Data for Eschen et al. (2024) “Adoption of a sustainable land management practice for invasive Prosopis juliflora in East Africa”. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43170-024-00315-1>

**Coding of data:**

Column B: Country 1 = Kenya, 2 = Tanzania

Column C: Gender 1 = Male, 2 = Female

Column E: Highest level of education 0 = None, 1 = Primary school, 2 = middle school, 3 = Secondary school, 4 = Vocational training, 5 = tertiary

Column M: Risk acceptance 0 = low, 10 = highest

Column N: Land tenure type 1 = Owned with title, 2 = Owned without title, 3 = Rented, 4 = Communal land

Columns BF, BI, BL, BO, BR, BU, BX, CA, CD, CG: Change 1 = Increase, 2 = decrease, 3 = no change

Column CI-CV: binary response (1 indicates source used)

Column DB: Years since prosopis introduction: 1 = <5 years, 2 = 6 to 10 years, 3 = 11 to 15 years, 4 = 16 to 20 years, 5 = 21 to 25 years, 6 = >26 years, 88 = Don’t know, 99 = Don’t know

Column DE: How prosopis introduced 1 = NGO, 2 = Planted by locals, 3 = Government initiative, 88 = Don’t know, 99 = Don’t know

Column DI: When prosopis arrived on farm1 = <5 years, 2 = 6 to 10 years, 3 = 11 to 15 years, 4 = 16 to 20 years, 5 = 21 to 25 years, 6 = >26 years, 88 = Don’t know, 99 = Don’t know

Column DJ: How prosopis arrived on farm 1 = Water movement, 2 = Animal movements, 3 = spread by people as seed or plants, 88 = Don’t know, 99 = Don’t know

Column DK: Proportion of farm affected by prosopis 1 = 0%, 2 = 1-10%, 3 = 11-25%, 4 = 26-50%, 5 = 51-75%, 6 = >75%

Columns DL, DM: binary response (1 indicates yes)

Column DN: Did you modify SLM 1 = Installation of pump for irrigation, 2 = Prevention of re-invasion through animal grazing, 99 = Other, specify

Column DP: where did you implement SLM 1 = On own land, 2 = On rented land, 3 = Close to homestead (< 2 min walking), 4 = Further away

Column DZ: Has income changed since implementing SLM Change 1 = Increase, 2 = decrease, 3 = no change

Column EA: Overall perception of SLM 1 = Exceeds expectation, 2 = good, 3 = neutral /no change from standard practice, 4 = not so good, 5 = awful

Column EB: Has your perception of SLM changed 1 = Improved a lot, 2 = better, 3 = No change, 4 = Worse, 5 = A lot worse

Column EF: Reasons to adopt SLM (or not) 1 = Looking to improve value of land, 2 = Immediate or long-term financial benefits, 3 = Saw neighbours’ success, 4 = Investment too high (initial or continuous), 5 = Too expensive to hire labour to remove prosopis, 6 = Too dangerous to remove prosopis (human health risk), 7 = Not enough benefits, or the benefits don’t outweigh the disadvantages/investment, 8 = Prefer farming over prosopis, 9 = Prosopis has become an increasing problem on the land, 10 = Land with prosopis cannot be used, 11 = Better benefit-cost ratio of farming compared to charcoal making, 12 = Farming more sustainable, 13 = Removing prosopis too much work, 14 = Prosopis re-establishes after removal, 15 = Land ownership/tenure, 99 = Other, specify

All area sizes indicated are in acres

Columns EN-EZ contain values for selected variables in USD, using approximate exchange rates for October 2022. Monetary values in all other columns are in local currency (i.e. TZS for Tanzania and KSH for Kenya).

Columns EH-EM contain data used to analyse the results of the choice experiment. ID is a unique identifier for each respondent