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Objective: To evaluate the quality of information provided by an experiential dynamic games-based education protocol compared to a traditional seminar based protocol. Both protocols were administered to farmers from low income households in central Malawi.

Problem and relevance for agricultural development: Poor agricultural land management remains a major problem in Malawi. Some policy incentives such as subsidies, weather indexed insurance and cash payments have been proposed to motivate better land management among farmers. There is need for research on their relative preferences from individual farmers’ perspective.

Methodology: We use choice elicitation (CE) to elicit farmer preferences for fertilizer subsidy, indemnity insurance (with and without basis risk) and direct cash payments as incentives to adopt labor intensive improved land management. The CE and household surveys sessions were preceded by either two educational programs: a seminar format “Chalk and Talk (C&T)” or an experiential learning game (ELG) program.

Process: The ELG involved enacting probabilistic games featuring such activities as drawing from a bag of green + red balls to depict good rainfall (green ball drawn) or poor rainfall (red ball drawn) or a bag of orange + blue balls to depict “basis risk”: orange ball drawn: indemnity insurance pays out or blue ball drawn: indemnity does not pay out.

### Payoff Structure for Choice Set Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive Program</th>
<th>Poor Rains Yield (tons)</th>
<th>Good Rains Yield (tons)</th>
<th>Poor Rain Payoff (MK)</th>
<th>Good Rain Payoff (MK)</th>
<th>Expected Value of Program (MK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Farming</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK 800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,800</td>
<td>40,800</td>
<td>36,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK 1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK 1300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>41,300</td>
<td>37,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK 1600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>37,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK 2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Some Results

#### Proportions of CE participants electing indemnity insurance as cash payment is varied

#### Proportion of CE participants electing fertilizer voucher as cash payment is varied

Conclusions: Relative to traditional education protocols, experiential dynamic learning games improve the ability of farmers with generally low levels of literacy and numeracy to understand the functions and complex dynamic implications of financial instruments and economic policies with which they have had little or no practical experience.