



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/157756/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Ghanian, Mansour, Ghoochani, Omid, Dehghanpour, Mojtaba et al. (2020) Understanding farmers' climate adaptation intention in Iran: a protection-motivation extended model. *Land Use Policy*. pp. 1-13. ISSN: 0264-8377

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104553>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 Understanding farmers' climate adaptation intention in Iran: a protection-motivation 2 extended model

3
4 Mansour Ghanian, Omid M. Ghoochani, Mojtaba Dehghanpour, Milad Taqipour, Fatemeh
5 Taheri, Matthew Cotton.

6
7 Author's preprint manuscript accepted for publication in *Land Use Policy*.

8 9 Abstract

10 Adaptation to climate change is a matter of urgent social scientific analysis. Within the
11 agricultural sector of many developing nations, farmers must make long-term decisions to
12 adapt to climate change impacts in order to provide food security and sustainable livelihoods.
13 However, deeper understanding of farmers' decision-making, as a key stakeholder group, is of
14 vital importance in forming adaptive land use policy 'from the bottom-up'. This study
15 investigates the psychosocial factors that influence farmers' adaptation intention in the critical
16 case of Marvdasht County in Iran – a case that exemplifies agricultural stakeholder decision-
17 making in arid and drought-prone regions. We present a conceptual combination-model
18 grounded in Protection Motivation Theory (PMT), employing a correlational survey among
19 256 farmer-stakeholders. First, we discuss the relative value of the combined model to
20 understanding adaptation intentions. Second, we find that the factors that represent the
21 externalities of farmers' behaviour need to be more thoroughly integrated in to adaptation
22 planning. Third, we find that farmers' adaptation intention is directly affected by
23 maladaptation, and indirectly by economic disincentives, barriers to belief in anthropogenic
24 climate change and broader risk perceptions.

25 **Keywords:** Climate Change; Adaptation; Protection Motivation Theory; Combined Model;
26 Marvdasht Township.

27 28 29 1. Introduction

30 Climate change influences temperature and rainfall patterns, ocean pH, snow and ice cover,
31 and weather variability - leading to systemic shocks, including natural disasters such as severe
32 drought and famine, hurricane and heat waves (Coumou and Rahmstorf, 2012). It also creates
33 longer-term stresses on ecosystems, upon human infrastructures and resources, including those
34 for energy, transport, potable water, irrigation and sanitation capacity, and upon agricultural
35 productivity (Howden et al., 2007). Anthropogenic climate change thus severely and rapidly
36 impacts upon humans societies through their links to rapidly changing natural systems
37 (Wheeler and Von Braun, 2013).

38 Agricultural management is a key climate adaptation objective from a human development
39 perspective (Azadi et al., 2015; Bartolini and Viaggi, 2013; Ostwald and Chen, 2006; Thornton
40 et al., 2009). Agriculture sustains rural livelihoods and is a primary growth factor for many
41 developing economies: contributing to poverty reduction, economic development and the
42 supply of environmental services (Ghanian et al., 2016; van Dijk et al., 2016). However, the
43 agricultural sector is inherently sensitive to climate change (Ghoochani et al., 2017; Wheeler
44 and Von Braun, 2013) through biodiversity loss, crop failure, water access loss, disease and
45 pest pressure (Altieri et al., 2015; Howden et al., 2007; Turrall et al., 2011). Climate change
46 impacts are felt most acutely within localized food systems, and smallholder farmers are
47 particularly vulnerable (Misra, 2017). Despite recent global progress in improving food
48 security (Abbasi et al., 2016), climate change threatens to increase the challenges of famine
49 and hunger across the developing world (Hanjra and Qureshi, 2010). Thus impacts vary
50 depending upon the changes in rainfall patterns and temperature which are, in turn,

1 differentiated across geographic regions (Vermeulen et al., 2012). This makes national-scale
2 policy responses difficult to implement. Although rapid progress in ending global hunger has
3 been seen in recent decades, climate change currently threatens to slow down or reverse such
4 progress (Wheeler and Von Braun, 2013).

5 In addition to direct crop-yield effects, climate change also creates knock-on negative
6 impacts on the socio-ecological systems surrounding agricultural practices, such as increased
7 pollution from nutrient transport and sediment loading (Lee et al., 2006; Roesch-McNally et
8 al., 2017). Climate and agricultural impacts are therefore mutually related and self-reinforcing,
9 with agriculture both driving and being influenced by climate change. Current research has
10 demonstrated interactive changes in atmospheric composition through to the extensive
11 modification of Earth's ecosystems as a result of agricultural activity (Cerdà et al., 2016; Foley
12 et al., 2005; Lawniczak et al., 2016; Rojas-Downing et al., 2017; Tilman and Clark, 2015). As
13 such, adaptation responses within the agricultural sector must also remain mitigation-sensitive
14 and thus reduce GHG-related impacts and other eco-systemic disruptive effects.

15 From a human development perspective, there are multiple agricultural system-properties
16 that must be assessed and integrated with our understanding of global climate change impacts
17 and responses (Janssen et al., 2015). An agricultural system contains myriad social, cultural,
18 political, economic and institutional factors which influence their sensitivity to climate change
19 (Bryant et al., 2000); and also their resilience, vulnerability, and flexibility in the face of it
20 (Folke, 2006). To reduce the risks to farming systems and to combat potential welfare losses,
21 smallholder farmers in particular need to recognize climatic changes and undertake appropriate
22 investments for both mitigation and adaptation strategies (Altieri and Nicholls, 2017; Cooper
23 et al., 2008; Howden et al., 2007; Roesch-McNally et al., 2017; Thomas et al., 2007).
24 Mitigation entails all anthropogenic interventions or policies aimed towards reducing GHG
25 emissions or enhancing the sinks for GHGs. On a global level, mitigation is essential to
26 minimize future negative impacts (Elum et al., 2017). However, at smaller national, regional,
27 or local-community scales, mitigation strategies will differ depending on the level of economic
28 development and their relative growth perspectives. In practical terms, for smallholder farmers
29 *adaptation* responses are of particular concern (IPCC, 2007). Adaptation refers to the
30 adjustments to practices, processes and systems of land use, technology implementation, social
31 practices and policy responses necessary to minimize current, and/or future adverse effects of
32 climate change, and to take advantage of available opportunities to maximize benefits
33 (Eriksen et al., 2011; Hirte et al., 2018). The development of what is often termed *adaptive*
34 *capacity* for agricultural systems include changes to (Keshavarz et al., 2014; Smit and
35 Skinner, 2002):

- 36 1) Farm production practices, (including planning for land productivity and ecosystem
37 services: e.g. soil quality, water quality, and irrigation water management)
- 38 2) Farm financial and physical capital resource management (e.g. farm size, livestock,
39 on-farm structures)
- 40 3) Technological developments, (e.g. irrigation equipment and crop varieties)
- 41 4) Government programs to reduce farmer vulnerability (e.g. maximising income,
42 savings, credit, and crop insurance).

43 Adaptation can (and should) occur at many different geographic and governance scales
44 (Eriksen et al., 2011). The best-practice in adaptation planning is commonly recognized to
45 occur from the 'bottom up' at *local scales* of assessment (Adger et al., 2013; Ayers and Forsyth,
46 2009; Urwin and Jordan, 2008; Van Aalst et al., 2008; Wright et al., 2014), by taking into
47 account governance scale, institutional, technological, economic and political capacities
48 (Rayner, 2010), and livelihood strategies (Rahman et al., 2018). For farmers specifically,

1 adaptation decision-making takes place within the context of planning for their farm business,
2 and the maintenance of livelihood capital over time (Kuang et al., 2019). Such planning
3 necessarily involves changes to land use practices over both short and long-term timescales.
4 This is particularly true of rural communities within developing countries with limited
5 resources and technology (Wang et al., 2019). Adaptation planning strategies include
6 resilience-raising products and changes to production practice: e.g. changes in crop type and
7 variety, changes to fertilizer and seed types (and quality), pesticide use changes, the planting
8 of shade trees, water storage, improved irrigation mechanisms, and farm livelihood
9 diversification (Fahad and Wang, 2018; Grüneis et al., 2018). Adaptation decision-making is
10 also in response to both climatic and non-climatic stimuli, and the broader social, political, and
11 economic system(s) within which they operate (Bradshaw et al., 2004), including cultural,
12 social capital and place-based influences (Khanian et al., 2017; Saptutyningasih et al., 2019).

13 Given the vulnerability of smallholder farmers' livelihoods to climate change, short and
14 long-term adaptation decision-making amongst farming populations has become an important
15 research topic for land-use and social development research (Burnham and Ma, 2016; Dang et
16 al., 2018; Jamshidi et al., 2015). Moreover, though adaptation decision-making can be assessed
17 at individual, household, community, regional, sectorial, national, and global settings (Bryant
18 et al., 2000), for development practice the individual-farm-level scale remains vitally
19 important.

20 Generally speaking, public perceptions of climate adaptation are important dimensions of
21 public action towards adopting pro-environmental behaviors and social practices (Adger, 2003;
22 Cotton and Stevens, 2018; Elum et al., 2017; Grothmann and Patt, 2005; Tripathi and Mishra,
23 2017). However, it is commonly found that climate change is socio-culturally 'invisible' to
24 many public stakeholders (Adger, 2001; Nelson et al., 2002; Wolf, 2011), in the sense that the
25 impacts of climate change (e.g. drought, flooding, biodiversity loss), appear spatially and
26 temporally distant and diffuse, and so are often construed in abstract, rather than concrete terms
27 (Spence et al., 2012a). Given the global nature of climate systems, there is temporal and
28 geographic distance between cause and effect of climate change; perceptions of climate change
29 therefore qualitatively differ from other locally perceptible environmental problems such as
30 water pollution, municipal waste management or urban air quality (Weber and Stern, 2011),
31 and climate change is perceived as an abstract problem for many people (Moser, 2010).
32 Ironically, this perception of climate change as distant or abstract may occur even when
33 individuals directly observe or experience environmental change within their lifetime. In the
34 context of empirical development research, however, regions that have historical experience of
35 extreme weather (such as frequent flooding or prolonged, extensive, and severe drought) will
36 likely have a more concrete understanding of climate change impacts in the region in terms of
37 the increasing likelihood, frequency and severity of such events (Keshavarz et al., 2013). It is,
38 therefore, of interest to climate change, development and land use researchers to understand
39 the relationship between the experience of extreme weather-related impacts, perceptions of
40 climate change and *intentions* to act given this knowledge and experience, i.e. how do
41 vulnerable groups intend to change their production practices and livelihood strategies in the
42 face of climate change stressors (Roesch-McNally et al., 2017)?

43 44 **1.2 Agricultural adaptation in Iran**

45 The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region is particularly vulnerable to climate
46 change. It is one of the world's most arid regions, coupled with high dependency on climate-
47 sensitive agriculture and a high proportion of its population and economic activity in flood-
48 prone urban coastal zones (Evans, 2009; Sowers et al., 2011). Within this region, Iran is
49 particularly vulnerable (Karimi et al., 2018) due to its smallholder agricultural productivity
50 driving rural livelihoods and economic development under conditions of climate-sensitive

1 ecological conditions (Nassiri et al., 2006). Agriculture in an essential politico-economic issue
2 for Iranian development outcomes. Since 1980 the Iranian government has prioritized land use
3 towards agricultural productivity to keep food prices low. This protects consumers by
4 guaranteeing food security and ensures greater government stability. To this aim the Iranian
5 government has used barrier-trade policies and direct intervention in the price of foodstuff and
6 inputs (Gilanpour, 2006). However, productivity and food security are threatened by extreme
7 weather events, e.g. Iran has experienced 27 drought occurrences in the last 40 years
8 (Amirkhani, 2009). Iran is an important case from a climate and development perspective, as
9 although the World Bank assigns Iran's economies into upper-middle-income groups, major
10 limitations such as lack of conclusive regulations, educational programs and infrastructure,
11 have contributed to slowing national economic development (Sayyed, 2013). In other words,
12 despite its classification, it still has more in common with developing countries than developed
13 ones.

14 Our case study is the Marvdasht County in Fars Province. The case study is important for
15 three reasons. Firstly, Marvdasht is one of highest agricultural production regions (e.g. it is
16 ranked first in wheat production within the province). Secondly, both arable and pastoral
17 farming take place, primarily by smallholders. Thirdly, meteorological data show that
18 Marvdasht is one of the highest risk regions Iran for drought (Keshavarz and Karami, 2014).
19 Yet, given a relative paucity of information on farmers' adaptation intentions across the country
20 (Abdollahzadeh, 2017; Esmailnejad, 2017) it is necessary to better understand how farmers
21 within high risk-high impact regions respond to future climate change. Understanding the
22 psychosocial factors that influence Iranian farmers' adaptation intention is essential in this task,
23 and Marvdasht is a critical case within which to explore these dimensions.

24 This empirical study attempts to address a research gap firstly surrounding Iranian farmer
25 adaptation intentions, and secondly to investigate a conceptual model for understanding
26 adaptation decision-making in this sector and this country, built upon *Protection Motivation*
27 *Theory* (PMT). Understanding the influencing factors on adaptation intention in a non-
28 Western, developing country is essential to assist policymakers to generate bottom-up, locally
29 sensitive policy options for the authorities and regions of Iran's high-risk agricultural
30 communities; and for broader learning about climate and development planning in similarly
31 at-risk locations. Furthermore, the possibility of further PMT applications in the context of
32 climate change and land use decision-making is also discussed.

34 2. Research Framework

35 Social and behavioral scientists have devised a range of conceptual models to describe the
36 factors that influence environmental decision-making. Of note is Ajzen's *Theory of Planned*
37 *Behaviors* (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991). Under TPB, *intention* is the predictor of behavior. Intention is
38 predicated upon three important factors: attitudes toward behaviors, subjective norms, and
39 perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 1991, 2002). In better understanding subjective norms
40 within this model, the moral dimensions of human decision-making processes and perceived
41 environmental values were explored more thoroughly in the Value-Belief-Norm (VBN) theory
42 proposed by Stern (Stern, 2000). Together, these conceptual models explain the impact of
43 attitude and social pressure on behavior. However, they are less well equipped to understand
44 the predictors of behavior in the context of decision-making under conditions of risk and
45 uncertainty (Le Dang et al., 2014b) This latter factor is highly pertinent to decision-making for
46 climate adaptation.

47 With regards to risk-based decision-making specifically, *Protection Motivation Theory*
48 (PMT) was first developed by Rogers (1975) to explain the effects of *health hazards* on
49 individuals' attitudes and behaviors. Indeed, the model was initially applied almost exclusively
50 in health/disease prevention cases (Janmaimool, 2017). PMT like TPB, investigates the factors

1 affecting motivation and individual behavior, but it more strongly emphasizes the role of risk
2 perception in motivating an individual to minimize potential negative impacts (Le Dang et al.,
3 2014b). In PMT, it is assumed that an individual's motivation to protect themselves from any
4 risks is the main reason to direct behavior against existing threats (Maddux and Rogers, 1983;
5 Menard et al., 2017; Milne et al., 2000; Witte, 1994). PMT has more recently been applied in
6 fields outside of health risk management (Janmaimool, 2017; Milne et al., 2000; Wolf et al.,
7 1986), notably in research on natural hazards, environmental management and climate change
8 specifically (Brügger et al., 2015; Bubeck et al., 2012; Dang et al., 2012; Grothmann and Patt,
9 2005; Grothmann and Reusswig, 2006; Lam, 2015; Le Dang et al., 2014a; Truelove et al.,
10 2015).

11 The risks of climate change, for some, stimulate feelings of fear and anxiety, which under
12 the PMT model would be assumed to influence attitude change and decision-making towards
13 adaptive practices. Three cases stand out. First, Dang et al. (2014) applied PMT to adaptive
14 decision-making amongst farmers, finding that farmers have more adaptation intention when
15 they perceive both higher risks from climate change and greater effectiveness of adaptive
16 measures. In contrast, they are less likely to intend to adapt when they are subject to wishful
17 thinking, denials of climate change risk and fatalism (Le Dang et al., 2014b). Second,
18 Grothmann and Patt (2005) applied PMT to measure risk perception, adaptive capacity and
19 adaptation process in two urban and rural communities in Germany and Zimbabwe, finding
20 that farmers have a higher probability of adapting to climate change when they have a better
21 understanding of the climate risks (Grothmann and Patt, 2005). Third, Keshavarz and Karami
22 (2016) explored PMT applied to Iranian farmer populations, specifically looking at pro-
23 environmental behaviors during a drought. They found that some variables related to PMT
24 such as perceived vulnerability, perceived severity, response efficacy, response costs, and self-
25 efficacy as well as income and the social environment significantly predicted farmers'
26 behavior. Collectively these studies show the value of PMT to assess climate change decision-
27 making amongst affected populations.

28 In climate decision-making, it is necessary to differentiate mitigating (pro-
29 environmental) behaviors aimed at reducing global risks, and those associated with personal
30 adaptation action to protect livelihoods against future climate-related threats. In the latter case,
31 it is perceived risk, vulnerability, severity of adverse consequences, and potential to minimize
32 those risks through the individual's self-efficacy and response efficacy that are important
33 factors within the PMT model (Janmaimool, 2017). The core assumption is that individuals are
34 more likely to engage in behaviors that minimize risks under conditions of perceived higher
35 susceptibility and severity, as well as high response efficacy and perceived self-efficacy
36 (Janmaimool, 2017). However, in the case of climate change, individuals often underestimate
37 risks. This is due to two factors. Firstly, individuals (may) lack personal experience of
38 environmental hazards against which to imagine and interpret future climate change-related
39 hazards. Secondly, there are cognitive challenges associated with engaging with low
40 probability-high consequence events (Grothmann and Patt, 2005; Swim et al., 2009). As
41 mentioned above, this means that climate change can potentially remain 'invisible' or
42 psychologically distant; it is perceived as something affecting others rather than themselves,
43 and is construed in abstract rather than concrete terms as a result (Spence et al., 2012b).
44 Experiencing extreme weather (such as drought) will augment perceptions of both risk
45 probability and severity, promoting the intention to change in order to be better able to cope
46 with future changes (Jennifer R. Marlon, 2018). It can thus be assumed that given an
47 individual's experience with extreme weather, they are more inclined to adapt to future climate
48 change-related impacts, as the perceived risk more closely mirrors the actual risk probability
49 associated with climate change events. We presume, therefore, that farmers within the drought-

1 stricken Marvdasht region have sufficient experiential knowledge of extreme weather events
2 to conceptualize future climate change-related impacts to the region.

3 4 **2.1 Protection motivation theory in adaptation decision-making**


5 Focusing on the role of perception and adaptation intentions, Grothmann and Patt (2005)
6 enhance PMT to explain the socio-cognitive processes of risk perception interactions and
7 coping perception that farmers show in the face of climate variability and extreme risks.
8 Individuals would be more likely to engage in adaptive action if they (a) perceive themselves
9 to be capable of performing a relevant action and (b) think that this specific activity is effective
10 (Grothmann and Patt, 2005). People balance different potential benefits and risks. The decision
11 is made based on the results of *coping appraisal* and *threat appraisal* (Janmaimool, 2017).
12 Individuals' adaptive responses can be motivated by the perceptions of severity, vulnerability,
13 and reward. Higher perception of vulnerability and severity is likely to enhance individual
14 motivation to perform risk preventative behavior. In other words, people are less likely to
15 engage in risk preventative behaviors if they perceive more rewards from current practices
16 (Council, 2001; Millstein and Halpern-Felsher, 2002).

17 There are four core elements in the cognitive mediating processes of PMT: threat appraisal,
18 coping appraisal, maladaptive coping, and protection motivation (Floyd et al., 2000; Rogers,
19 1975; Taylor and May, 1996). Grothmann and Patt (2005) conceptualized these four factors in
20 climate change context as climate change risk appraisal, adaptation appraisal, avoidant
21 maladaptation, and adaptation intention. Similarly, Dang et al. (2012) framed these factors as
22 risk perception of climate change (which describes how individuals assess the personal threat
23 of climate change in terms of perceived probability and perceived severity), adaptation
24 assessment (consisting of perceived self-efficacy, perceived adaptation efficacy, and perceived
25 adaptation cost), maladaptation (including decision-making under uncertainty, fatalism, denial
26 and wishful thinking), and adaptation intention in another framework (Le Dang et al., 2014b).
27 Therefore, the factors of PMT have been applied and specified in the context of climate change:
28 relabeled as *risk perception of climate change*, *adaptation assessment*, *maladaptation*, and
29 *adaptation intention* in the PMT-based framework introduced by Dang et al., (2014). However,
30 a positive evaluation of self-efficacy and risk perception alone will not necessarily translate to
31 adaptation intention (Berrang-Ford et al., 2011). Grothmann and Patt (2005) account for this
32 by adding three external factors to their model, all of which act on an individual's perception
33 of risks and/or coping capacities: (1) *social discourse*, (2) *adaptation incentives*, and (3)
34 *objective adaptive capacity*, such as power, money, entitlements, knowledge, as well as
35 institutional and social support. Also, Le Dang et al. (2014b) applied these factors as *belief in*
36 *climate change*, *adaptation incentives/disincentives*, and *subjective norms*.

37 Issues of discourse and social norms are important as the effectiveness of technological and
38 institutional agricultural adaptations are bound by socioeconomic capacity (Reilly and
39 Hohmann, 1993). Therefore, one of the limitations on the adoption of new technologies such
40 as new crop varieties, irrigation systems or fertilizers has been the removal of government
41 support for agricultural inputs (disincentives) (Kurukulasuriya and Rosenthal, 2013).
42 Moreover, maladaptive coping strategies of farmers (maladaptation) resembled
43 informal *responses* taken by local individuals (Ehara et al., 2018; Suckall et al., 2014).
44 Consequently, Keshavarz et al. (2014) suggest that agricultural extension agencies may
45 contribute to pro-environmental outcomes of adaptation intention by implementing a range of
46 social and economic incentives and social learning programs. Likewise, Aslo and Suckall et
47 al.'s (2014) examination of trade-offs made by local people in their coping strategies with long-
48 term development, climate adaptation, and mitigation in two case studies in villages in
49 Zanzibar, found that villagers who lost forests and farmland tried to shift their activities to more
50 remote areas and/or intensify their labor activities to mitigate these effects. Fishers whose

1 catches are affected by tourism activities may shift their work to deeper waters or expand their
2 plots to ensure minimum productivity. These are examples of maladaptation. Therefore,
3 disincentives and belief in climate change have an impact on maladaptation. In this study, the
4 tripartite framework introduced by Dang et al., (2014) and the three later factors are synthesized
5 to form our novel conceptual framework, shown in Figure 1.

6
7
8




9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Figure 1. Conceptual framework

3. Materials and methods

A survey approach was conducted to test the hypotheses developed in this study and to determine influencing factors on adaptation intention of farmers. The survey was conducted in the Marvdasht Township. The case study area covers 3687 km². It is located in the northern part of the city of Shiraz in the Fars province, shown in Figure 2.

1
2



3
4

Figure 2. Location of the study area (Marvdasht Township in the Fars province, Iran)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Our critical case study-population is composed of farmers. The survey was conducted in 2017 (local population circa. $n=14,000$). A sample of 373 farmers was selected based on the Cochran formula (margin error=0.05) using a completely random sampling method. The sample was randomly selected from the list of farmers in the district received from the Agricultural Office of the city. Data collection occurred in 2017. We arranged times and places for met with farmers either in their home or workplace to conduct face-to-face interviews using a prepared questionnaire. Farmers had an ongoing right to decline or withdraw from answering questions and data were discarded in each instance. No incentives were provided. Before starting to complete the questionnaire, we provided a simple definition of climate change: “Climate change is a change in the usual weather of your place. This could be a change in how much rain in your place usually gets in a year. Or it could be a change in a place’s usual temperature for a month or season.” All responses were checked to ensure they were complete. Some participant responses were deemed incomplete, and thus not included in the study. Finally, the return rate of completed and useable questionnaires was 256 – an acceptable return rate of 68% (Nulty, 2008).

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

The research instrument was a fixed-response questionnaire in two sections. The first contained demographic characteristics of the respondents, including age, gender, agricultural experience, marital status, and education. Eight perceptual factors were constructed in the second section i.e. *adaptation intention*, *risk perception of climate change*, *maladaptation*, *adaptation assessment*, *belief in climate change*, *subjective norms*, *incentives*, and *disincentives*. These factors are described conceptually and operationally in table 2. The questionnaire contained items similar (but modified based on the panel of experts’ comments to fit the context) to those used in past studies (Arbuckle Jr et al., 2015; Feng et al., 2017; Le Dang et al., 2014b). The farmers were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the items using a 5-point Likert scale (from Strongly disagree=1 to Strongly agree=5). The items included in the study’s questionnaire are shown in Table 1. The questionnaire used in the study was in Persian (Farsi) and all items in Table 1 have been translated to English.

33

34

35

The validity of the researcher-made questionnaire was tested prior to the launch of the study. Specifically, the questionnaire was reviewed by different related disciplinary experts to ensure the validity (faculty members of rural developments, agricultural extension, agro-

1 ecology, and agro-climate specialists), who evaluated the interpretation of the questions, the
2 length of the questionnaire, interpretability of the questions, and clarity. Next, to assess the
3 reliability of the questionnaire, a pilot study (fieldwork) was conducted among the farmers of
4 Ahvaz Township. After collecting 30 pilot questionnaires, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient
5 was calculated, showing coefficients that exceeded acceptable rates (more than 0.7) for all the
6 scales used in the study (Table 1). All questionnaire data were initially input into SPSS. SPSS
7 software was used to produce descriptive statistics and their frequency. Also, the values for
8 skewness and kurtosis did not identify any serious violations of normality, as all the
9 coefficients were below ± 2 . Finally, we applied an SEM¹ analysis through AMOS² 20 software
10 to test the model and determine which variables can be used to predict adaptation intention of
11 farmers towards climate change.

¹ Structural Equation Modeling Arbuckle, J., Wothke, W., 2004. Structural equation modeling using AMOS: An Introduction [EB].

² Analysis of Moment Structures *ibid.*

1. The items included in the study questionnaire and the Cronbach's alpha for the main scales of the study (translated from P

Conceptual Definition	Operational definition	Code ³	Items	Skewnes s	Kurtosi s
Adaptation intention includes the behavioral and psychological dynamics of the individuals that adjust the variations in living conditions to improve their survival. It helps individuals to set-up strategies and decision making to maximizing their benefit (Gessesse et al., 2018)	In this study, adaptation intention was measured by asking farmers to what extent they agreed based on 5-point Likert scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for all items.	AI1	I will use drought tolerant crop varieties.	0.85	0.51
		AI2	I will increase the depth of my well.	0.47	0.80
		AI3	I will use products with lower water requirements.	1.00	0.42
		AI4	I will create variety in cultivating products.	0.81	0.64
		AI5	I will use plants that are resistant to salinity.	0.74	0.03
		AI6	I will be looking for a job other than in agriculture.	0.58	0.56
		AI7	I will use low-tillage techniques.	0.33	0.44
		AI8	I will insure my products.	1.32	1.75
Risk perception is defined as people's knowledge performance through information flow, which helps to	In this study, risk perception of climate change was measured by asking farmers to what extent they agreed based	R1	Climate change has increased poverty and unemployment.	1.14	1.34
		R2	Climate change has led to a diminution of religious beliefs among the people.	0.15	1.04

we use these codes for showing each question.

foster adaptive actions in responding to the consequences of climate change (Chiang, 2018).	on 5-point Likert scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for all items.	R3	Climate change has increased farmers' debt.	0.71	0.01	I		
		R4	Climate change has reduced farmers' capital.	1.16	1.21			
		R5	Climate change has lowered land prices.	0.84	0.15			
		R6	Climate change has pushed up prices for agricultural products.	0.43	0.97			
		R7	Climate change has increased pests and diseases in the fields.	0.57	0.24			
		R8	Climate change has reduced product yield.	0.52	0.08			
		R9	Climate change has reduced the amount of water to the farm.	1.52	1.16			
		R10	Climate change has reduced the quality of agricultural products.	0.43	0.42			
		Maladaptation describes as an action that results in an undesirable and unintended outcome(s) (Magnan et al., 2016)	In this study, maladaptation was measured by asking farmers to what extent they agreed based on 5-point Likert scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for all items.	M1	There is no need for action to be taken in the face of climate change, because these actions will not make any difference.	0.73	0.68	(
				M2	All issues are determined by fate and are unchangeable.	0.63	0.70	I
M3	God will protect me, my lands, and my family against climate change.			0.03	1.30			
The practice of identifying options to	In this study, adaptation assessment was measured by asking farmers to what	AA1	I have enough motivation and energy to deal with climate change.	0.84	0.23	(

<p>adapt to climate change and evaluating them in terms of criteria such as availability, benefits, costs, effectiveness, efficiency, and feasibility (McCarthy et al., 2001).</p>	<p>extent they agreed based on 5-point Likert scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for all items.</p>	AA2	<p>I have enough money and resources to apply strategies for adapting to climate change.</p>	0.32	1.17	I
		AA3	<p>I think I have the ability to deal with the potential dangers of climate change.</p>	0.70	0.18	
		AA4	<p>Climate change is not such a big challenge, and human inventiveness will be able to cope with it.</p>	0.54	0.86	
		AA5	<p>I think there is not enough evidence of climate change taking place that we should take action.</p>	0.36	1.11	
<p>These were measured in terms of three conceptually different beliefs: (a) the belief that global climate change is occurring, (b) the beliefs about its possible causes, and (c) the beliefs of its possible consequences (Heath and Gifford, 2006)</p>	<p>In this study, belief in climate change was measured by four items (B1-B4) on 5-point Likert scales that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).</p>	B1	<p>Climate change is already taking place.</p>	1.44	1.75	
		B2	<p>My farming has been affected by climate change.</p>	1.14	1.41	
		B3	<p>My family has been affected by climate change.</p>	1.18	1.42	(e I
		B4	<p>Climate change will change my lifestyle.</p>	1.39	1.05	
<p>It is a factor, especially a financial advantage that encourages a particular action (Stevenson, 2010)</p>	<p>In this study, incentives, measured by asking farmers to what extent the respective actions influence farmers' adaptive behavior based on 5-point scales from 1</p>	I1	<p>Government support for providing varieties of cultivated herbs in the region will make the region's farmers adapt to the phenomenon of climate change.</p>	1.25	1.09	(I
		I2	<p>Government support for buying agricultural insurance for poor</p>	1.11	0.27	

	(not at all) to 5 (very much).		households will improve the region's farmers capacity to adapt to climate change.		
		I3	Government provision of information and warnings at the time of climate-related risks will improve the region's farmers capacity to adapt to climate change.	1.24	0.98
It is a factor, especially a financial disadvantage that discourages a particular action (Stevenson, 2010)	In this study, disincentives, measured by asking farmers to what extent the respective actions influence farmers' adaptive behavior based on 5-point scales from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).	D1	The increase in electricity prices will improve the region's farmers capacity to adapt to climate change.	0.17	1.34
		D2	Increasing water prices will improve the region's farmers capacity to adapt to climate change.	0.22	1.40
		D3	The increase in fuel prices will improve the region's farmers capacity to adapt to climate change.	0.02	1.48
Individual's perception or opinion about what important others believe the individual should do (Finlay et al., 1999)	In this study, subjective norm was measured by 5-point Likert scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).	S1	My friends, relatives and family expect me to engage in climate change-friendly behaviors.	0.80	0.27
		S2	My friends, relatives and my family are engaging in climate change-friendly behaviors, so I will do so also.	0.69	0.12

1 **4. Analysis**

2 Respondent demographic attributes are shown in Table 2. Reflecting gender bias within the
 3 profession in the case study region, we gained 228 responses from men (89.1%) and only 28
 4 from women (10.9%). The average age of respondents was 43.86 years, and 30.5% held
 5 masters-level graduate degrees. Mean agricultural experience of the respondents was 21.22
 6 years.

7
 8 **Table 2.** Demographic attributes of the respondents

Demographic attributes	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	228	89.1
	Female	28	10.9
Marital status	Single	53	20.7
	Married	203	79.3
Education	Illiteracy	29	11.3
	Elementary	18	7
	High school	42	16.4
	Diploma	58	22.7
	B.Sc.	16	6.3
	M.Sc.	78	30.5
	Ph.D.	15	5.9
Age (year)	Mean	St.D.	Min-Max
	43.86	12.71	19-70
Agricultural experience (year)	Mean	St.D.	Min-Max
	21.22	14.17	2-60

9
 10 A confirmatory measurement model was tested by AMOS software (V20). The use of
 11 CFA was to ensure the uni-dimensionality of the scales measuring each factor. Confirmatory
 12 Factor Analysis (CFA) was employed to examine whether measures of a factor were consistent
 13 with the nature of that factor or not (Henson and Roberts, 2006). As shown in Table 3, several
 14 commonly-used fit indices were employed to assess the overall model fit (Schreiber et al.,
 15 2006). The comprehensive goodness-of-fit indices produced a Chi-square of 1172.23, and Chi-
 16 square/DF=1.88 (Schreiber et al., 2006), The comparative fit index (CFI) value of 0.91,
 17 incremental fit index (IFI) value of 0.88 and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) value of 0.90, were
 18 deemed good fits to the model according to Hu and Bentler (1999) – whereby for these indices
 19 a value of 0.7 and above is satisfactory, 0.8 and above is good, and 0.9 and above is very good.
 20 The root means square error of approximation (RMSEA) value was 0.07, where an RMSEA
 21 threshold in the range of 0.05 to 0.10 is considered an indication of fair fit (Henry and Stone,
 22 1994). Thus, the results of the measurement model indicate an acceptable fit.

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28 **Table 3.** Measures of the research framework model fit

Items	Chi square	Chi square/DF	IFI	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
Indices	1172.23	1.88	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.07

- 1 CFI: Comparative Fit Index
- 2 IFI: Incremental Fit Index
- 3 TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index
- 4 CFI: Comparative Fit Index
- 5 RMSEA: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
- 6

7 All standardized factor loadings should be at least 0.5 and statistically significant.
8 Loadings of this size indicate that observed indicators are strongly related to their associated
9 factors. It also contributes to construct validity (Hair, 2010). In the model, all standardized factor
10 loadings are significant. Most factor loadings are above 0.5, except some values at marginal
11 levels (as shown in Table 4). Taken together, the findings indicate that there was a satisfactory
12 fit between the proposed model and the data. Additionally, convergent and discriminant validity
13 was established for all factors. As shown in Table 4, composite reliability for all factors met the
14 threshold of 0.7, which was suggested by Hair et al., (2010). Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
15 for all factors was greater than the threshold of 0.5 (Hair, 2010). Based on the suggestion of
16 Hair et al., (2010), discriminant validity statistics, i.e. MSV (Maximum Shared Variance) and
17 ASV (Average Shared Squared Variance), should be less than AVE. As can be seen in Table 3,
18 all factors had good discriminant validity. Finally, the values of Skewness and Kurtosis did not
19 identify any serious violations of normality.

20

21 **Table 4.** Factor loadings and convergent and discriminant validity in Confirmatory Factor
22 Analysis

Items' code	Adaptation Intention	Risk perception of climate change	Maladaptation	Adaptation assessment	Belief in climate change	Incentive	Disincentive	Subjective norms
AI1	0.71 ^a							
AI2	0.72 ^{**}							
AI3	0.70 ^{**}							
AI4	0.71 ^{**}							
AI5	0.73 ^{**}							
AI6	0.71 ^{**}							
AI7	0.70 ^{**}							
AI8	0.72 ^{**}							
R1		0.65 ^a						
R2		0.75 ^{**}						
R3		0.67 ^{**}						
R4		0.65 ^{**}						
R5		0.81 ^{**}						
R6		0.57 ^{**}						
R7		0.77 ^{**}						
R8		0.85 ^{**}						
R9		0.68 ^{**}						
R10		0.70 ^{**}						
M1			0.56 ^a					

M2									0.69**
M3									0.88**
AA1									0.79 ^a
AA2									0.69**
AA3									0.68**
AA4									0.74**
AA5									0.65**
B1									0.67 ^a
B2									0.74**
B3									0.70**
B4									0.71**
I1									0.83 ^a
I2									0.63**
I3									0.65**
D1									0.71 ^a
D2									0.74**
D3									0.89**
S1									0.87 ^a
S2									0.75**
CR	0.89	0.91	0.77	0.84	0.80	0.75	0.83	0.79	
AVE	0.51	0.51	0.53	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.62	0.66	
MSV	0.08	0.03	0.31	0.31	0.01	0.14	0.08	0.14	
ASV	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.05	

(a) Values were not calculated because loadings were set to 1.0 to control factor variance

(**) Significant at 1%

1

2 4.1 Factors influencing the adaptation intention towards climate change

3

4 The comprehensive goodness-of-fit indices for the path analysis, as shown in Table 5,
5 are the Chi square=4.24 and Chi square/DF=2.12 (smaller than 3) (Schreiber et al., 2006). The
6 other goodness-of-fit indicators i.e. NFI⁴, CFI⁵, IFI⁶, and TLI⁷ are below the threshold
7 (according to Hu and Bentler, 1999), values from 0.90 indicate an acceptable fit and that values
8 from 0.95 indicate a good/close fit). Also, the RMSEA⁸ is within the acceptable threshold.
9 Taken together, the findings indicate that there is a satisfactory fit between the proposed model
10 and the data.

11

Table 5. Measures of the research framework model fit

	Items	Chi square	Probability level	DF	Chi square/DF	NFI	IFI	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
Path analysis	Indices	4.24	0.12	2	2.12	0.98	0.99	0.90	0.99	0.07

12

13 Table 6 reports the direct and indirect effects of all variables on the endogenous
14 variables of the study (Adaptation Intention). As shown in table 6, risk perception has a
15 significant negative effect on the maladaptation of farmers towards climate change. This

⁴ Normed fit index

⁵ Comparative Fit Index

⁶ Incremental Fit Index

⁷ Tucker-Lewis Index

⁸ Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

1 finding is consonant with the Le Dang et al. (2014b) study of Vietnamese farmer adaptation
 2 intentions that found that belief in climate change has a significant negative effect on
 3 maladaptation intention. Likewise, Blennow and Persson (2009) found that belief in climate
 4 change is a crucial factor for explaining observed differences in adaptation among Swedish
 5 forest owners. Our results also show that disincentives have a significant positive influence on
 6 the maladaptation intentions of Iranian farmers. This finding corresponds with World Bank
 7 findings (Kurukulasuriya and Rosenthal, 2013) which illustrate that disincentives (primarily
 8 economic) are primary drivers of adaptation intentions, and the findings of Bagagnan et al.
 9 (2019) who find that subsidies will improve resilience amongst Gambia's farmers. Finally, the
 10 results show that maladaptation has a significant positive influence on climate adaptation
 11 intention of the farmer population. This stands in contrast to the work of other PMT model
 12 researchers, such as Rippetoe and Rogers (1987), who investigated health threat and found
 13 negative influence between these both factors. Also, it contradicts Le Dang et al.'s (2014) study
 14 of adaptation intentions that found maladaptation to have a significant negative influence on
 15 adaptation intentions. The proportion of variance that is explained by the predictors of intention
 16 was 0.23. This means that 57% of the variance associated with adaptation intention is
 17 accounted for by all other variables, from which among them, risk perception, belief in climate
 18 change and disincentive had significant effects. Please also refer to figure 3.

19
 20 **Table 6.** Standardized indirect and direct effect

Path	Direct effect	Indirect effect
Risk Perception → Maladaptation	-0.250**	-
Risk Perception → Adaptation intention	0.121	-0.021
Adaptation Assessment → Maladaptation	0.121	-
Adaptation Assessment → Adaptation intention	-0.151	0.010
Belief in Climate Change → Maladaptation	-0.286**	-
Belief in Climate Change → Adaptation intention	0.017	-0.023
Disincentive → Maladaptation	0.246**	-
Disincentive → Adaptation intention	-0.204	0.020
Incentive → Adaptation intention	-0.065	-
Subjective Norms → Adaptation intention	-0.132	-
Maladaptation → Adaptation intention	0.182**	0.000

21
 22




Figure 3. Path analysis of research framework

5. Discussion

We find that the estimated model for farmer climate adaptation intention has a good fit and so has the capacity to predict adaptation intention. The Protection Motivation Theory (PMT), upon which this study is based, is therefore suitable for investigating the underlying factors influencing climate adaptation intention. We augmented and applied PMT to understand adaptation intentions. While PMT has been used to understand the behaviors related to acute personal risks, in this study we applied the model in the context of slow-onset risks over longer temporal horizons. Rogers' original PMT model explained the impact of fear on motivating the specific individual behavioral responses. Within the PMT model, it is assumed that accepting any behavior to ameliorate threat is a direct action of the individual's motivation to protect themselves (El Dib et al., 2008). Though pertinent to understanding the impacts to the individual of health-related concerns, PMT is less able to model for individuals risk decision-making in relation to climate change, simply because climate change is less visible and tangible, due to its psychologically distant nature for many people. We, therefore, augment the model to include the variables that represent the externalities of farmers' behavior, as well as incentives and disincentives. We also bring in broader socio-economic factors and physical resources in understanding farmers' climate change adaptive behavior and investigate socio-cognitive factors under conditions of uncertainty. Thus we began with the conceptual framework developed by Le Dang et al. (2014b) and sought to incorporate economic and psychological dimensions to better understand farmer climate adaptation intentions. The value of such a model is that it has predictive power, making it a useful tool for local adaptation decision-making in the agricultural sector. Specifically, it allows governments to identify the most important obstacles to adaptation practices at the farm and farming-community level, hence better contributing to bottom-up and locally contextualized land use and agricultural policy formulation.

In this study, we investigated the influence of incentive/disincentives and found that disincentives have a positive impact on the maladaptation of farmers towards climate change. In other words, the deterrent factor that has been tested by the region's farmers has had a positive impact on the intention to adapt. We argue that farmers who understand some of the shortcomings or implementation of some of the existing laws (such as the cost of water and

1 electricity) are more likely to display maladaptation intentions towards climate change. In a
2 development context, it is important to remember that adaptation decision-making within the
3 agricultural sector occurs under conditions of severe financial resource constraints (Mertz,
4 2009). In practical terms, it is important to understand that farmers' unwillingness to adapt by
5 changing their cropping calendar or planting techniques may be simply due to a lack of money
6 or fear of financial hardship as a result of taking action, as seen in other cases of farmer
7 attitudinal assessments (notably Bastakoti et al., 2017).

8 It is necessary for adaptation planning to facilitate policy interventions that align privately
9 profitable actions (for, in this case, farmers) with socio-ecologically desirable outcomes (Yohe
10 and Tol, 2002). Concerns regarding the complexity and uncertain feedback-mechanisms in
11 social-ecological systems have paved the way for more inclusive decision-making:
12 implementation of adaptation policies is characterized by a learning-by-doing attitude instead
13 of an aspiration to control changes that occur because of climate variability (Biesbroek et al.,
14 2009). Most climate-related policies (Folke, 2006; Lim et al., 2005) allow for locally or
15 regionally targeted adaptation responses within a common policy frame, in the hope that this
16 allows for more specific reactions to climate change. Following the logic underlying our PMT-
17 based study, policies that seek to strengthen individuals' coping capacity are most likely to
18 succeed if they emphasize both individual responsibility and collective environmental benefits.
19 In summary, and based upon no significant influence of incentives on the adaptation intention
20 of farmers, this research shows that a re-evaluation of economic incentive structures might be
21 fruitful in an attempt to construct an effective choice architecture. This is even more crucial
22 considering the degree to which flexibility of decision-making is institutionalized in the
23 environmental and agricultural sectors.

24 We find that belief in climate change has a negative influence on farmers' maladaptation.
25 In this regard, it should be considered that the likelihood of farmers' maladaptation to climate
26 change decreases when they perceive the related risks of these changes and the effectiveness
27 of adaptation activities. Therefore, it can be said that farmers who have personal experience of
28 the negative consequences of climate change-related events, such as drought for example, and
29 have seen farms that have been affected by climate change phenomena with severe product
30 cuts, will be more cognizant of the threat of anthropogenic climate change, and less prone to
31 denialism or fatalism.

32 Finally, we find that perceived maladaptation has a positive influence on adaptation
33 intention. By definition, the concept of adaptive behavior is a decision-making and
34 implementation process for a set of measures to maintain the capacity to deal with changes
35 now or in the future (defined here as activities to try to reduce the negative and adverse effects
36 of climate change on agriculture). It must also be remembered that farmers, like any other
37 population, do not universally behave in environmentally sustainable ways. They display
38 skepticism about climate change, or else perceive climate change as temporally and spatially
39 distant, therefore, it is a factor that reduces the propensity for climate change-related action. In
40 short, according to the Carlton and Jacobson (2013) climate change is not a primary concern
41 for people, and this is likely true amongst farming populations. Denialist or fatalistic positions
42 based within religious or cultural beliefs, and a lack of trust amongst farmers in information
43 from different sources may also play a role in influencing adaptation intention (Le Dang et al.,
44 2014b), and this is an ongoing societal and policy challenge.

45 46 **6. Conclusions**

47 Farmers face considerable socio-economic and psychological barriers to effective
48 adaptation in the face of dangerous anthropogenic climate change. It is necessary for policy
49 authorities to identify and resolve such obstacles to improve livelihoods and ensure sustainable
50 food supplies to meet long-term development outcomes. Many of the most important obstacles

1 to adaptation practices in the agricultural sector occur at the farm level, and so understanding
2 farmers' decision-making around adaptation is essential. The identification of influencing
3 factors can thus help to generate suitable policy solutions. Agricultural policies and targeted
4 efforts must build adaptive capacity (Howden et al., 2007), and improved engagement will be
5 critical in developing strategies to enhance this adaptive capacity for farmers. Successful
6 adaptation typically is cooperative, cross-jurisdictional, and interdisciplinary (Fisichelli et al.,
7 2016). Also, it should be considered that there are differences in the factors that influence
8 farmers' adaptation intention across the regions (Dang et al., 2018). It behooves local
9 authorities to pay attention to the socio-demographic and geophysical characteristics of each
10 region and the corresponding perceptual factors that dominate in each, in order to design
11 appropriate adaptation strategies. The intensity of any management intervention is dependent
12 upon the focal resource's vulnerability to climate change within the management area and may
13 change with management time horizons and rates of climate change (Fisichelli et al., 2016).

14 Our results show that belief in climate change has a negative effect on farmers'
15 maladaptation intention towards climate change. Information provision is therefore crucial in
16 shaping farmers' perception of climate change risk and the effectiveness of adaptive measures.
17 Inaccurate information may lead to maladaptation which, in turn, influences the adaptation
18 intention and behavioral response. Therefore, it is important to ensure the accuracy and
19 timeliness of information about climate change risk and adaptation responses. The sources and
20 messengers of climate change information are important, not simply the quality of the
21 information itself. As such, agricultural extension services are important in supporting farmers
22 with technical knowledge of adaptive measures. Moreover, our results revealed that
23 disincentives have positive impact on the maladaptation of farmers towards climate change,
24 thus policymakers should investigate farmers' financial conditions as a matter of improving
25 overall livelihood strategies as well as adaptation strategy.

26 In this case study of Iranian farmer adaptation intentions, it is significant that farming
27 practice takes place in arid and semi-arid regions. Iranian farmer populations have extensive
28 experience of drought. This means that drought may be construed as regular and natural
29 phenomenon, rather than a climate change-related event. However, as with many climate-
30 change related impacts – it is the frequency and severity of such droughts which will increase
31 as global temperatures rise. In Iran, the public sector holds responsibility for educational and
32 extensional support and advisory services in the agricultural sector, and the management of
33 agricultural insurance systems. Public sector organizations, therefore, carry a responsibility
34 towards farmer engagement and education. However, Government policy towards the sector is
35 currently focused upon short-term tangible issues such as increasing the crop yield and pest
36 control; whereas long-term climate adaptation planning is de-prioritized. We conclude,
37 therefore, that farmers' intentions and practices are like to be more strongly influenced by the
38 demands of the public sector than by their social networks of relatives and friends, as the latter
39 mainly requests short-term increases in crop yield. We recommend, therefore, that immediate
40 policy changes are necessary from the top-down: for public authorities to better communicate
41 climate risks and adaptations options, and to better incorporate government-to-farmer mutual
42 engagement on adaptation planning, to establish trust, and to thus improve stimulate adaptation
43 intention and greater success in agricultural outcomes under climate stress. We suggest that a
44 policy of agricultural extension is needed that provides appropriate advisory and educational
45 services designed to prepare farmers for the consequences of climate change, introduce
46 potential solutions and ameliorate the adverse consequences. Furthermore, agricultural
47 extension can incorporate diverse cultural values among Iranian farmers as a strength within
48 an educational program. Adaptation policy through agricultural extension should thus operate
49 at the provincial and/or township level, to foster social and cultural learning amongst farmer
50 networks about climate change, its consequences and the range of potential adaptation

- 1 responses, and to thus improve adaptation decision-making given ongoing resource constraints
- 2 experienced by vulnerable farmer groups.
- 3
- 4

1 7. References

- 2 Abbasi, N., Ghoochani, O., Ghanian, M., Kitterlin, M., 2016. Assessment of Households' Food
3 Insecurity through use of a USDA Questionnaire. *Adv Plants Agric Res* 4, 00155.
- 4 Abdollahzadeh, G.A., Alireza; Sharifzadeh, Mohammad Sharif;, 2017. Investigating Rural
5 People Perceptions of Climate Changes and Adaptation Strategies in Zabol County. *Geography
6 and Environmental Planning* 28, 85-106 (In Persian).
- 7 Adger, W.N., 2001. Social capital and climate change. *Citeseer*.
- 8 Adger, W.N., 2003. Social capital, collective action, and adaptation to climate change.
9 *Economic geography* 79, 387-404.
- 10 Adger, W.N., Barnett, J., Brown, K., Marshall, N., O'brien, K., 2013. Cultural dimensions of
11 climate change impacts and adaptation. *Nature Climate Change* 3, 112.
- 12 Ajzen, I., 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision
13 processes* 50, 179-211.
- 14 Ajzen, I., 2002. Constructing a TPB questionnaire: Conceptual and methodological
15 considerations.
- 16 Altieri, M.A., Nicholls, C.I., 2017. The adaptation and mitigation potential of traditional
17 agriculture in a changing climate. *Climatic Change* 140, 33-45.
- 18 Altieri, M.A., Nicholls, C.I., Henao, A., Lana, M.A., 2015. Agroecology and the design of
19 climate change-resilient farming systems. *Agronomy for sustainable development* 35, 869-890.
- 20 Amirkhani, S., Chizari, M., & Hosseini, M., 2009. Factors influencing on drought management
21 in Varamin Township., *Third Congress of Extension Sciences and Agricultural Education,
22 Mashhad, Iran*, pp. 107-118.
- 23 Arbuckle, J., Wothke, W., 2004. Structural equation modeling using AMOS: An Introduction
24 [EB].
- 25 Arbuckle Jr, J.G., Morton, L.W., Hobbs, J., 2015. Understanding farmer perspectives on
26 climate change adaptation and mitigation: The roles of trust in sources of climate information,
27 climate change beliefs, and perceived risk. *Environment and behavior* 47, 205-234.
- 28 Ayers, J., Forsyth, T., 2009. Community-based adaptation to climate change. *Environment:
29 science and policy for sustainable development* 51, 22-31.
- 30 Azadi, H., Ghanian, M., Ghoochani, O.M., Rafiaani, P., Taning, C.N., Hajivand, R.Y., Dogot,
31 T., 2015. Genetically Modified Crops: Towards Agricultural Growth, Agricultural
32 Development, or Agricultural Sustainability? *Food Reviews International* 31, 195-221.
- 33 Bartolini, F., Viaggi, D., 2013. The common agricultural policy and the determinants of
34 changes in EU farm size. *Land use policy* 31, 126-135.
- 35 Bastakoti, R.C., Bharati, L., Bhattarai, U., Wahid, S.M., 2017. Agriculture under changing
36 climate conditions and adaptation options in the Koshi Basin. *Climate and Development* 9,
37 634-648.
- 38 Berrang-Ford, L., Ford, J.D., Paterson, J., 2011. Are we adapting to climate change? *Global
39 environmental change* 21, 25-33.
- 40 Biesbroek, G., Termeer, C., Kabat, P., Klostermann, J., 2009. Institutional governance barriers
41 for the development and implementation of climate adaptation strategies. *Earth System
42 governance: People, Places and the Planet*.
- 43 Blennow, K., Persson, J., 2009. Climate change: Motivation for taking measure to adapt.
44 *Global Environmental Change* 19, 100-104.
- 45 Bradshaw, B., Dolan, H., Smit, B., 2004. Farm-level adaptation to climatic variability and
46 change: crop diversification in the Canadian prairies. *Climatic Change* 67, 119-141.
- 47 Brügger, A., Morton, T.A., Dessai, S., 2015. Hand in hand: Public endorsement of climate
48 change mitigation and adaptation. *PLoS One* 10, e0124843.

1 Bryant, C.R., Smit, B., Brklacich, M., Johnston, T.R., Smithers, J., Chiotti, Q., Singh, B., 2000.
2 Adaptation in Canadian agriculture to climatic variability and change, Societal adaptation to
3 climate variability and change. Springer, pp. 181-201.

4 Bubeck, P., Botzen, W.J., Aerts, J.C., 2012. A review of risk perceptions and other factors that
5 influence flood mitigation behavior. *Risk analysis* 32, 1481-1495.

6 Burnham, M., 2014. The human dimensions of climate change: Smallholder perception and
7 adaptation in the Loess Plateau region of China.

8 Burnham, M., Ma, Z., 2016. Linking smallholder farmer climate change adaptation decisions
9 to development. *Climate and Development* 8, 289-311.

10 Carlton, S.J., Jacobson, S.K., 2013. Climate change and coastal environmental risk perceptions
11 in Florida. *Journal of environmental management* 130, 32-39.

12 Cerdà, A., Burguet, M., Keesstra, S., Prosdocimi, M., Di Prima, S., Brevik, E., Novara, A.,
13 Jordan, A., Tarolli, P., 2016. The impact of agriculture terraces on soil organic matter,
14 aggregate stability, water repellency and bulk density. A study in abandoned and active farms
15 in the Sierra de Enguera, Eastern Spain. *Development* 25, 288-296.

16 Chiang, Y.-C., 2018. Exploring community risk perceptions of climate change-a case study of
17 a flood-prone urban area of Taiwan. *Cities* 74, 42-51.

18 Cooper, P., Dimes, J., Rao, K., Shapiro, B., Shiferaw, B., Twomlow, S., 2008. Coping better
19 with current climatic variability in the rain-fed farming systems of sub-Saharan Africa: An
20 essential first step in adapting to future climate change? *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*
21 *Environment* 126, 24-35.

22 Cotton, M., Stevens, E., 2018. Mapping discourses of climate change adaptation in the United
23 Kingdom. *Weather, Climate, and Society*.

24 Coumou, D., Rahmstorf, S., 2012. A decade of weather extremes. *Nature climate change* 2,
25 491.

26 Council, N.R., 2001. Adolescent risk and vulnerability: Concepts and measurement. National
27 Academies Press.

28 Dang, H., Li, E., Bruwer, J., 2012. Understanding Climate Change Adaptive Behaviour of
29 Farmers: An Integrated Conceptual Framework. *International Journal of Climate Change:*
30 *Impacts & Responses* 3.

31 Dang, H.L., Li, E., Nuberg, I., Bruwer, J., 2018. Vulnerability to climate change and the
32 variations in factors affecting farmers' adaptation: A multi-group structural equation modelling
33 study. *Climate and Development* 10, 509-519.

34 Ehara, M., Hyakumura, K., Kurosawa, K., Araya, K., Sokh, H., Kohsaka, R., 2018. Addressing
35 Maladaptive Coping Strategies of Local Communities to Changes in Ecosystem Service
36 Provisions Using the DPSIR Framework. *Ecological Economics* 149, 226-238.

37 El Dib, R.P., Silva, E.M., Morais, J.F., Trevisani, V.F., 2008. Prevalence of high frequency
38 hearing loss consistent with noise exposure among people working with sound systems and
39 general population in Brazil: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* 8, 151.

40 Elum, Z.A., Modise, D.M., Marr, A., 2017. Farmer's perception of climate change and
41 responsive strategies in three selected provinces of South Africa. *Climate Risk Management*
42 16, 246-257.

43 Ericksen, P., Thornton, P.K., Notenbaert, A.M.O., Cramer, L., Jones, P.G., Herrero, M., 2011.
44 Mapping hotspots of climate change and food insecurity in the global tropics.

45 Esmailnejad, M.A., Bohlul, 2017. Finding and ranking adaptation strategies for climate
46 change from the local perspective. Case Study: Sistan Plain. *Journal of Spatial Analysis*
47 *Environmental Hazards* 4, 63-72 (In Persian).

48 Evans, J.P., 2009. 21st century climate change in the Middle East. *Climatic Change* 92, 417-
49 432.

- 1 Fahad, S., Wang, J., 2018. Farmers' risk perception, vulnerability, and adaptation to climate
2 change in rural Pakistan. *Land use policy* 79, 301-309.
- 3 Feng, X., Liu, M., Huo, X., Ma, W., 2017. What Motivates Farmers' Adaptation to Climate
4 Change? The Case of Apple Farmers of Shaanxi in China. *Sustainability* 9, 519.
- 5 Finlay, K.A., Trafimow, D., Moroi, E., 1999. The importance of subjective norms on intentions
6 to perform health behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 29, 2381-2393.
- 7 Fisichelli, N.A., Schuurman, G.W., Hoffman, C.H., 2016. Is 'resilience' maladaptive? Towards
8 an accurate lexicon for climate change adaptation. *Environmental management* 57, 753-758.
- 9 Floyd, D.L., Prentice-Dunn, S., Rogers, R.W., 2000. A meta-analysis of research on protection
10 motivation theory. *Journal of applied social psychology* 30, 407-429.
- 11 Foley, J.A., DeFries, R., Asner, G.P., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S.R., Chapin, F.S.,
12 Coe, M.T., Daily, G.C., Gibbs, H.K., 2005. Global consequences of land use. *science* 309, 570-
13 574.
- 14 Folke, C., 2006. Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems
15 analyses. *Global environmental change* 16, 253-267.
- 16 Gessesse, A.T., Li, H., He, G., Berhe, A.A., 2018. Study on farmers land consolidation
17 adaptation intention: A structural equation modeling approach, the case of Sichuan province,
18 China. *China Agricultural Economic Review* 10, 666-682.
- 19 Ghanian, M., Ghoochani, O.M., Kitterlin, M., Jahangiry, S., Zarafshani, K., Van Passel, S.,
20 Azadi, H., 2016. Attitudes of agricultural experts toward genetically modified crops: A case
21 study in Southwest Iran. *Science and engineering ethics* 22, 509-524.
- 22 Ghoochani, O.M., Ghanian, M., Baradaran, M., Azadi, H., 2017. Multi stakeholders' attitudes
23 toward Bt rice in Southwest, Iran: Application of TPB and multi attribute models. *Integrative*
24 *Psychological and Behavioral Science* 51, 141-163.
- 25 Gilanpour, O., 2006. Challenges of Iran's agriculture sector in accession Process to the WTO,
26 Eighth European Trade Study Meeting.
- 27 Grothmann, T., Patt, A., 2005. Adaptive capacity and human cognition: the process of
28 individual adaptation to climate change. *Global Environmental Change* 15, 199-213.
- 29 Grothmann, T., Reusswig, F., 2006. People at risk of flooding: why some residents take
30 precautionary action while others do not. *Natural hazards* 38, 101-120.
- 31 Grüneis, H., Penker, M., Höferl, K.-M., Schermer, M., Scherhauer, P., 2018. Why do we not
32 pick the low-hanging fruit? Governing adaptation to climate change and resilience in Tyrolean
33 mountain agriculture. *Land use policy* 79, 386-396.
- 34 Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Babin, B.J. and Black, W.C., 2010. *Multivariate data Analysis: A*
35 *Global Perspective*. Pearson, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- 36 Hanjra, M.A., Qureshi, M.E., 2010. Global water crisis and future food security in an era of
37 climate change. *Food Policy* 35, 365-377.
- 38 Heath, Y., Gifford, R., 2006. Free-market ideology and environmental degradation: The case
39 of belief in global climate change. *Environment and behavior* 38, 48-71.
- 40 Henry, J.W., Stone, R.W., 1994. A structural equation model of end-user satisfaction with a
41 computer-based medical information system. *Information Resources Management Journal*
42 *(IRMJ)* 7, 21-33.
- 43 Henson, R.K., Roberts, J.K., 2006. Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research:
44 Common errors and some comment on improved practice. *Educational and Psychological*
45 *measurement* 66, 393-416.
- 46 Hirte, G., Nitzsche, E., Tucharaktschiew, S., 2018. Optimal adaptation in cities. *Land use policy*
47 73, 147-169.
- 48 Howden, S.M., Soussana, J.-F., Tubiello, F.N., Chhetri, N., Dunlop, M., Meinke, H., 2007.
49 *Adapting agriculture to climate change*. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 104,
50 19691-19696.

1 Hu, L.t., Bentler, P.M., 1999. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
2 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a*
3 *multidisciplinary journal* 6, 1-55.

4 IPCC, 2007. Summary for Policy Makers In: *Climate change 2007: impacts, adaptation and*
5 *vulnerability. Contribution of working group II to the fourth assessment report International*
6 *Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, and Cambridge, UK. 7-22.*

7 Jamshidi, A., Nouri Zamanabadi, S.H., Ebrahimi, M.S., 2015. *Adaptation to Climate Change*
8 *in Sirvan County, Ilam Province: Options and Constraints. Journal of Research and Rural*
9 *Planning* 4, 79-95.

10 Janmaimool, P., 2017. Application of Protection Motivation Theory to Investigate Sustainable
11 Waste Management Behaviors. *Sustainability* 9, 1079.

12 Janssen, S., Porter, C., Moore, A., Athanasiadis, I., Foster, I., Jones, J., Antle, J., 2015. Towards
13 a new generation of agricultural system models, data, and knowledge products: building an
14 open web-based approach to agricultural data, system modeling and decision support. *AgMIP.*
15 *Towards a New Generation of Agricultural System Models, Data, and Knowledge Products*
16 91.

17 Jennifer R. Marlon, S.v.d.L., Peter D. Howe, Anthony Leiserowitz, S. H. Lucia Woo &
18 Kenneth Broad, 2018. Detecting local environmental change: the role of experience in shaping
19 risk judgments about global warming. *Journal of risk research.*

20 Karimi, V., Karami, E., Keshavarz, M., 2018. Climate change and agriculture: Impacts and
21 adaptive responses in Iran. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture* 17, 1-15.

22 Keshavarz, M., Karami, E., 2014. Farmers' decision-making process under drought. *Journal of*
23 *Arid Environments* 108, 43-56.

24 Keshavarz, M., Karami, E., 2016. Farmers' pro-environmental behavior under drought:
25 Application of protection motivation theory. *Journal of Arid Environments* 127, 128-136.

26 Keshavarz, M., Karami, E., Vanclay, F., 2013. The social experience of drought in rural Iran.
27 *Land Use Policy* 30, 120-129.

28 Keshavarz, M., Karami, E., Zibaei, M., 2014. Adaptation of Iranian farmers to climate
29 variability and change. *Regional environmental change* 14, 1163-1174.

30 Khanian, M., Serpoush, B., Gheitarani, N., 2017. Balance between place attachment and
31 migration based on subjective adaptive capacity in response to climate change: the case of
32 Famenin County in Western Iran. *Climate and Development*, 1-14.

33 Kuang, F., Jin, J., He, R., Wan, X., Ning, J., 2019. Influence of livelihood capital on adaptation
34 strategies: Evidence from rural households in Wushen Banner, China. *Land Use Policy* 89,
35 104228.

36 Kurukulasuriya, P., Rosenthal, S., 2013. Climate change and agriculture: A review of impacts
37 and adaptations.

38 Lam, S.-P., 2015. Predicting support of climate policies by using a protection motivation
39 model. *Climate policy* 15, 321-338.

40 Lawniczak, A.E., Zbierska, J., Nowak, B., Achtenberg, K., Grześkowiak, A., Kanas, K., 2016.
41 Impact of agriculture and land use on nitrate contamination in groundwater and running waters
42 in central-west Poland. *Environmental monitoring and assessment* 188, 172.

43 Le Dang, H., Li, E., Nuberg, I., Bruwer, J., 2014a. Farmers' assessments of private adaptive
44 measures to climate change and influential factors: a study in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.
45 *Natural hazards* 71, 385-401.

46 Le Dang, H., Li, E., Nuberg, I., Bruwer, J., 2014b. Understanding farmers' adaptation intention
47 to climate change: A structural equation modelling study in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.
48 *Environmental Science & Policy* 41, 11-22.

1 Lee, S., Dunn, R., Young, R., Connolly, R., Dale, P., Dehayr, R., Lemckert, C., McKinnon, S.,
2 Powell, B., Teasdale, P., 2006. Impact of urbanization on coastal wetland structure and
3 function. *Austral Ecology* 31, 149-163.

4 Lim, B., Spanger-Siegfried, E., Burton, I., Malone, E., Huq, S., 2005. Adaptation policy
5 frameworks for climate change: developing strategies, policies and measures. Citeseer.

6 Maddux, J.E., Rogers, R.W., 1983. Protection motivation and self-efficacy: A revised theory
7 of fear appeals and attitude change. *Journal of experimental social psychology* 19, 469-479.

8 Magnan, A., Schipper, E., Burkett, M., Bharwani, S., Burton, I., Eriksen, S., Gemenne, F.,
9 Schaar, J., Ziervogel, G., 2016. Addressing the risk of maladaptation to climate change. *Wiley*
10 *Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 7, 646-665.

11 McCarthy, J.J., Canziani, O.F., Leary, N.A., Dokken, D.J., White, K.S., 2001. *Climate change*
12 *2001: impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability: contribution of Working Group II to the third*
13 *assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* Cambridge University
14 Press.

15 Menard, P., Bott, G.J., Crossler, R.E., 2017. User Motivations in Protecting Information
16 Security: Protection Motivation Theory Versus Self-Determination Theory. *Journal of*
17 *Management Information Systems* 34, 1203-1230.

18 Mertz, O., Halsnæs, K., Olesen, J. E., & Rasmussen, K. , 2009. Adaptation to climate change
19 in developing countries. *Environmental management* 43, 743-752.

20 Millstein, S.G., Halpern-Felsher, B.L., 2002. Perceptions of risk and vulnerability. *Journal of*
21 *adolescent health* 31, 10-27.

22 Milne, S., Sheeran, P., Orbell, S., 2000. Prediction and intervention in health-related behavior:
23 A meta-analytic review of protection motivation theory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*
24 30, 106-143.

25 Misra, M., 2017. Smallholder agriculture and climate change adaptation in Bangladesh:
26 questioning the technological optimism. *Climate and Development* 9, 337-347.

27 Moser, S.C., 2010. *Communicating climate change: history, challenges, process and future*
28 *directions.* Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change 1, 31-53.

29 Nassiri, M., Koocheki, A., Kamali, G., Shahandeh, H., 2006. Potential impact of climate
30 change on rainfed wheat production in Iran: (Potentieller Einfluss des Klimawandels auf die
31 Weizenproduktion unter Rainfed-Bedingungen im Iran). *Archives of Agronomy and Soil*
32 *Science* 52, 113-124.

33 Nelson, V., Meadows, K., Cannon, T., Morton, J., Martin, A., 2002. Uncertain predictions,
34 invisible impacts, and the need to mainstream gender in climate change adaptations. *Gender &*
35 *Development* 10, 51-59.

36 Nulty, D.D., 2008. The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be
37 done? *Assessment & evaluation in higher education* 33, 301-314.

38 Ostwald, M., Chen, D., 2006. Land-use change: Impacts of climate variations and policies
39 among small-scale farmers in the Loess Plateau, China. *Land Use Policy* 23, 361-371.

40 Rahman, H.T., Mia, M.E., Ford, J.D., Robinson, B.E., Hickey, G.M., 2018. Livelihood
41 exposure to climatic stresses in the north-eastern floodplains of Bangladesh. *Land use policy*
42 79, 199-214.

43 Rayner, S., 2010. How to eat an elephant: a bottom-up approach to climate policy. *Climate*
44 *Policy* 10, 615-621.

45 Reilly, J., Hohmann, N., 1993. Climate change and agriculture: the role of international trade.
46 *The American Economic Review* 83, 306-312.

47 Rippetoe, P.A., Rogers, R.W., 1987. Effects of components of protection-motivation theory on
48 adaptive and maladaptive coping with a health threat. *Journal of personality and social*
49 *psychology* 52, 596.

1 Roesch-McNally, G.E., Arbuckle, J.G., Tyndall, J.C., 2017. What would farmers do?
2 Adaptation intentions under a Corn Belt climate change scenario. *Agriculture and Human*
3 *Values* 34, 333-346.

4 Rogers, R.W., 1975. A protection motivation theory of fear appeals and attitude change¹. *The*
5 *journal of psychology* 91, 93-114.

6 Rojas-Downing, M.M., Nejadhashemi, A.P., Harrigan, T., Woznicki, S.A., 2017. Climate
7 change and livestock: Impacts, adaptation, and mitigation. *Climate Risk Management* 16, 145-
8 163.

9 Saptutyningsih, E., Diswandi, D., Jaung, W., 2019. Does social capital matter in climate change
10 adaptation? A lesson from agricultural sector in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Land Use Policy*,
11 104189.

12 Sayyed, M., 2013. SWOT analysis of Tandooreh National Park (NE Iran) for sustainable
13 ecotourism. *Proceedings of the International Academy of Ecology and Environmental Sciences*
14 3, 296.

15 Schreiber, J.B., Nora, A., Stage, F.K., Barlow, E.A., King, J., 2006. Reporting structural
16 equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *The Journal of*
17 *educational research* 99, 323-338.

18 Smit, B., Skinner, M.W., 2002. Adaptation options in agriculture to climate change: a typology.
19 *Mitigation and adaptation strategies for global change* 7, 85-114.

20 Sowers, J., Vengosh, A., Weinthal, E., 2011. Climate change, water resources, and the politics
21 of adaptation in the Middle East and North Africa. *Climatic Change* 104, 599-627.

22 Spence, A., Poortinga, W., Pidgeon, N., 2012a. The psychological distance of climate change.
23 *Risk Analysis: An International Journal* 32, 957-972.

24 Spence, A., Poortinga, W., Pidgeon, N., 2012b. The psychological distance of climate change.
25 *Risk analysis* 32, 957-972.

26 Stern, P.C., 2000. Towards a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior, *journal*
27 *of social issues*, 56.

28 Stevenson, A., 2010. *Oxford dictionary of English*. Oxford University Press, USA.

29 Suckall, N., Tompkins, E., Stringer, L., 2014. Identifying trade-offs between adaptation,
30 mitigation and development in community responses to climate and socio-economic stresses:
31 Evidence from Zanzibar, Tanzania. *Applied Geography* 46, 111-121.

32 Swim, J., Clayton, S., Doherty, T., Gifford, R., Howard, G., Reser, J., Stern, P., Weber, E.,
33 2009. Psychology and global climate change: Addressing a multi-faceted phenomenon and set
34 of challenges. A report by the American Psychological Association's task force on the interface
35 between psychology and global climate change. American Psychological Association,
36 Washington.

37 Taylor, A.H., May, S., 1996. Threat and coping appraisal as determinants of compliance with
38 sports injury rehabilitation: An application of protection motivation theory. *Journal of sports*
39 *sciences* 14, 471-482.

40 Thomas, D.S., Twyman, C., Osbahr, H., Hewitson, B., 2007. Adaptation to climate change and
41 variability: farmer responses to intra-seasonal precipitation trends in South Africa. *Climatic*
42 *change* 83, 301-322.

43 Thornton, P.K., Jones, P.G., Alagarswamy, G., Andresen, J., 2009. Spatial variation of crop
44 yield response to climate change in East Africa. *Global Environmental Change* 19, 54-65.

45 Tilman, D., Clark, M., 2015. Food, Agriculture & the environment: Can we feed the world &
46 save the Earth? *Daedalus* 144, 8-23.

47 Tripathi, A., Mishra, A.K., 2017. Knowledge and passive adaptation to climate change: An
48 example from Indian farmers. *Climate Risk Management* 16, 195-207.

1 Truelove, H.B., Carrico, A.R., Thabrew, L., 2015. A socio-psychological model for analyzing
2 climate change adaptation: A case study of Sri Lankan paddy farmers. *Global Environmental*
3 *Change* 31, 85-97.

4 Turrall, H., Burke, J.J., Faurès, J.-M., 2011. Climate change, water and food security. Food and
5 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Rome, Italy.

6 Urwin, K., Jordan, A., 2008. Does public policy support or undermine climate change
7 adaptation? Exploring policy interplay across different scales of governance. *Global*
8 *environmental change* 18, 180-191.

9 Van Aalst, M.K., Cannon, T., Burton, I., 2008. Community level adaptation to climate change:
10 the potential role of participatory community risk assessment. *Global environmental change*
11 18, 165-179.

12 van Dijk, W.F., Lokhorst, A.M., Berendse, F., de Snoo, G.R., 2016. Factors underlying
13 farmers' intentions to perform unsubsidised agri-environmental measures. *Land Use Policy* 59,
14 207-216.

15 Vermeulen, S.J., Campbell, B.M., Ingram, J.S., 2012. Climate change and food systems.
16 *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 37.

17 Wang, W., Zhao, X., Cao, J., Li, H., Zhang, Q., 2019. Barriers and requirements to climate
18 change adaptation of mountainous rural communities in developing countries: The case of the
19 eastern Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau of China. *Land Use Policy*, 104354.

20 Weber, E.U., Stern, P.C., 2011. Public understanding of climate change in the United States.
21 *American Psychologist* 66, 315.

22 Wheeler, T., Von Braun, J., 2013. Climate change impacts on global food security. *Science*
23 341, 508-513.

24 Witte, K., 1994. Fear control and danger control: A test of the extended parallel process model
25 (EPPM). *Communications Monographs* 61, 113-134.

26 Wolf, J., 2011. Climate change adaptation as a social process, *Climate change adaptation in*
27 *developed nations*. Springer, pp. 21-32.

28 Wolf, S., Gregory, W.L., Stephan, W.G., 1986. Protection motivation theory: Prediction of
29 intentions to engage in anti-nuclear war behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 16,
30 310-321.

31 Wright, H., Vermeulen, S., Laganda, G., Olupot, M., Ampaire, E., Jat, M., 2014. Farmers, food
32 and climate change: ensuring community-based adaptation is mainstreamed into agricultural
33 programmes. *Climate and development* 6, 318-328.

34 Yohe, G., Tol, R.S., 2002. Indicators for social and economic coping capacity—moving toward
35 a working definition of adaptive capacity. *Global Environmental Change* 12, 25-40.