by Moses, Epko, & Ogah (2024), which reported
 111 an average household size of six persons among cassava farming families. Moreover, nearly all farmers (99.31%)
 112 had received some level of formal education, which has significant implications for the adoption of modern
 113 agricultural technologies, including CSA practices. This finding is in line with the work of Owolade, Alonge,
 114 Agbontale, &Adesanlu (2019), who argued that educated farmers are more likely to embrace innovative cassava
 115 farming techniques, ultimately enhancing agricultural productivity. The study also found that the mean farm size
 116 was 1.44 hectares, indicating that farmers in the region predominantly operated as smallholders with limited land
 117 resources. This finding aligns with previous research by Bello et al. (2022) and Chukwujekwuet al. (2022), which
 118 reported an average farm size of approximately two hectares. The average farming experience in the study area was
 119 11 years, suggesting that farmers had accumulated considerable expertise to navigate agricultural challenges. This is
 120 consistent with the studies of Moses, Epko, & Ogah (2024), as well as Uzokwe&Ofuoku (2022), which reported an
 121 average farming experience of 13 years.
 122 Regarding farm income, the results indicated that annual earnings were relatively low, with an average annual
 123 income of ₦406,916.70. This aligns with the findings of Chukwujekwuet al. (2022), who reported that smallholder
 124 farmers in Nigeria generally earn poor incomes. Furthermore, only 21.67% of the farmers had contact with
 125 extension services, reflecting poor outreach efforts, which could be attributed to insufficient extension personnel or
 126 inadequate funding. This lack of extension support could negatively impact the adoption of CSA practices among
 127 cassava farmers in the study area. Lastly, the findings revealed that 54.17% of respondents were affiliated with
 128 farmers' associations, while 45.83% were not. This suggests that a majority of the farmers were members of at least
 129 one agricultural organization.

130
131
132
133
134

The Climate-smart Agricultural practices utilized by the Cassava farmers in the study area

The distribution of farmers according to the CSA practices adopted in the study area is present in Table 2.

Table 2: Awareness of Climate-Smart Agricultural practices by the respondents

Climate-Smart Agricultural practices	Frequency (*)	Percentage
Engage in mulching	37	30.83
Control of irrigation water	43	35.83
Changing planting time to meet with rain	104	86.67
Planting of cover crops to maintain soil moisture	42	32.29
Harvest and store rain water to be used on my farm	72	60.00
Minimum tillage	90	75.00
Take crop insurance to protect my farm	65	54.17
Organic manuring	109	90.83
Mixed cropping	97	80.83
Afforestation	55	45.83
Crop rotation	93	77.50

Source: Field Survey, 2024 (*) = Multiple response allowed

135 The findings presented in Table 2 indicate that the most adopted climate-smart agricultural practices among cassava
 136 farmers in the study area included the use of organic manure (90.83%), adjusting planting schedules to align with
 137 rainfall patterns (86.67%), mixed cropping (80.83%), crop rotation (77.50%), and minimal tillage (75.0%). These
 138 results suggest that the adoption of Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices varies among smallholder cassava
 139 farmers in the region. This observation aligns with the studies of Kanyanjiet al. (2020) and Collins et al. (2022),
 140 which reported varying adoption rates of agricultural practices in Kenya. Previous studies, such as Reppinet al.
 141 (2020), have highlighted that CSA practices—including the application of animal manure, soil and water
 142 conservation techniques, agroforestry, crop diversification, and crop-livestock integration—play a crucial role in
 143 enhancing food security and improving community livelihoods. The broader implication of these findings is that
 144 such climate-smart strategies enable farmers to mitigate the negative impacts of climate change and enhance farm
 145 productivity in the study area (Acevedo et al., 2020; Barasa et al., 2021).

146
147
148

Factors influencing the usage of Climate-smart Agricultural
Table 3: Factors influencing the usage of Climate-smart Agricultural

Variables	Changing date	planting	Minimum tillage		Organic manure		Mixed farming		Crop rotation	
	Coef.	Std. err	Coef.	Std. err	Coef.	Std. err	Coef.	Std. err	Coef.	Std. err
Age	0.000078	0.002899	-0.0022778	0.0035753	0.00329	0.0025	-0.00430	0.00316	0.001749	0.003587
Sex	0.019488	0.749967	-0.0233834	0.092493	-0.0344	0.0648	0.10824	0.08192	0.108595	0.092811
Household size	-0.023551	0.013842	-0.0324434	0.0170717	-0.02580**	0.0119	-0.02930	0.01512	0.000624	0.017130
Years spent schooling	-0.001002	0.005684	-0.018299**	0.0070112	0.003161	0.0049	0.001638	0.00621	-0.00758	0.007035
Farm size	0.0277938	0.537724	0.1062024	0.663172	-0.00027	0.0464	0.021723	0.05873	0.059190	0.066545
Extension contact	0.0225447	0.79974	-0.228481**	0.986315	0.030771	0.69111	-0.17539	0.08736	-0.182778	0.098970
Association	-0.010575	0.734214	0.1758923	0.0905502	-0.06658	0.06344	0.061566	0.08020	0.010576	0.090861
Awareness of CSA	-0.063267	0.895462	-0.0085634	0.1104368	-0.07995	0.07738	-0.07389	0.09781	-0.12406	0.110816

149
150
151
152
153

Number of CSA utilized	0.763526***	0.275775	0.1048371***	0.340112	0.018853	0.02383	0.10395***	0.03012	0.047377	0.034128
Constant	0.4979958**	0.22273	0.407388	0.274698	0.84692***	0.19248	0.4149644	0.24330	0.369480	0.275643

Source: field Survey, 2024 *, ** and *** represents statistical significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% level.

154
155 The factors influencing farmers' decisions to adopt individual or combined climate-smart agricultural (CSA)
156 practices were analyzed. Various determinants influenced the adoption of these practices (Table 3). The results
157 indicate that the household head's level of formal education played a role in the use of minimum tillage.
158 Specifically, farmers with fewer years of formal education were more likely to implement minimum tillage
159 compared to those with higher educational attainment. This contradicts the findings of Baba & Abdulai (2023), who
160 reported that education influenced the use of minimum tillage, such as soil fertility conservation and water retention,
161 making them more inclined to adopt the practice. Furthermore, there was a significant negative relationship between
162 farmers' contact with extension agents and the adoption of minimum tillage. Extension services enhance smallholder
163 farmers' understanding and application of agricultural technologies. Research indicates that farmers who frequently
164 interact with extension agents are more likely to adopt CSA practices, including minimum tillage, due to increased
165 awareness of its benefits (Jabbar et al., 2024). Moreover, the adoption of minimum tillage was positively associated
166 with the number of CSA practices adopted. This suggests that engaging with multiple CSA practices increases the
167 likelihood of adopting minimum tillage. These findings align with previous studies that highlight the role of CSA
168 practice diversity in influencing adoption decisions.

169 Household size was found to have a negative influence on the adoption of organic manure, suggesting that smaller
170 households were more likely to incorporate organic manure into their farming practices. Household size serves as a
171 critical factor in agricultural decision-making, as it indicates the availability of labour for implementing new farming
172 techniques. This finding contrasts with the study by Njoku et al. (2024), which reported that the adoption of organic
173 manure tends to increase with larger household sizes. Additionally, contact with extension services had a significant
174 negative effect on the adoption of mixed farming. Extension services are essential in equipping smallholder farmers
175 with the knowledge and skills needed to implement advanced agricultural technologies. However, the findings
176 suggest that the limited availability of extension personnel may hinder the effective dissemination of technical
177 knowledge on mixed farming. This contradicts the conclusions of Mogaka and Murithi (2021), who found that
178 farmers' engagement with extension services enhances the adoption of climate-smart agricultural (CSA) practices.
179 Furthermore, the number of CSA practices adopted had a positive effect on the uptake of mixed farming. This
180 indicates that farmers who engage with multiple CSA techniques are more likely to incorporate mixed farming into
181 their agricultural activities. The positive correlation aligns with previous studies, which found that cassava farmers
182 frequently employ multiple cropping systems, implying that smallholder farmers tend to integrate various CSA
183 practices into their farming strategies (Waaswaet al., 2022; Vatvaet al., 2023).

184 **Food security status of the respondents**

185 The result of the food security status of households in the study area is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Food Security Status of Households

Food security category	Frequency	Percentage
Highly food secure	9	7.50
Marginally Food secure	51	42.50
Low food secure	33	27.50
Very Low food secure	27	22.50
Total	120	100

Source: Field Survey, 2024

186
187 Table 4 shows the result of the food security using the USDA food security assessment approach. The result revealed
188 that a large proportion of the households were marginally food secure (42.50%), while 27.50% and 22.50% were
189 low food secure and very low food secure, respectively. Only 7.50% were highly food secure. The result implies
190 that more than half of the cassava farming households experience one form of food insecurity or the other, making it
191 a matter of critical concern. According to Akukwe (2020), most of the respondents in the agrarian community of
192 South-East Nigeria were food insecure (53.5%), while 46.5% were food secure.

193 Table 5 presents the findings of the ordered probit regression, analyzing the impact of climate-smart agricultural
194 (CSA) practices on the food security status of cassava farming households. The Chi-square statistic (61.27) was
195 highly significant at the 1% level ($p < 0.01$), indicating that the independent variables meaningfully influenced food
196 security outcomes. The model's R^2 value of 20.45% suggests that the included variables accounted for 20.45% of the
197 variation in the probability of food security among cassava farming households. The results indicate that gender
198 ($p < 0.05$) had a negative coefficient, whereas household size ($p < 0.05$), farm size ($p < 0.05$), and the number of CSA

199 practices adopted ($p < 0.01$) had positive coefficients. The negative relationship between gender and food security
 200 suggests that female-headed households are more likely to experience food insecurity than male-headed households.
 201 This finding aligns with Nnaji, Nazmum, and Alan (2022), who highlighted that limited access to land and other
 202 productive resources among female-headed households negatively impacts their food security.
 203

204 **Table 5: Effect of CSA practices adoption on Cassava farming households` Food Security Status in the study**
 205 **area**

Variables	Food security			
	Coefficient	Std. error	Z	P>/z/
Age	0.0124	0.0101443	1.22	0.222
Sex	-0.6569621	0.2572643	-2.55	0.011**
Household size	0.1092416	0.0495384	2.21	0.027**
Years spent schooling	-0.0195468	0.0226429	-0.86	0.388
Farm size	0.3884572	0.187156	2.08	0.038**
Farming experience	-0.0199916	0.0112072	-1.78	-0.074
Extension contact	0.3811826	0.2755423	1.38	0.167
Awareness of CSA	0.3327511	0.3015334	1.10	0.270
Number of CSA utilized	0.2455158	0.0905688	2.71	0.007***
/cut 1/	-0.4186698	0.7906208		
/cut 2/	1.64613	0.7971871		
/cut 3/	2.685814	0.8160163		
Diagnostic test				
Number of obs	120			
LR chi2 (9)	61.27			
Prob > chi2	0.0000			
Pseudo R2	0.2045			

206 Sources: Estimates from the analysis of the data from the field survey. *, ** and *** represent statistical significance
 207 at 10%, 5% and 1% level respectively.
 208

209 Household size exhibited a positive and statistically significant relationship ($p < 0.05$) with food security status. This
 210 supports the findings of Herrera et al. (2021), who reported that larger households benefit from increased labour
 211 availability, which enhances agricultural productivity and food security. Similarly, farm size was positively
 212 associated with food security ($p < 0.05$), corroborating the study by Yahaya and Danmaigoro (2020), which found that
 213 larger farm sizes contribute to improved food security among farming households in Zuru Agricultural Zone, Kebbi
 214 State. Furthermore, the number of CSA practices adopted by cassava farmers had a positive and highly significant
 215 ($p < 0.01$) impact on food security. This suggests that increasing the use of CSA techniques enhances the likelihood of
 216 food security among farming households, providing valuable insights into strategies for improving food security in
 217 Nigeria.

218 **Table 6: Effect of CSA practices adoption on Cassava farming households` food security - Marginal Effect of**
 219 **Food Security**

Variables	Highly Food secure		Marginal Food secure		Low Food secure		Very Low Food secure	
	$\frac{\partial y}{\partial x}$	P>/z/	$\frac{\partial y}{\partial x}$	P>/z/	$\frac{\partial y}{\partial x}$	P>/z/	$\frac{\partial y}{\partial x}$	P>/z/
Age	-0.006	0.267	-0.004	0.227	0.002	0.242	0.00271	0.224
Sex	0.0292	0.061	0.223	0.011	-0.095	0.012	-0.162	0.023
Household size	-0.006	0.089	-0.038	0.033	0.019	0.053	0.024	0.031
Year of Formal education	0.001	0.402	0.007	0.392	-0.003	0.398	-0.004	0.390
Farm size	0.021	0.105	0.134	0.044	-0.069	0.064	-0.084	0.042
Farming experience	0.001	0.144	0.007	0.080	-0.003	0.102	-0.004	0.079
Extension contact	-0.017	0.167	-0.134	0.172	0.058	0.114	0.093	0.213

Awareness of CSA	-0.015	0.273	-0.117	0.274	0.053	0.226	0.078	0.307
Number of CSA utilized.	-0.013	0.060	-0.084	0.010	0.044	0.024	0.054	0.009

Source: Field survey, 2024

220
221
222 The marginal effects analysis indicated that the sex of the household head had a positive influence on Marginal Food
223 Secure and Very Low Food Secure, but a negative impact on Low Food Secure. This finding aligns with Boscowet
224 al. (2025), who highlighted the role of gender in determining the adoption of climate-smart agricultural (CSA)
225 practices and, by extension, food security status. Additionally, household size positively influenced Marginal Food
226 Secure and Very Low Food Secure. However, this study’s findings contrast with those of Ali et al. (2022) and
227 Musafiri et al. (2022). They argued that as households adopt more CSA practices, more resources are allocated to
228 agricultural activities, leaving fewer resources for food expenditures. Furthermore, farm size had a positive effect on
229 Marginal Food Secure but a negative influence on Very Low Food Secure. The positive relationship aligns with Li
230 et al. (2024), who reported that an increase in farm size enhances production levels, thereby improving food security
231 status. The analysis also showed that the number of CSA practices adopted positively influenced Marginal Food
232 Secure, Low Food Secure, and Very Low Food Secure. This supports previous research indicating that an increase
233 in CSA practices helps mitigate climate change effects, enhances agricultural productivity, and ultimately improves
234 food security (Girma et al.,2023; Ma & Rahut,2024). Additionally, these findings are in line with studies suggesting
235 that greater adoption of CSA practices leads to higher yields, which positively impacts household food security and
236 dietary diversity (Omotosho & Omotayo, 2024; Vatsa et al., 2023; Akter et al., 2022).

237 **Conclusion and Recommendations**

238 This study investigated the effect of climate-smart agricultural (CSA) practices on food security among cassava
239 farming households in Kogi State, Nigeria. It provides valuable insights into how CSA practices influence
240 household food security in the region. The findings indicate that the most adopted CSA practices among cassava
241 farmers include the application of organic manure, changing planting to align with rainfall patterns, mixed cropping,
242 minimal tillage, and crop rotation. Key factors influencing the decision to adopt CSA practices in the study area
243 include the number of CSA techniques utilized, years of formal education, and household size. Additionally, factors
244 such as gender, household size, farm size, and the number of CSA practices adopted significantly impacted the food
245 security status of farming households. Based on these findings, the study recommends that governments and
246 development partners establish inclusive financial policies and institutional frameworks—developed in collaboration
247 with smallholder farmers—to facilitate the widespread adoption of CSA practices in Kogi State, Nigeria.

248 **References**

- 249 Acevedo, M., Pixley, K., Zinyengere, N., Meng, S.S., Tufan,H., Cichy K., Bizikova L., Isaacs K., Ghezzi-Kopel K.
250 andPorciello, J. (2020). A Scoping Review of Adoption ofClimate-Resilient Crops by Small-Scale Producers
251 inLow-and Middle-Income Countries.” National Plants, 6(6). pp. 1231-1241.
- 252 Akter, S., Fatema, N., & Beyene, A.D. (2022). Barriers to adoption of climate-smart agriculture by smallholder
253 farmers: A case study from Bangladesh. Land Use Policy, 112, 105856.
254 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105856>
- 255 Akukwe, T.I. (2020). Household food security and its determinants in agrarian communities of southeastern
256 Nigeria. Agro-Science 19, 54–60. doi: 10.4314/as.v19i1.9.
- 257 Ali, H., Menza, M. and Hagos, F. (2022). Impact of climate-smart agriculture adoption on food security and
258 multidimensional poverty of rural farm households in the Central Rift Valley of Ethiopia. Agric & Food
259 Secur 11, 62 .<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-022-00401-5>
- 260 Ayorinde Ogunyiola, Maaz Gardezi & Sumit Vij (2022). Smallholder farmers’ engagement with climate smart
261 agriculture in Africa: role of local knowledge and upscaling, Climate Policy, 22:4, 411-426, DOI:
262 10.1080/14693062.2021.2023451.
- 263 Barasa, P.M., Botai, C.M., Botai, J.O. and Mabhaudhi, T. (2021). AReview of Climate Smart Agriculture Research
264 andApplications in Africa. Agronomy, 11(1255), pp.234-250, 2021.
265 <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11061255>.
- 266 Belachew, A., Mekuria, W. and Nachimuthu, K. (2020). Factors influencing adoption of soil and water conservation
267 practices in the northwest Ethiopian highlands, Int. Soil Water Conserv. Res.8, 80–89.
- 268 Boscow Okumu, Maren Radeny, Laura Cramer, (2025). Welfare effects and gender dimensions of adoption of
269 climate smart agriculture practices: Evidence from Kenyan small-scale farmers, World Development
270 Sustainability, Volume 6, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2025.100204>.

271 Collins, M., Musafiri a,b,* , Milka Kiboi b, Joseph Macharia c, Onesmus K. Ng'etich d, David K. Kosgei e, Betty
272 Mulianga f, Michael Okoti g, Felix K. Ngetich b,h (2022). Adoption of climate-smart agricultural practices
273 among smallholder farmers in Western Kenya: do socioeconomic, institutional, and biophysical factors
274 matter? pp. 1-8. *Heliyon*8 (2022) e08677.

275 Felix K. Ngetich, (2021). Determinants of farmers' perceptions of climate variability, mitigation, and adaptation
276 strategies in the central highlands of Kenya, *Weather and Climate Extremes*, Volume 34, 100374,
277 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2021.100374>.

278 Girma Tilahun, Amare Bantider, Desalegn Yayeh, (2023). Impact of adoption of climate-smart agriculture on food
279 security in the tropical moist montane ecosystem: The case of Geshy watershed, Southwest Ethiopia,
280 *Heliyon*, Volume 9, Issue 12, e22620, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22620>.

281 Herrera, J.P., Rabezara, J.Y., Ravelomanantsoa, N.A.F., Metz, M., France, C., Owens, A., Pender, M., Nunn, C.L.
282 and Kramer, R.A. (2021). Food insecurity related to agricultural practices and household characteristics in
283 rural communities of northeast Madagascar. *Food Secur.* 2021;13(6):1393-1405. doi: 10.1007/s12571-021-
284 01179-3. Epub 2021 Jun 24. PMID: 34188720; PMCID: PMC8222503.

285 Kanyenji, G.M., Oluoch-Kosura, W., Onyango, C.M. and Karanja Ng'ang'a, S. (2020). Prospects and constraints in
286 smallholder farmers' adoption of multiple soil carbon enhancing practices in Western Kenya, *Heliyon* 6,
287 e03226.

288 Ali, H., Menza, M. and Hagos, F. (2022). Impact of climate-smart agriculture adoption on food security and
289 multidimensional poverty of rural farm households in the Central Rift Valley of Ethiopia. *Agric & Food*
290 *Secur* **11**, 62 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-022-00401-5>

291 Ma, W and Rahut, D.B. (2024). Climate-smart agriculture: adoption, impacts, and implications for sustainable
292 development, *Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Change*, 29:44 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-024-10139-z>

293 Ma, W., and Rahut, D.B. (2024). Climate-smart agriculture: adoption, impacts, and implications for sustainable
294 development. *Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Change* **29**, 44 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-024-10139-z>.

295 Mairura, F.S., Musafiri, C.M., Kiboi, M.K., Macharia, J.M., Ng'etich, O.K., Shisanya, C.A., Okeyo, J.M., Mugendi,
296 D.N., Okwuosa, E.A. and Ngetich, F.K. (2021). Determinants of farmers' perceptions of climate variability,
297 mitigation, and adaptation strategies in the central highlands of Kenya, *Weather Clim. Extr.* 34 (2021)
298 100374.

299 Mirón, I.J., Linares, C. and Díaz, J. (2023). The influence of climate change on food production and food safety.
300 *Environ Res* 216:114674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.114674>

301 Mogaka, B.O., Bett, H.K., Ng'ang'a, S.K. (2021) Socioeconomic factors influencing the choice of climate-smart soil
302 practices among farmers in western Kenya, *J. Agric. Food Res.* 100168.

303 Mogaka, H.R., & Muriithi, L.N. (2021). Factors affecting multiple climate change adaptation practices of
304 smallholder farmers in lower Eastern Kenya. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 25(4).

305 Mohummed Shofi& Ullah Mazumder, (2024). Do climate-smart agricultural practices impact the livelihoods of
306 vulnerable farmers in the Southern part of Bangladesh? *Climate Services*, Volume 36, 100524.
307 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2024.100524>.

308 Moses, A.R. Ekpo, A.S. & Ogah, A.S. (2024). Socio-Economic Profiles of Cassava Farmers and the Impact of
309 VCDP-AF Implementation Strategies on Smallholder Productivity in Kogi State, Nigeria, *International*
310 *Journal of Bioscience and Agrological Research (IJBAR)*, 5(1), pp. 1-18.

311 Musafiri, C.M., Kiboi, M. and Macharia, J. (2022). Adoption of climate-smart agricultural practices among
312 smallholder farmers in Western Kenya: do socioeconomic, institutional, and biophysical factors matter?
313 *Heliyon* 8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08677>

314 Njoku, C.L., Mgbeokwere, M.C., Izuogu, C.U., Olaolu, M.O., Azuamairo, G.C., & Ibrahim-Olesin, S. (2024).
315 Effects of Climate-Smart Agricultural Practices on Cassava Farmers' Output in Ebonyi State,
316 Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 28(1), 123-134.

317 Nnaji, A., Nazmun, N.R. and Alan, R. (2021). Gendered access to land and household food insecurity: Evidence
318 from Nigeria, *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, 51, 45–67. doi:10.1017/age.2021.13

319 Ogunyiola, A., Gardezi, M., & Vij, S. (2022). Smallholder farmers' engagement with climate smart agriculture in
320 Africa: role of local knowledge and upscaling. *Climate Policy*, 22(4), 411–426.
321 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2021.2023451>.

322 Omotoso, K.T., & Omotayo, A.M. (2024). Climate-smart agriculture and food security in subSaharan Africa: A
323 systematic review. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 16(1), 2-25.
324 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCCSM-06-2022-0145>

325 Oyawole, F.P., Shittu, A. and Kehinde, M. (2021) Women empowerment and adoption of climate-smart agricultural
326 practices in Nigeria. *African Journal of Economics and Management Studies* 12:105-119.
327 <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-04-2020-0137>

- 328 Reppin, S., Kuyah, S. and Neergaard, A. (2020). Contribution of agroforestry to climate change mitigation and
329 livelihoods in Western Kenya. *Agroforest Syst* 94, 203–220 (2020). [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-019-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-019-00383-7)
330 [00383-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-019-00383-7)
- 331 Saleem, A., Anwar, S. and Nawaz, T. (2024). Securing a sustainable future: the climate change threat to agriculture,
332 food security, and sustainable development goals. *J.Umm Al-Qura Univ. Appl. Sci.* (2024).
333 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43994-024-00177-3>.
- 334 Vatsa, P., Ma, W., Zheng, H. and Li, J. (2023). Climate-smart agricultural practices for promoting sustainable
335 agrifood production: yield impacts and implications for food security. *Food Policy* 121:102551. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102551)
336 [org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102551](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102551)
- 337 Vatsa, K., Garg, K.K., & Singh, S. (2023). Climate-smart agriculture practices for enhancing crop productivity and
338 sustainability: A review. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 78(1), 5A-11A.
339 <https://doi.org/10.2489/jswc.78.1.5A>
- 340 Waaswa, A., OywayaNkurumwa A, Mwangi Kibe A, Ngeno Kipkemoi J (2022). Climate-Smart agriculture and
341 potato production in Kenya: review of the determinants of practice. *Climate Development* 14:75–
342 90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2021.1885336>.
- 343 Yahaya, K. and Danmaigoro, A. (2020). Analysis of Food Security Status among Farming Households in Zuru
344 Agricultural Zone of Kebbi State, Nigeria, *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance*, Volume 11, Issue 2 Ser.
345 IV (Mar – Apr 2020), PP 48-55.
- 346 Zizinga, A., Mwanjalolo, J.G.M. and Tietjen, B. (2022). Climate change and maize productivity in Uganda:
347 simulating the impacts and alleviation with climate smart agriculture practices. *Agric Syst* 199:103407.
348 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2022.10>