The effect of climate change and agricultural diversification on the total value of agricultural output of farm households in Sub-Saharan Africa

Jithitikulchai, Theepakorn

Faculty of Economics, Thammasat University, World Bank

1 December 2023

The Impact of Climate Change and Agricultural Diversification on the Total Value of Agricultural Output of Farm Households in Sub-Saharan Africa

Theepakorn Jithitikulchai
Corresponding author: theepakorn@econ.tu.ac.th, theepakorn@worldbank.org

Abstract

This study investigates the impact of temperature and precipitation on the economic value of agricultural output from farm households in six Sub-Saharan African countries: Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda. Using a repeated cross-sectional dataset covering the period from 2008 to 2016, this study explores how the adverse effects of climate change vary among different levels of agricultural diversification. The findings reveal that a one-degree temperature increase negatively impacts the value of agricultural output. Nevertheless, households engaged in diversified production activities exhibit better adaptation to higher temperatures, leading to attenuated effects of climate change. Therefore, this study highlights the critical importance of diversification as a strategy to enhance the resilience of farm households in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Keywords: agricultural diversification, agricultural households, climate change, climate resilience, sustainable agriculture

A preprint version:

Jithitikulchai, Theepakorn (2023): The effect of climate change and agricultural diversification on the total value of agricultural output of farm households in Sub-Saharan Africa. *African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 18 (December 2023): pp. 152-170.

1. Introduction

Climate change is a globally recognized phenomenon, which brings risks such as droughts and floods. The average global temperature has risen by almost 1 degree Celsius since 1901 and is projected to increase by 2 to 5 degrees Celsius by the end of the twenty-first century, contingent on efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (USGCRP, 2018; IPCC, 2021). In Africa, the temperature rise is expected to occur faster than the global average, while the region is predicted to experience a long-term decline in precipitation (Nhemachena & Hassan, 2007; Gannon et al., 2014). This scenario will lead to more frequent and severe extreme weather events in the future (IPCC, 2014; Ault, 2020).

Agriculture continues to play a crucial role as the primary economic sector in alleviating poverty and fostering prosperity in Sub-Saharan Africa (Kray et al., 2019). However, Africa is highly vulnerable to the risks of climate change, mainly due to the significant number of people engaged in agriculture, making poverty eradication a challenge. The repercussions of climate change on farm households are likely to be amplified and expose them to even greater production and income risks. Previous studies have confirmed that climate change has created a loss to the agricultural sector around the world and the damage will be higher in the future, especially for developing countries, e.g., Mendelsohn, Nordhaus, and Shaw (1994), Attavanich and McCarl (2014), and Brown et al. (2017). Moreover, several studies have shown that poor farmers with low levels of assets tend to have lower adaptation capacity to cope with climate shocks, such as those located in areas vulnerable to a drought or flood shock (Chonabayashi, 2021; Chonabayashi, Jithitikulchai, and Qu, 2020b; Nikoloski, Christiaensen, and Hill, 2018; Sesmero, Ricker-Gilbert, and Cook, 2018; Hallegatte et al., 2016; Mano and Nhemachena, 2007; Skoufias, 2012).

To address the risk of income loss, households often opt for low-risk, low-return strategies instead of more profitable options (Hallegatte et al., 2016). This choice can lead to a perpetuating cycle of poverty across generations (Damania et al., 2017). For instance, extreme weather events severely affect vulnerable populations, and climate change exacerbates the effects. The income loss experienced by the bottom 40 percent of the population due to climate change is estimated to be 70 percent higher than that of the average population (Hallegatte & Rozenberg, 2017), likely because climate shocks directly reduce agricultural income and increase food prices due to low crop yields. Climate change's repercussions on global food security are significant, with projections suggesting that it could force an additional 35 million and 122 million people into extreme poverty under optimistic and pessimistic scenarios (Mendelsohn et al., 2012).

Agricultural diversification often refers to crop diversification, different varieties and mixed production, is a good adaptation to climate risks. The adaptation strategies include promoting sustainable agricultural practices (IPCC, 2014; Rosa et al., 2020, Zhang et al., 2021). Nhemachena et al. (2010) demonstrate that the mixed crop-livestock farms are less sensitive to climate variations than specialized farms. Prommawin et al. (2022) suggested that households engaged in diversified production activities enterprises are better adapted to higher temperature. The intercropping can increase rain use efficiency and increase or stabilize crop yields (Kar et al., 2004; Agegnehu et al., 2008; Sileshi et al., 2011; Sileshi et al., 2012; Miller et al., 2016; Koskey et al., 2022). Drought-resistant crop varieties and other improved varieties are introduced in many studies as an effective strategy to deal with the negative rainfall shocks and stabilize the agricultural production (Xiong and Tarnavsky, 2020; Abou et al., 2021; Mwinkom et al., 2021; Kusiima, 2023). Livestock is another common production for rural African households, though its contribution to the total household income is generally small (Bundala et al., 2020; Kaumbata et al., 2020; Giller et al., 2021; Sekaran et al. 2021). Sekaran et al. (2021) concluded that the crop-livestock integration can improve agriculture production and address food security.

One significant gap in the literature seems to be the lack of studies analyzing the economic impact of climate change on agricultural households' production at the regional scale in Africa, despite many studies being conducted at the country scale. This may be due to a lack of household survey data with comparable information on agricultural livelihoods and climate change across countries. Some literature looks into the regional analysis of the nexus between climate resilience and agricultural diversification in Sub-Saharan Africa, drawing from the national-level scientific research and policy dialogues into the regional implication (Kray et al., 2019; Ires and Jacobs-Mata, 2022; and Jacobs-Mata and Girvetz, 2023).

This study endeavors to address the existing research gap by quantitatively assessing the economic impact of climate change and agricultural diversification on farm households in six Sub-Saharan African nations: Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda. The analysis is based on a repeated cross-sectional pooling dataset from the Living Standards Measurement Study – Integrity Surveys on Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) conducted between 2008-2016. The primary focus is to understand how these factors influence the economic value of agricultural production for the selected countries.

To the best of the author's knowledge, this study represents the first regional analysis of the interplay between climate resilience and agricultural diversification in Sub-Saharan Africa. Utilising the nationally representative, agriculturally intensive, and cross-country comparable LSMS-ISA data, this study aims to explore the intricate relationship between climate change and agricultural diversification for farm households across Africa's agricultural landscape. The study sheds light into the role of the agricultural diversification as an adaptation strategy for farm households in Sub-Saharan African countries. The regional scale of analysis could offer regional evidence about agricultural diversification as a climate resilience approach in Africa.

2. Methodology

This study discovers whether diversification of agricultural production increases farmers' economic resilience to climate change. The total value of agricultural output is used as an output measure of agricultural production. To identify diversification effects on economic resilience, this study regresses the total value of agricultural output on temperature and rainfall, among other control variables, with year and country fixed effects. In this setting, one can evaluate the differentiated climate change impacts on the household sub-samples *with* and *without* agricultural diversification.

This study considered a household as being diversified if it had either at least two agricultural activities or was categorized as both crops and livestock. This approach is similar in spirit to that in Lien et al. (2006), Birthal et al. (2013), Chonabayashi, Jithitikulchai, and Qu (2020), Chonabayashi (2021), and Prommawin et al. (2022).

This study assumed that households managed their farm to maximize their output value from various agricultural enterprises, taking the observable climate as given. Following

Chonabayashi, Jithitikulchai, and Qu (2020), this study considered the following equation to analyze the impacts of temperature and rainfall on the output value of farm households:

$$\ln \mathrm{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_{temp} temp + \beta_{temp^2} temp^2 + \beta_{precip} precip + \beta_{precip^2} precip^2$$
$$+\boldsymbol{\delta}'\boldsymbol{X} + \sum_{year} \beta_{year} \times I(year) + \sum_{country} \beta_{country} \times I(country) + u \quad (1)$$

where y is a vector of total value of agricultural output from production activities, $temp$ and $precip$ are temperature and precipitation variables, $\boldsymbol{X}$ is a matrix of exogenous variables including observable characteristics such as labor and land inputs, physical capacity of farm and livelihood, and other household attributes. The control variables also include spatial and temporal dummy variables, in which $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. The continuous explanatory variables have their square term to capture nonlinearity in their statistical associations with the output variable. The variable u represents a vector of stochastic disturbance components.

The parameters β_0, β_{temp}, β_{temp^2}, β_{precip}, β_{precip^2}, $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, $\{\beta_{year}\}$, $\{\beta_{country}\}$ are the regression coefficients to be estimated. To account for heteroskedasticity and spatially correlated errors, the statistical inference employs cluster-robust standard errors which allow intragroup correlation at the country-specific survey strata level, such as zone (in Ethiopia and Nigeria), TA (in Malawi), grappe (in Niger), or district (in Uganda and Tanzania). To accurately represent the farmer populations statistically, all calculations incorporate the sample households' stratified sampling weights.

To estimate the economic values of household enterprises *with* and *without* agricultural diversification, the study utilizes the regression coefficients from each model to simulate the total value of agricultural output, using the average characteristics of each country in the most recent year available. Specifically, the year dummy variable is fixed at 2016, as it corresponds to the most recent year covered by the LSMS-ISA data used in this study. Consequently, the economic valuation of the impacts of climate change and agricultural diversification on the total value of agricultural output will primarily be presented in terms of percentage points change, facilitating a clear understanding of the effects of these factors on agricultural production.

3. Data

The study utilized nationally representative household-level data from the Living Standards Measurement Study – Integrity Surveys on Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) project. LSMS-ISA is a multi-round survey that collects detailed agricultural information at plot and household levels and includes geo-referenced enumeration location data. There is a growing body of literature that analyses the LSMS-ISA data to explore Africa's agricultural landscape (Sheahan et al., 2014; Christiaensen, 2017; Sheahan and Barrett, 2017; Christiaensen et al., 2018; and Holden, 2018 among others). This study uses the cross-section datasets of six countries: Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda between 2008 and 2016. Total number of surveys conducted in this study is 19, as outlined in the following details.

- Ethiopia: 2011, 2013, 2015
- Malawi: 2010, 2013, 2016
- Niger: 2011, 2014
- Nigeria: 2010, 2012, 2015

- Tanzania: 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014
- Uganda: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2013

Agricultural households are defined as those with at least one member involved in the following agricultural activities: crop cultivation, livestock or poultry ownership, or both. This study classifies households that engage in multiple activities as diversified. This study uses the number of agricultural activities as a proxy of agricultural diversification indicators to measure household climate resilience. To further distinguish between different types of agricultural engagements among farming households, this study categorizes their activities as crop production, non-crop production, or a combination of both.

To assess the output of enterprises in the agricultural sector, this study employs the measure of agricultural value production, which is calculated by the value of cultivation of crops and livestock production. All monetary values are converted into 2011 USD levels using the consumer price index and purchasing power parity (PPP).

This study defines agricultural workers in a household includes self-employed and unpaid family workers in agriculture and hired non-family labor. Other explanatory variables include the size of land used for agricultural activities (in hectares), agricultural wealth index, index of access to infrastructure, gender and age of household head, and access to information identified as cellphone ownership. Regarding the capacity of physical capital and environment, this study considers both the agricultural wealth and infrastructure indexes given in the LSMS-ISA datasets. Both indexes provided the same conclusions in terms of positive or negative coefficient signs and relativity across farmers with different diversification types. This study uses the percentile of both indexes for ease of interpretation. The magnitude of changes from the percentage points of index distribution could be translated into output differentials. Following Mendelsohn, Nordhaus, and Shaw (1994), Fleischer, Lichtman, and Mendelsohn (2008), and Sanghi and Mendelsohn (2008); this study includes additional exogenous variables to capture earth's location heterogeneity including latitude, longitude, and altitude.

The LSMS-ISA household data contains annual climate variables such as temperature and precipitation, readily available in the survey datasets. This climate information is originally sourced from the UC Berkeley WorldClim dataset, providing global climate grids with a spatial resolution of approximately 1 square kilometer. The climate information covers the average annual temperature calculated from monthly climatology (°C) and total annual precipitation from monthly climatology (mm).

4. Results

This study investigates the impact of agricultural diversification on the output of agricultural households and their resilience to climate vulnerability. A key finding is that farmers who engage in agricultural diversification experience fewer impacts from rising temperatures compared with those without diversification. The main regression results are presented in Table 1, which broadly covers two categories: (a) all households and (b) sub-population households categorized by their level of diversification in agricultural activities.

The first classification (a) involves a regression analysis of *all* households using different types of dummy variables for diversification:

(a1) All agricultural households with a dummy variable for two agricultural activities, relative to one activity.

(a2) All agricultural households with two dummy variables, one for producing only livestock and the other for producing both crops and livestock - where both dummy variables are interpreted relative to producing crops only.

The second classification (b) covers four types of *sub-sample* agricultural households based on their diversification in agricultural activities:

(b1) Agricultural households produced crops only.

(b2) Agricultural households produced livestock only.

(b3) Agricultural households produced only one activity, either crops or livestock.

(b4) Agricultural households with two activities, producing both crops and livestock.

Impacts from temperature and precipitation

Table 1 shows that rising temperatures can have a substantial adverse effect on agricultural output value. Specifically, a one-degree Celsius increase in temperature, on average, can reduce agricultural output value by 14 percent for all agricultural households.

However, when examining the impacts of temperature on different types of farmers, based on their agricultural diversification practices, it becomes apparent that households with diversified crops and activities experience lesser impacts on their output than those without diversification. This suggests that diversification can be an effective strategy to mitigate the negative effects of temperature increases on agricultural output.

In addition, this study reveals that the relationship between temperature and agricultural production value is almost non-linear, with a positive impact observed for temperature squared. However, the coefficients for temperature squared are relatively small, at less than one percent for a one-degree Celsius increase. This indicates that the economic losses resulting from a temperature increase are significant and cumulative, and the positive coefficients of temperature squared are not sufficient to offset the decline in farmers' output.

Regarding precipitation, the study finds that it generally has a positive impact on agricultural output value. However, there are two exceptions: agricultural households that exclusively produce livestock, and those with only one activity (such as producing only crops or only livestock) experience a negative impact from precipitation. It is important to note that rainfall has the greatest positive impact on agricultural households with diversified crops and activities. Furthermore, the coefficients for rainfall squared are also negligible as those of the temperature squared.

As demonstrated in Appendix Table A1-A2, the sensitivity analysis utilizing different sets of control variables validates that farmers who practice crops and activity diversification encounter fewer negative impacts from rising temperatures and experience a positive influence from rainfall.

Impacts of labor, land, and physical capital capacity

Table 1 illustrates that an increase in either labor or land could have a positive impact on agricultural output value. However, the negative coefficients of their squared terms are relatively small.

For all households, a one-unit increase in agricultural worker is associated with a 3 percent increase in agricultural output value. However, the impact of labor on output value varies across different types of households. For households that exclusively produce crops, a one-unit increase in labor would lead to a 3 percent increase in output value. In contrast, for households that exclusively produce livestock, the output value would increase by 27 percent with the same increase in labor. This suggests that livestock production is more labor-intensive than crop production.

An increase of one hectare of land dedicated to agricultural activities is associated with a 15 percent increase in agricultural output value for all households. However, the effects of land size on households exclusively producing livestock are statistically insignificant, while an increase of one hectare for households exclusively producing crops would increase output by 17 percent. Thus, land appears to be more crucial for crop production than for livestock production.

This study also discovers positive impacts from higher levels of the agricultural wealth index and the index of access to infrastructure. Specifically, an increase of one standard deviation in the agricultural wealth index would result in a 36 percent increase in the total value of agricultural output for all households. The effects of agricultural capital capacity are more significant for non-diversified households. However, the index of access to infrastructure has smaller and mostly statistically insignificant slope coefficients.

Impacts from household characteristics

Farm households with a female head experience lower agricultural output value. The age of the household head has a non-linear positive impact on output, with older heads of households leading to higher output values. Access to information, as measured by owning a cellphone, is associated with a 12 percent increase in output value for all agricultural households. However, the effects of cellphone ownership vary across different household groups with or without diversification.

Impacts from spatial heterogeneity

Latitude does not have a significant effect on agricultural output value. However, there are negative effects from longitude, indicating that agricultural households located further to the east in SSA tend to have higher agricultural output. Additionally, this study finds that higher elevations have a negative impact on agricultural output. Furthermore, households located in rural areas tend to have higher output value. When comparing output values across countries, most countries have lower output value than Ethiopia, particularly farmers in Niger.

Impacts of agricultural diversification

We can observe from the slope coefficients of dummy variables for agricultural diversification in the regression model for *all* farm households that the impacts of diversification by having economic activities of both producing crops and livestock are notably large. Specifically, households with diversification have a 50 percent higher output value than households with only one activity.

Economic values of agricultural diversification and climate change adaptation

As illustrated in Tables 2-3, the economic valuation reveals that agricultural households that engage in diversification experience fewer negative impacts from increasing temperatures. A one-degree Celsius increase in temperature is associated with a 14% reduction in output for all agricultural households. However, households with agricultural diversification have a 50% higher output value than those engaged in only one activity. Furthermore, households that produce both crops and livestock experienced lower impacts from temperature increases. On the other hand, an increase in precipitation had the highest positive impact on output for households that engage in diversification.

Table 1: Regression results on log of total value of agricultural output

	All agricultural households		Subgroups of agricultural households			
	Control for diversification:					
Dependent variable: **Log of total value of agricultural output**	**a1) Two activities (relative to one activity)**	**a2) Livestock only or Mixed (relative to crops only)**	**b1) Only crops**	**b2) Only livestock**	**b3) One activity (only crops or livestock)**	**b4) Two activities (both crops and livestock)**
Annual Mean Temperature (Celsius)	-0.145***	-0.144***	-0.170**	-0.207**	-0.262***	-0.131***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.019)	(0.025)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Annual Mean Temperature (Celsius) squared	0.004***	0.003***	0.003*	0.005**	0.006***	0.003***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.051)	(0.047)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Avg 12-month total rainfall (mm/100)	0.044***	0.045***	0.063***	-0.089**	-0.032*	0.076***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.002)	(0.012)	(0.055)	(<0.001)
Avg 12-month total rainfall (mm/100) squared	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.003***	0.002	0.000	-0.003***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.123)	(0.897)	(<0.001)
Number of agricultural worker	0.026***	0.026***	0.029***	0.270***	0.032***	0.025***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Number of agricultural worker squared	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.010***	-0.000***	-0.000***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Land used for agriculture (hectares)	0.149***	0.150***	0.174***	0.081	0.164***	0.150***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.568)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Land used for agriculture (hectares) squared	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.001***	-0.007	-0.001***	-0.002***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.510)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Agricultural wealth index	0.363***	0.363***	0.511***	0.352**	0.471***	0.299***

Dependent variable: Log of total value of agricultural output	All agricultural households — Control for diversification: a1) Two activities (relative to one activity)	a2) Livestock only or Mixed (relative to crops only)	Subgroups of agricultural households — b1) Only crops	b2) Only livestock	b3) One activity (only crops or livestock)	b4) Two activities (both crops and livestock)
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.014)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Index of access to infrastructure	0.043*	0.043*	-0.056	-0.039	-0.014	0.033
	(0.097)	(0.093)	(0.253)	(0.773)	(0.764)	(0.276)
Female head (relative to male head)	-0.269***	-0.269***	-0.230***	-0.066	-0.218***	-0.274***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.467)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Age of head	0.021***	0.021***	0.023***	0.001	0.022***	0.020***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.970)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Age of head squared	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000	-0.000***	-0.000***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.839)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Household has a cellphone	0.114***	0.113***	0.117***	0.115	0.124***	0.111***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.130)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
EA Latitude	-0.003	-0.003	0.009	-0.065***	-0.024***	0.007*
	(0.387)	(0.395)	(0.250)	(0.006)	(<0.001)	(0.094)
EA Latitude squared	-0.001***	-0.001***	0.001**	0.001	-0.001**	-0.000*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.048)	(0.580)	(0.024)	(0.055)
EA Longitude	-0.025***	-0.026***	-0.053***	0.004	-0.030**	-0.013
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.916)	(0.047)	(0.125)
EA Longitude squared	0.001***	0.001***	0.001***	0.000	0.000	0.001***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.009)	(0.693)	(0.137)	(0.001)

	All agricultural households		Subgroups of agricultural households			
	Control for diversification:					
Dependent variable: **Log of total value of agricultural output**	**a1) Two activities (relative to one activity)**	**a2) Livestock only or Mixed (relative to crops only)**	**b1) Only crops**	**b2) Only livestock**	**b3) One activity (only crops or livestock)**	**b4) Two activities (both crops and livestock)**
Log of Elevation (m)	-0.316***	-0.314***	-0.211	-0.386*	-0.297**	-0.343***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.125)	(0.086)	(0.010)	(0.008)
Log of Elevation (m) squared	0.035***	0.035***	0.023	0.033	0.037***	0.037***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.124)	(0.257)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Rural (relative to urban)	0.425***	0.428***	0.377***	0.344***	0.427***	0.385***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Malawi (relative to Ethiopia)	-0.218**	-0.214**	0.242	-2.332***	-0.542***	0.067
	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.242)	(<0.001)	(0.002)	(0.536)
Niger (relative to Ethiopia)	-0.885***	-0.881***	-1.337***	0.260	-1.292***	-0.495***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.764)	(<0.001)	(0.005)
Nigeria (relative to Ethiopia)	-0.094	-0.091	0.266	0.406	0.172	0.082
	(0.472)	(0.489)	(0.332)	(0.577)	(0.500)	(0.591)
Tanzania (relative to Ethiopia)	-0.217***	-0.209***	0.375**	-1.504***	-0.487***	0.035
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.025)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.657)
Uganda (relative to Ethiopia)	-0.245***	-0.240***	0.186	-0.353	-0.374***	-0.050
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.233)	(0.281)	(0.004)	(0.468)
Year of survey conducted=2010 (relative to 2008)	0.068**	0.069**	-0.052	0.222	-0.035	0.093**
	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.383)	(0.372)	(0.551)	(0.013)
Year of survey conducted=2011 (relative to 2008)	0.435***	0.437***	0.499***	0.190	0.489***	0.408***

	All agricultural households		Subgroups of agricultural households			
	Control for diversification:					
Dependent variable: Log of total value of agricultural output	a1) Two activities (relative to one activity)	a2) Livestock only or Mixed (relative to crops only)	b1) Only crops	b2) Only livestock	b3) One activity (only crops or livestock)	b4) Two activities (both crops and livestock)
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.608)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Year of survey conducted=2012 (relative to 2008)	-0.075**	-0.075**	-0.078	0.079	-0.027	-0.016
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.183)	(0.748)	(0.643)	(0.672)
Year of survey conducted=2013 (relative to 2008)	0.008	0.010	0.093	-0.222	0.017	0.033
	(0.835)	(0.805)	(0.284)	(0.393)	(0.829)	(0.454)
Year of survey conducted=2015 (relative to 2008)	0.352***	0.353***	0.190**	-0.198	0.150**	0.380***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.011)	(0.457)	(0.036)	(<0.001)
Year of survey conducted=2016 (relative to 2008)	-0.524***	-0.523***	-0.544***	-0.311	-0.567***	-0.466***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.298)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Two activities (relative to one activity)	0.490***					
	(<0.001)					
Livestock only (relative to crops only)		0.046				
		(0.336)				
Mixed (relative to crops only)		0.496***				
		(<0.001)				
Constant	7.262***	7.233***	7.481***	9.642***	9.014***	7.047***
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)

Dependent variable: Log of total value of agricultural output	**All agricultural households**		**Subgroups of agricultural households**			
	Control for diversification:					
	a1) Two activities (relative to one activity)	**a2) Livestock only or Mixed (relative to crops only)**	**b1) Only crops**	**b2) Only livestock**	**b3) One activity (only crops or livestock)**	**b4) Two activities (both crops and livestock)**
Number of observations	46270	46270	15683	2553	18236	28034
R-squared	0.268	0.268	0.210	0.243	0.187	0.213
Adjusted R-squared	0.267	0.267	0.209	0.234	0.185	0.212

Note: Coefficients are the estimates of the standard linear regression using household-level data from the LSMS-ISA which covers Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda in 2008-2016. Standard errors are clustered at the level of the country-specific strata. Estimated coefficients with the cluster-robust p-values in parentheses (* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001).

Table 2: Economic valuation of impacts of climate and diversification to total value of agricultural output (million USD, 2011 PPP)

	Baseline: current practice of agricultural diversification		Simulation: updated practice of agricultural diversification			
	Control for diversification:					
	a1) Two activities (relative to one activity)	a2) Livestock only or Mixed (relative to crops only)	b1) Only crops	b2) Only livestock	b3) One activity (only crops or livestock)	b4) Two activities (both crops and livestock)
Agricultural output (million USD at 2011 PPP)	116,892	116,935	25,039	8,037	29,622	88,525
Increase in annual mean temperature (Celsius)						
0.50	-8,249.5	-8,185.2	-2,075.2	-768.8	-3,786.5	-5,618.1
1.00	-16,499.0	-16,370.5	-4,150.4	-1,537.6	-7,573.0	-11,236.2
1.50	-24,748.5	-24,555.7	-6,225.7	-2,306.4	-11,359.5	-16,854.3
2.00	-32,998.0	-32,740.9	-8,300.9	-3,075.2	-15,146.0	-22,472.4
Increase in avg 12-month total rainfall (mm/100)						
0.50	2,414.0	2,495.7	704.3	-357.3	-526.8	3,277.3
1.00	4,828.0	4,991.4	1,408.6	-714.5	-1,053.6	6,554.6
1.50	7,242.0	7,487.1	2,112.8	-1,071.8	-1,580.5	9,831.9
2.00	9,655.9	9,982.8	2,817.1	-1,429.0	-2,107.3	13,109.2
Two activities (relative to one activity)	57,441.0					
Livestock only (relative to crops only)		5,435.3				
Mixed (relative to crops only)		58,246.2				

Table 3: Impacts of climate and diversification to total value of agricultural output (as % changed)

	Baseline: current practice of agricultural diversification		Simulation: updated practice of agricultural diversification			
	Control for diversification:					
	a1) Two activities (relative to one activity)	a2) Livestock only or Mixed (relative to crops only)	b1) Only crops	b2) Only livestock	b3) One activity (only crops or livestock)	b4) Two activities (both crops and livestock)
Increase in annual mean temperature (Celsius)						
0.50	-7.1%	-7.0%	-8.3%	-9.6%	-12.8%	-6.3%
1.00	-14.1%	-14.0%	-16.6%	-19.1%	-25.6%	-12.7%
1.50	-21.2%	-21.0%	-24.9%	-28.7%	-38.3%	-19.0%
2.00	-28.2%	-28.0%	-33.2%	-38.3%	-51.1%	-25.4%
Increase in avg 12-month total rainfall (mm/100)						
0.50	2.1%	2.1%	2.8%	-4.4%	-1.8%	3.7%
1.00	4.1%	4.3%	5.6%	-8.9%	-3.6%	7.4%
1.50	6.2%	6.4%	8.4%	-13.3%	-5.3%	11.1%
2.00	8.3%	8.5%	11.3%	-17.8%	-7.1%	14.8%
Two activities (relative to one activity)	49.1%					
Livestock only (relative to crops only)		4.6%				
Mixed (relative to crops only)		49.8%				

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Climate change is a pressing issue that poses risks such as drought and flooding. Extreme weather events have adverse effects on the economy, leading to economic losses and hindering growth. Climate change is expected to increase the frequency of severe weather events, leading to higher economic damages. Vulnerable populations, such as poor farmers, are particularly susceptible to income loss, potentially leading to a lifelong cycle of poverty. Despite numerous studies being conducted at the country scale, there is a lack of research analyzing the economic impact of climate change and agricultural diversification on agricultural households' livelihoods at the regional scale in Africa. A multi-country study is necessary to assess the impacts of weather shocks and climate resilience on the region more comprehensively.

The purpose of this study is to document the nexus of climate change and agricultural diversification as an adaptation strategy for the farm households in six Sub-Saharan African countries spreading across the Africa continent. In summary, this study highlights the importance of agricultural diversification in mitigating the negative impacts of climate change on agricultural output in Sub-Saharan Africa. The findings suggest that promoting diversified farming practices could be a critical strategy to improve the resilience of farm households in the region, particularly as the effects of climate change continue to worsen. This study reveals that a one-degree Celsius increase in temperature is linked with a 14% decline in agricultural output for all households. However, households that engage in agricultural diversification are expected to have about 50% higher agricultural output compared to the overall average, holding other things equal constant (ceteris paribus), indicating that diversification can help mitigate the negative impacts of climate change.

Even though there are large cross-country variations such as agricultural intensification and fertilizer uses (Holden, 2018) indicating that policies should be country-specific. Furthermore, Sheahan and Barrett (2014) and Sheahan and Barrett (2017) documented variations within-country heterogeneity, especially in some large countries such as Ethiopia and Nigeria. Nevertheless, the Africa's scenarios of rise in temperature and decline in precipitation with more frequent and severe extreme weather events are more likely expected, while the poor farmers in Africa have limited adaptation capacity to cope with climate shocks. The regional scale of analysis could provide insightful evidence for a confirmation of agricultural adaptation as a climate resilience strategy for the continent.

Following Kray e al. (2018), policies for productive diversification are broadly grouping into six categories: (1) Subsidies and agricultural public expenditure; (2) Rural infrastructure and markets; (3) Agricultural research, and seed systems; (4) Agricultural advisory services, skills development, and agripreneurship; (5) Natural capital, land and water tenure; and (6) Nutrition, health, and social protection. The allocation of limited resources requires the deliberation of local context and evidence-based research. Kray e al. (2018) also pointed out that the agricultural input support programs often have resulted in increased agricultural specialisation but in turn costing the agroecosystem resilience and nutritional diversity.

There are some cautions on policy interpretations from this study. If the farm is situated in a natural setting that promotes the growth of specific staple crops, either due to soil composition or a unique pattern of rainfall and temperature, and it has access to well-functioning markets to sell its product and acquire a variety of nutritious foods, then opting for specialization could be a more favourable choice (Kray et al., 2019).

Econometrically, the author suggests taking into account the non-stationarity of the climate change evidenced in the continent (Gosoniu et al., 2009; Karambiri et al., 2011; Djibo et al., 2015; Garcia-Aristizabalet al., 2015; De Paola et al., 2018; McBride et al., 2022). A reviewer of this manuscript highly recommended using variations in temperature and rainfall from the mean as the key explanatory variables to capture the long-term variability of climate change. Lastly, to connect economic interactions at the micro and the macro levels, the aggregation of the farming systems *with* and *without* agricultural diversification could be addressed for individual heterogeneity such as applying an impact evaluation's methodological framework of balancing the farmer characteristics between cohorts. Please note that the estimation of economic values of households *with* and *without* agricultural diversification in this study already has a fixed characteristic pattern for each country.

Even so, the finding from this study highlights the need for policies and interventions that encourage farmers to diversify their agricultural production, such as promoting the cultivation of multiple crops and the use of integrated farming systems. Therefore, this study underscores the urgent need for effective strategies to help farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa cope with the impacts of climate change.

By promoting agricultural diversification and other resilience-building measures, governments and other stakeholders can help to build a more sustainable and resilient agricultural sector in the region. The desirable incentives to promote agricultural diversification should incorporate the goals of poverty reduction and sustainable development that in turn will enhance the climate resiliency in Sub-Saharan Africa, covering about one-fifth of the total land surface of Earth and sixty percent of the global poor living under the extreme poverty line.

References

Abou, S., Ali, M., Wakponou, A. and Sambo, A., 2021. Sorghum farmers' climate change adaptation strategies in the semiarid region of Cameroon. In African handbook of climate change adaptation 147-165. Springer International Publishing.

Agegnehu, G., Ghizaw, A. and Sinebo, W., 2008. Yield potential and land-use efficiency of wheat and faba bean mixed intercropping. Agronomy for sustainable development, 28, 257-263.

Attavanich, W. and McCarl, B.A., 2014. How is CO 2 affecting yields and technological progress? A statistical analysis. Climatic change, 124, 747-762.

Ault, T.R., 2020. On the essentials of drought in a changing climate. Science, 368(6488), 256-260.

Birthal, P.S., Joshi, P.K., Roy, D. and Thorat, A., 2013. Diversification in Indian agriculture toward high-value crops: The role of small farmers. Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue canadienne d'agroeconomie, 61(1), 61-91.

Brown, M.E., Funk, C., Pedreros, D., Korecha, D., Lemma, M., Rowland, J., Williams, E. and Verdin, J., 2017. A climate trend analysis of Ethiopia: examining subseasonal climate impacts on crops and pasture conditions. Climatic Change, 142, 169-182.

Bundala, N., Kinabo, J., Jumbe, T., Rybak, C. and Sieber, S., 2020. Does homestead livestock production and ownership contribute to consumption of animal source foods? A pre-intervention assessment of rural farming communities in Tanzania. Scientific African, 7, p.e00252.

Chonabayashi, S., Jithitikulchai, T. and Qu, Y., 2020. Does agricultural diversification build economic resilience to drought and flood? Evidence from poor households in Zambia. African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 15(311-2020-1781), 65-80.

Chonabayashi, S. 2021. Essays in Environmental and Development Economics. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cornell University.Christiaensen, L., 2017. Agriculture in Africa – Telling myths from facts: A synthesis. Food Policy, 67, pp.1-11.

Christiaensen, L., Demery, L., Dillon, B., Barrett, CB., Deininger, KW.., Savastano, S., Xia, F., Adjognon, GS., Liverpool-Tasie, LS O.., Reardon, T., Carletto, C., Corral, P., Guelfi, A., McCullough, EB., Palacios-Lopez, A., Kilic, T., Davis, BK., Di Giuseppe, S., Zezza, A., Nagler, P., Naude, W., Sheahan, MB., Binswanger-Mkhize, HP., Omonona, BT., Sanou, A., Ogunleye, WO., Miller, DC., Munoz Mora, JC., Nikoloski, ZS., Hill, R., Ndiaye, M., d'Hotel, EM., Cotty, TL. and Kaminski, J., 2018. Agriculture in Africa - Telling myths from facts. Washington, D.C., World Bank Group.

Damania, R., Desbureaux, S., Hyland, M., Islam, A., Rodella, A.S., Russ, J. and Zaveri, E., 2017. Uncharted waters: The new economics of water scarcity and variability. World Bank Publications.De Paola, F., Giugni, M., Pugliese, F., Annis, A. and Nardi, F., 2018. GEV parameter estimation and stationary vs. non-stationary analysis of extreme rainfall in African test cities. Hydrology, 5(2), p.28.

Djibo, A.G., Seidou, O., Karambiri, H., Sittichok, K., Paturel, J.E. and Saley, H.M., 2015. Development and assessment of non-linear and non-stationary seasonal rainfall forecast models for the Sirba watershed, West Africa. Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies, 4, pp.134-152.

Fleischer, A., Lichtman, I. and Mendelsohn, R., 2008. Climate change, irrigation, and Israeli agriculture: Will warming be harmful?. Ecological economics, 65(3), 508-515.

Gannon, C., Kandy, D., Turner, J., Kumar, I., Pilli-Sihvola, K., & Chanda, F. S. (2014). Near-term climate change in Zambia. Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre, The Hague.

Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Bucchignani, E., Palazzi, E., D'Onofrio, D., Gasparini, P. and Marzocchi, W., 2015. Analysis of non-stationary climate-related extreme events considering climate change scenarios: an application for multi-hazard assessment in the Dar es Salaam region, Tanzania. Natural Hazards, 75, pp.289-320.

Giller, K.E., Delaune, T., Silva, J.V., van Wijk, M., Hammond, J., Descheemaeker, K., van de Ven, G., Schut, A.G., Taulya, G., Chikowo, R. and Andersson, J.A., 2021. Small farms and development in sub-Saharan Africa: Farming for food, for income or for lack of better options?. Food Security, 13(6), 1431-1454.

Gosoniu, L., Vounatsou, P., Sogoba, N., Maire, N. and Smith, T., 2009. Mapping malaria risk in West Africa using a Bayesian nonparametric non-stationary model. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis, 53(9), pp.3358-3371.

Hallegatte, S. and Rozenberg, J., 2017. Climate change through a poverty lens. Nature Climate Change, 7(4), 250-256.

Hallegatte, S., Vogt-Schilb, A., Bangalore, M. and Rozenberg, J., 2016. Unbreakable: building the resilience of the poor in the face of natural disasters. World Bank Publications.

Holden, S.T., 2018. Fertilizer and sustainable intensification in Sub-Saharan Africa. Global food security, 18, pp.20-26.IPCC. 2014. Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

IPCC. 2021. Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Synthesis report.

Ires, I. and Jacobs-Mata, I., 2022. Policy support for climate-resilient agricultural transformations: IPSR innovation profile. First edition, December 2022. Montpellier: CGIAR System Organization.

Jacobs-Mata, I. and Girvetz, E.H., 2023. CGIAR initiative on Ukama Ustawi: Diversification for resilient agrifood systems in East and Southern Africa: 2022 Technical Report. Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR).

Kar, G., Singh, R. and Verma, H.N., 2004. Alternative cropping strategies for assured and efficient crop production in upland rainfed rice areas of eastern India based on rainfall analysis. Agricultural Water Management, 67(1), 47-62.

Karambiri, H., García Galiano, S.G., Giraldo, J.D., Yacouba, H., Ibrahim, B., Barbier, B. and Polcher, J., 2011. Assessing the impact of climate variability and climate change on runoff in West Africa: the case of Senegal and Nakambe River basins. Atmospheric Science Letters, 12(1), pp.109-115.

Kaumbata, W., Banda, L., Mészáros, G., Gondwe, T., Woodward-Greene, M.J., Rosen, B.D., Van Tassell, C.P., Sölkner, J. and Wurzinger, M., 2020. Tangible and intangible benefits of local goats rearing in smallholder farms in Malawi. Small Ruminant Research, 187, p.106095.

Koskey, G., Leoni, F., Carlesi, S., Avio, L. and Bàrberi, P., 2022. Exploiting plant functional diversity in durum wheat–lentil relay intercropping to stabilize crop yields under contrasting climatic conditions. Agronomy, 12(1), p.210.Kray, H.A., Heumesser, C., Mikulcak, F., Giertz, A. and Bucik , M., 2019. Productive diversification in African agriculture and its effects on resilience and nutrition (English). Washington, D.C. : World Bank Group.

Kusiima, A., 2023. Assessing the effectiveness of climate change adaptation interventions by Agro-pastoralists in Nabiswera sub-county. Doctoral dissertation, Makerere University , Uganda.

Lien, G., Flaten, O., Jervell, A.M., Ebbesvik, M., Koesling, M. and Valle, P.S., 2006. Management and risk characteristics of part-time and full-time farmers in Norway. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 28(1), 111-131.

Mano, R. and Nhemachena, C., 2007. Assessment of the economic impacts of climate change on agriculture in Zimbabwe: A Ricardian approach. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, (4292).

McBride, C.M., Kruger, A.C. and Dyson, L., 2022. Trends in probabilities of temperature records in the non-stationary climate of South Africa. International Journal of Climatology, 42(3), pp.1692-1705.

Mendelsohn, R., Emanuel, K., Chonabayashi, S. and Bakkensen, L., 2012. The impact of climate change on global tropical cyclone damage. Nature climate change, 2(3), 205-209.

Mendelsohn, R., Nordhaus, W.D. and Shaw, D., 1994. The impact of global warming on agriculture: a Ricardian analysis. The American economic review, 753-771.

Mwinkom, F.X., Damnyag, L., Abugre, S. and Alhassan, S.I., 2021. Factors influencing climate change adaptation strategies in North-Western Ghana: Evidence of farmers in the Black Volta Basin in Upper West region. SN Applied Sciences, 3, 1-20.

Nhemachena, C., Hassan, R. and Kurukulasuriya, P., 2010. Measuring the economic impact of climate change on African agricultural production systems. Climate Change Economics, 1(01), 33-55.

Nikoloski, Zlatko, Luc Christiaensen, and Ruth Hill. 2018. Household shocks and coping mechanism: evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington D.C: World Bank :123–134.

Rosa, L., Chiarelli, D.D., Sangiorgio, M., Beltran-Peña, A.A., Rulli, M.C., D'Odorico, P. and Fung, I., 2020. Potential for sustainable irrigation expansion in a 3 C warmer climate. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(47), 29526-29534.

Sanghi, A. and Mendelsohn, R., 2008. The impacts of global warming on farmers in Brazil and India. Global Environmental Change, 18(4), 655-665.

Sekaran, U., Lai, L., Ussiri, D.A., Kumar, S. and Clay, S., 2021. Role of integrated crop-livestock systems in improving agriculture production and addressing food security–A review. Journal of Agriculture and Food Research, 5, p.100190.

Sesmero, J., Ricker-Gilbert, J. and Cook, A., 2018. How do African farm households respond to changes in current and past weather patterns? A structural panel data analysis from Malawi. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 100(1), 115-144.

Sheahan, M., Barrett, C.B. and Sheahan, M.B., 2014. Understanding the agricultural input landscape in Sub-Saharan Africa: recent plot, household, and community-level evidence. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, (7014).

Sheahan, M. and Barrett, C.B., 2017. Ten striking facts about agricultural input use in Sub-Saharan Africa. Food policy, 67, pp.12-25.

Sileshi, G.W., Akinnifesi, F.K., Ajayi, O.C. and Muys, B., 2011. Integration of legume trees in maize-based cropping systems improves rain use efficiency and yield stability under rain-fed agriculture. Agricultural water management, 98(9), 1364-1372.

Sileshi, G.W., Debusho, L.K. and Akinnifesi, F.K., 2012. Can integration of legume trees increase yield stability in rainfed maize cropping systems in Southern Africa?. Agronomy Journal, 104(5), 1392-1398.

Skoufias, E., 2012. The poverty and welfare impacts of climate change: quantifying the effects, identifying the adaptation strategies. World Bank Publications.

USGCRP. 2017. Fourth national climate assessment. Technical report, U.S. Global Change Research Program.

Xiong, W. and Tarnavsky, E., 2020. Better agronomic management increases climate resilience of maize to drought in Tanzania. Atmosphere, 11(9), p.982.

Zhang, X., Yao, G., Vishwakarma, S., Dalin, C., Komarek, A.M., Kanter, D.R., Davis, K.F., Pfeifer, K., Zhao, J., Zou, T. and D'Odorico, P., 2021. Quantitative assessment of agricultural sustainability reveals divergent priorities among nations. One Earth, 4(9), 1262-1277.

Appendix

Table A1: Sensitivity analysis of temperature impacts on log of total value of agricultural output

	Subgroups of agricultural households				Control variables of regression fitting				
	Only crops	Only livestock	One activity (only crops or livestock)	Two activities (both crops and livestock)	Year and Country	Geographic Coordinates	Rural	Physical Capacity	Household Characteristics
Average temperature	-0.170**	-0.207**	-0.262***	-0.131***	o	o	o	o	o
	(0.019)	(0.025)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature squared	0.003*	0.005**	0.006***	0.003***					
	(0.051)	(0.047)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature	-0.201***	-0.221***	-0.242***	-0.131***	o		o	o	o
	(0.003)	(0.010)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature squared	0.004**	0.005**	0.005***	0.003***					
	(0.010)	(0.011)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature	-0.172**	-0.251***	-0.239***	-0.128***	o	o		o	o
	(0.014)	(0.005)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature squared	0.003*	0.006***	0.005***	0.003***					
	(0.051)	(0.008)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature	-0.142*	-0.297***	-0.216***	-0.123***	o	o	o		o
	(0.057)	(0.002)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature squared	0.003	0.006***	0.005***	0.003***					
	(0.119)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(<0.001)					

	Subgroups of agricultural households				Control variables of regression fitting				
	Only crops	**Only livestock**	**One activity (only crops or livestock)**	**Two activities (both crops and livestock)**	**Year and Country**	**Geographic Coordinates**	**Rural**	**Physical Capacity**	**Household Characteristics**
Average temperature	-0.167**	-0.242***	-0.230***	-0.118***	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**	
	(0.016)	(0.006)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature squared	0.003*	0.005***	0.005***	0.002***					
	(0.058)	(0.008)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature	-0.151**	-0.297***	-0.209***	-0.102***	**o**				
	(0.036)	(0.002)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)					
Average temperature squared	0.003*	0.007***	0.005***	0.002***					
	(0.073)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)					

Note: The ordinary least square coefficients of annual mean temperature (Celsius) on log of total value of agricultural output. The common control variables in all models are year and country dummy variables. The geographic coordinates cover latitude, longitude, elevation, and their squared terms. The rural control variable is a dummy variable relative to urban areas. The physical capacity covers number of agricultural worker and its squared, land used for agricultural activities in hectare and its squared, agricultural wealth index, and index of access to infrastructure. The household characteristics cover female head dummy variable, age of head and its squared, and dummy variable whether the household owns a cellphone.

Table A2: Sensitivity analysis of precipitation impacts on log of total value of agricultural output

	Subgroups of agricultural households				Control variables of regression fitting				
	Only crops	Only livestock	One activity (only crops or livestock)	Two activities (both crops and livestock)	Year and Country	Geographic Coordinates	Rural	Physical Capacity	Household Characteristics
Average total rainfall	0.063***	-0.089**	-0.032*	0.076***	o	o	o	o	o
	(0.002)	(0.012)	(0.055)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall squared	-0.003***	0.002	0.000	-0.003***					
	(<0.001)	(0.123)	(0.897)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall	0.061***	-0.133***	-0.020	0.059***	o		o	o	o
	(0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.226)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall squared	-0.003***	0.005***	-0.000	-0.002***					
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.900)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall	0.065***	-0.105***	-0.036**	0.080***	o	o		o	o
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.038)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall squared	-0.003***	0.003**	0.000	-0.003***					
	(0.001)	(0.021)	(0.854)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall	0.056***	-0.079**	-0.017	0.093***	o	o	o		o
	(0.006)	(0.030)	(0.308)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall squared	-0.003***	0.002	-0.001	-0.004***					
	(<0.001)	(0.283)	(0.158)	(<0.001)					

	Subgroups of agricultural households				Control variables of regression fitting				
	Only crops	**Only livestock**	**One activity (only crops or livestock)**	**Two activities (both crops and livestock)**	**Year and Country**	**Geographic Coordinates**	**Rural**	**Physical Capacity**	**Household Characteristics**
Average total rainfall	0.055***	-0.076**	-0.040**	0.076***	**o**	**o**	**o**	**o**	
	(0.008)	(0.031)	(0.020)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall squared	-0.002***	0.002	0.000	-0.003***					
	(0.003)	(0.125)	(0.692)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall	0.061***	-0.145***	0.002	0.082***	**o**				
	(0.002)	(<0.001)	(0.903)	(<0.001)					
Average total rainfall squared	-0.004***	0.005***	-0.001**	-0.004***					
	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(0.041)	(<0.001)					

Note: The ordinary least square coefficients of average 12-month total rainfall (mm/100) on log of total value of agricultural output. The common control variables in all models are year and country dummy variables. The geographic coordinates cover latitude, longitude, elevation, and their squared terms. The rural control variable is a dummy variable relative to urban areas. The physical capacity covers number of agricultural worker and its squared, land used for agricultural activities in hectare and its squared, agricultural wealth index, and index of access to infrastructure. The household characteristics cover female head dummy variable, age of head and its squared, and dummy variable whether the household owns a cellphone.