

Impact of Social Capital on Smallholder Farmers Agricultural Innovation Adoption

Tamene Betebo¹, Teferi Tolera², Adugna Eneyew², Sara Shikur

¹ PhD Candidate in Jimma University and Lecturer at Wachemo University

² PhD, Associate Profesor at Jimma University

³ PhD, Assistant Profesor at Wachemo University

ABSTRACT

In the contemporary world, when a new technology is introduced to farmers, not only do individual and household factors such as risk attitudes, wealth and resource endowments affect a farm household's likelihood of technology adoption but probably more importantly, social capital structures also appear to matter. Social capital concept is witnessing an increasing usage in circles of community development work and researches, and within its various constructions has been linked to agriculture and farming communities. Most agricultural communities are geographically defined and this facilitates through the locality development approach, emphasizing the importance of self-help and mutual aid in building better communities within identified areas and occupations. In this paper, we have discussed the relationship between social capital and agriculture, with specific focus on community development. We recognize the importance of community connections and its resultant social capital emergence, leading us to show how these societal ties and norms will be resourceful in making a community to develop, an explanation that recognizes the potential positive advantages of social capital development, which could help community development workers and society members build communities that truly promotes agriculture in the rural areas. Social capital has been focus of many researchers in recent years. Development of communities is a continuous process in order to sustain communities through utilizing their assets in a world that is increasingly becoming unpredictable and difficult in terms of togetherness and caring concerns for sustainability and productivity. Social capital in agriculture was reviewed from rural community perspectives and seen as a motivating and attaching force for the agrarian societies that benefits the agriculture. This review tries to capture some of the existing social capital and their contribution in rural agrarian societies. The development of social capital as unseen capital in any society will provide the community members the force to forge ahead in whatever self-help endeavor their community resolved to undertake. This review paper also considers the other side of the coin and looked at marginal community members that did not subscribe to social capital and became excluded from the beneficial collective actions of the majority. Social capital in agricultural communities will go a long way in empowering community members to sustainably produce food and develop their communities. This suggests the need to support farmer-based organizations and improve information channels related to input and output market information, credit and insurance.

Keywords: Social capital, Innovation Adoption, Impact and smallholder farmers.

DOI: 10.7176/ISDE/16-1-01

Publication date: July 31st 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Development of communities is a continuous process in order to sustain communities through utilizing their assets in a world that is increasingly becoming unpredictable and difficult in terms of togetherness and caring concerns for sustainability (Muhammad *et al.*, 2017). The transformative capacity of the social structure to a mutually beneficial productive action generally collective action and, norms of trust, reciprocity and effective sanctions are important forms of social capital (Getachew *et al.*, 2020). Social capital provides a foundation for development, the groundwork on which much of economic and social wellbeing is built because of the effect of social capital on labor productivity, poverty reduction, trade, education, health, income distribution, and family structure (Christoforou, 2017). In contemporary world, when a new technology is introduced to farmers, not only do individual and household factors such as risk attitudes, wealth and resource endowments affect a farm household's likelihood of technology adoption but probably more importantly, social capital structures also

appear to matter (Fikrewold Yeneneh, 2022). This suggests the need to support farmer-based organizations and improve information channels related to input and output market information, credit and insurance (Collins-Sowah et al., 2019). Sustainable livelihoods can be achieved or captured when the basic idea about social norms and social bonds has been cleared in the minds of the people (Rida Shibli *et al.*, 2021). In Ethiopia, 80.5% of the rural population are relied on agriculture for their livelihoods (Mekuria, 2018) about 66% of the country is suitable for agriculture and it accounts for 46.9% of the GDP (Esther, 2016) 77% of overall employment and close to 84% of foreign export earnings (ATA, 2016). However, it is still characterized by low input usage and productivity, climate-related disasters like droughts, significant post-harvest loss, and population pressure and land degradation. Similarly the sector is dominated by poor smallholders land holding size of 1.18ha labor-intensive farming with limited mechanization, and engaged in subsistence agriculture (World Bank, 2015; Lulu, 2020).

Agriculture plays a significant role in economic development, growth, fostering food security, job creation and poverty eradication. It is primary income provision sector to approximately 2.5 billion people in third world countries (Birir, 2021) smallholder agriculture is critical developmental aspect to meet Standard Development Goals one that is to alleviate poverty. However, the majority of smallholder farmers have not fully adopted new agricultural techniques. Society who has high social capital will open the possibility of solving the complexity of the problem more easily than low social capital. This happens to people who are accustomed to a high sense of mutual trust. Social capital noted that social capital that grows in a community that is good and cooperative behavior based on shared norms will be very helpful in strengthening these community entities. Additionally, social capital also reduces information costs and risk then helps reduce moral hazard and adverse selection (World Bank, 2015; Lulu, 2020). Access to information pertaining to agricultural knowledge is essential to develop farmers' abilities in maintaining and increasing farm productivity. Farmers who lack the means to acquire agricultural information from formal sources often rely on the information within their informal social network (Pratiwi and Suzuki, 2017). Weak social capital will reduce the spirit of mutual cooperation, exacerbate poverty, increase unemployment and crime and can hinder any efforts to improve social welfare (Busthanul *et al.*, 2021).

Today agricultural sector does not need only the supply of inputs and technologies, rather it requires also considerations of different institutional arrangements existing in agrarian societies. With this view we have tried to review different articles that consider social capital as one main input in agriculture and looked at their different role (Alemayehu Derbe, 2019). In the country, Ethiopia, which is one of the least developed countries in the globe, the level and distribution of social capital stock remain uncovered to date.

Evidence from different countries, however, suggests that social networks play a central role in people's lives in so many ways including in shaping beliefs, preferences, and decisions (Jakson, 2011). This review paper explains empirical evidence of the impact of social capital for the adoption of agricultural innovations and for farm productivity in smallholder farmers. Specifically, it review the determinants of information and learning links among farmers, and whether those information links and their structure affect the adoption of innovations, mainly agricultural innovation.

1.2. Objectives of the Review

The objective of this paper is to review the different forms of locally available mutual support associations and their values for agricultural innovations adoption. In more concrete terms, this review explains how different types of indigenous social network arrangements are used to implement agricultural practices. Moreover, review how farmers trigger social connectedness within the indigenous mutual support associations for agricultural innovations adoption.

2. METHODOLOGY

For this paper, a variety of documents were reviewed, and the data were collected from records, articles, journals and original research papers. The collected data were organized and compiled for interpretation. The arguments of different researchers were taken, and the reviewer supports accordingly and made interpretation. To ensure that the greatest number of articles are found in the common field of social capital and agricultural innovation adoption. It is designed in such a way that this paper can find the most relevant articles to the subject under review. A multidisciplinary perspective is adopted to ensure that the maximum number of related articles was reached, and searches of databases were not limited to any journals or any specific category of journals. This method's output is a database of relevant articles that are ready for quantitative and qualitative analysis. For this paper, at the identification time different articles from different sources are found through initial searches.

3. CONCEPTS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

Social capital is a collective asset in the form of shared norms, values, beliefs, trust, networks, and social relations that facilitate collective action for mutual benefits. Similarly, (Liang et al., 2015) define social capital as the networks that facilitate interactions between individuals. Furthermore, social capital (Carrillo Alvarez & Riera Romani, 2016) is the resources available to individuals and groups through membership in social networks. (Wedajo and Jilito, 2020) defined social capital as a strong social network based on trust and norms of reciprocity, mutual benefit, ownership, and common goal between and among members. Social capital is the network of the people who live and work in a common community and thus contribute to the effective functioning of their community. This depends on the effective functioning of the social groups in which the individuals share a common sense of identity, mutual understanding, norms, values, and trust. It is said to be the main force to measure the effective functioning of a community. Social capital focuses on the specific benefits to the society in which the flow of trust, information and cooperation among the social groups that form the social networks (Lin, 2008). Norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that are part of social groups and arise from the social capital. The idea of social capital enables the people to cooperate with each who are part of a society. However, another aspect of the social capital also exists in the literature (Kreuter & Lezin, 2002). Therefore bridging of social groups in social capital is of great importance otherwise it can lead to the isolation of social groups and adverse consequences (Portes, 2014).

According to (Balogun et al., 2017) impacts of social capital on agricultural productivity indirectly in two ways: by affecting the supply of both household and hired labour, as well as being a source of information for households. Households process this information to make technology adoption decisions that have direct impacts on their levels of productivity. Alternatively, more productive households might work with less productive households to help them improve their productivity. Social networks may also indirectly affect agricultural productivity by influencing farming practices and the households' propensity to adopt newer technologies via the supply of information through these networks. It is important to the efficient functioning of modern economies Macro-level social capital comprises different aspects of institutional quality and is closely related to the income distribution and social cohesion. It also indirectly impact agricultural productivity by affecting the quantity of labor available either from the immediate and extended family or through the social relationships available to the individual.

Impact of social capital at the level of individual households, social capital research has focused on how social networks catalyze peer-to-peer learning, innovation, adoption of sustainable agriculture practices, and how networks motivate greater participation in resource governance or conservation programs (Niles *et al.*, 2021). Existing research confirms that greater levels of social capital within individual households is related with behavioral changes and outcomes associated with resilience (e.g., sustainable agricultural practice adoption, access to resource programs). Further evidence in both high and low-income countries demonstrates positive relationships between social capital, particularly household participation in community groups or organizations (8, 31), and improved food security outcomes in both urban and rural settings (Niles *et al.*, 2021; Saint Vill et al., 2016).

Farmers in agricultural intervention projects have larger social networks and more sources of knowledge and information, produce a greater number of crops and have more diversified livelihood strategies (Cadger et al., 2016). Social networks may reduce climate vulnerability by improving capacity to adapt to stressors and increase household food security through times of hardship (Martin et al., 2004; Cadger et al., 2016; Niles and Brown, 2017). Furthermore, reciprocity among neighbors through exchange or lending of food or resources may explain the positive relationship between household social capital and food security (Martin *et al.*, 2004; Quetulio-Navarra *et al.*, 2017) and the negative relationship between social support and health outcomes (Ahmadi et al., 2017). Social capital refers to the internal social and cultural coherence of society, the norms and values that govern interactions among people and the institutions in which they are embedded. Social capital is the glue that holds societies together and without which there can be no economic growth or human well-being. Without social capital, society at large will collapse, and today's world presents some very sad examples of this (Jordan and Jordan, 2015).

3.1. Dimension of Social Capital in Agriculture

Social capital in agriculture, exploring the association between different forms of social capital and innovation in agriculture, from a sample of African countries, researchers studied instances and their work found mixed evidence that portrays some interesting findings. While structural social capital, especially in the form of connections beyond the village, is associated with more extensive adoption of innovations, the reverse is true for cognitive social capital that captured shared norms and trust within the local community, suggesting that social

capital in agriculture needs more researches and study to maximize the benefits therein (Rijn, Bulte and Adekunle, 2012). Another angle of the occurrence of social capital in agriculture is its role and place when farmers and non-farming people live in the same community. Farmers might attempt to develop social capital or neighborly relations with non-farming neighbors in order to mitigate

3.2. Social Capital and Innovation Adoption

Social capital is the concept that of shared values and network of relationships that exists between the people who work in the same community, and thus the achievement of their purpose and effective working of the community is achieved (Ab Yajid, 2020). Social capital is linked to development and the economic prosperity which enables the formation of new strategies (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). Literature focuses on three main dimensions of the social capital, network, norms, and trust in the inter relations that make the society and contribute towards the effective functioning of the society. Studies have shown that the behavior of the farmers towards the adoption of the new technologies is positively related to the social capital. The positive relation between the social capital and development of the community also reflects the contribution of the social capital towards the economic development. Strengthened social capital leads to the flow of information which therefore enhances the adoption of new technologies (Sandefur & Laumann, 1998). Studies have shown that social capital exerts noticeable influence on the farmers in their participation towards the adoption of new technologies. Their norms and trust towards the concerned authorities also shapes their trend and level of interest in the adoption of new technologies. Ethiopian agriculture is characterized by low productivity associated with, for example, low input usage (such as improved seed varieties and fertilizer), significant post-harvest loss, population pressure, poor farming practices, and land degradation (Mekonnen et al., 2018).

Studies based on individual economic incentives consider profitability as the major determinant of technology adoption and examine the factors that affect profitability of new technologies. From this point of view, the main determinants of innovation adoption are: information barriers (Abdulai *et al.*, 2008; Rosenzweig, 2010; Young, 2009), supply-side constraints such as limited availability of credit (Shiferaw et al., 2008), differences in agro-ecological and climatic conditions (Deressa et al., 2009), as well as heterogeneity among farm households in terms of adoption costs (Schreinemachers et al., 2010). This suggests that when adoption is considered as an individual action problem beyond profitability, capturing supply-side constraints and market inefficiencies is important since affordability is crucial in explaining low adoption rates of profitable technologies (Abdulai and Huffman, 2014; Shiferaw *et al.*, 2009). As a consequence, it is necessary to consider the adoption decision as one that complements individual calculations of profitability with the ability to implement adoption practices successfully.

3.3. Impact of Social Capital on Agricultural Innovation

Impacts of social capital refers to households' relation and networking with various community-based organizations such as saving and credit cooperative, Idir, Equb, religious group and mutual help group. It is a dummy variable which assumes a value of 1 if the household participate in a range of community-based organizations (more than two) and 0, otherwise. More involvement in community-based organizations has informal function of providing a 'grassroots insurance', which would be highly beneficial in the face of climate related shocks (Vincent, 2007). Thus, it was expected to influence households' vulnerability to food insecurity negatively (Debebe Cheber, 2021). Social capital is an investment to get new resources in society. Weak social capital will dim the spirit of mutual cooperation, exacerbate poverty, increase unemployment, crime, and hinder any effort in improving the welfare of the population including farmers. Utilizing the potential of social capital had been able to contribute to improving income of farmers in the rural area (Arsal et al., 2020).

Social capital is associated with positive food security outcomes, using survey data from 378 households in rural Uganda (Sseguya *et al.*, 2017). Households with bridging and linking social capital, characterized by membership in groups, access to information from external institutions, and observance of norms in groups, tended to be more food secure. Households with cognitive social capital, characterized by observance of generalized norms and mutual trust, were also more food secure than others.

The social-ecological effects of agricultural intensification are complex. Farmers' perceptions about the impacts of their land management and the impact of social information flows on their management through a case study in a farming community in Navarra, Spain, that is undergoing agricultural intensification due to adoption of large scale irrigation (Amaia Albizua *et al.*, 2021). They found that farmers' awareness about nature contributions to people co-production and their land management decisions determine, in part, the structure of the social networks among the farming community.

Socio-economic factors influencing the level of social capital among small-scale farming households in Kogi State were investigated. A total of 352 farming households were randomly selected across the agricultural zones in the state (Ayo Fatimoh *et al.*, 2018). The study concluded that social capital level is influenced by the socio-economic characteristics of the farming households.

Social capital on their decisions to deal with climate change and climate variability in Burkina Faso. The study is based on a household survey conducted among 450 households, randomly selected from three communities in Burkina Faso. Two indexes were constructed to capture farmers' structural and cognitive social capital; and using generalized Poisson regression (GPR) and a multivariate probit model, the study probes the effect of farmers' social capital on their choice of adaptation alternatives, the number of adaptation practices used, and the extent to which adaptation measures were applied. The results indicated that the effect of social capital depends on the type of indicator used and on the type of adaptation strategies necessary. Farmers' cognitive social capital was significantly and positively related to their choice of soil and water conservation techniques (SWCT), and techniques such as agroforestry and irrigation. Structural social capital, on the other hand, was positively associated with the adoption of new varieties and conservation tillage strategies and negatively associated with the use of a crop-diversification strategy. The results also highlighted that socio-economic, institutional and agro-ecological variables determine farmers' decisions to adapt to climate change (Yaméogo *et al.*, 2018).

Impact of social capital on farm productivity and food security among cocoa-based farming households in Southwestern, Nigeria. A multistage sampling procedure was employed to select 300 cocoa-based farming households for the study status (Kehinde *et al.*, 2021). Two-step Heckman and three-stage simultaneous models were used for the analyses. The results of a two-step Heckman model revealed that asset, age of household head, years of education, gender, farm size, land tenure, loan interest rate and extension visits were the determining factors influencing the probability of participating in social groups. The study concluded that social capital enhanced farm productivity and improved food security of the cocoa-based farming households (Mutenje *et al.*, 2016). This would enhance cocoa farming households' access to productive resource and thus achieve financial leverage that would further boost farm productivity. Enhanced farm productivity would improve their food security status (Kehinde *et al.*, 2021).

The choice between specialization and diversification of income is driven by multiple, interacting factors, such as economies of scale and scope, risk considerations, context, and household characteristics (Gabriela *et al.*, 2019). Using panel data from Ethiopia, investigate the role of social capital and the covariate risk of climate change and their interaction. They find that households with greater social capital tend to be more specialized, implying that diversification and informal insurance are substitutes in the mitigation of risk. They also find that this effect is significantly weaker in regions more prone to climate change, which is consistent with the average farmer being aware that informal insurance is not an effective protection against risks that affect the entire social network.

Existing literature suggests that innovations, particularly in poor countries, are constrained by lack of information and market inefficiencies such as the absence of well-functioning credit and insurance markets (Gabriela *et al.*, 2019). Networks may provide practical solutions in such circumstances and can guide policy decisions such as targeting. To be specific, social networks facilitate interaction, which is a central part of the innovation systems framework that understands the capacity for continuous innovation as a function of linkages, working practices, and policies that promote knowledge flows and learning among all actors (Hall *et al.*, 2006). The underlying idea is that wider knowledge and information are embodied in different actors and interaction among them enhances their innovation behavior and performance. Social networks are the channels for such interactions and for social learning to occur (Mutenje *et al.*, 2016).

In Ethiopia, for many centuries, indigenous societies mutual support associations like Guuza, Iqubi and Afoosha based on social support networks that used to respond to households and communities social needs and wellbeing that have been institutionalized and widely practiced among rural households in Ethiopia (Dercon *et al.*, 2006; Endris *et al.*, 2017). These social networks offer different services, such as mutual insurance, labor sharing, saving, and credit to rural households (Bernier & Meinzen-Dick, 2014) and fulfill many other socio-cultural obligations (Endris *et al.*, 2017). They are based on widely agreed norms of trust, moral obligation and reciprocities (Bernier & Meinzen-Dick, 2014; Wedajo *et al.*, 2019). Social connectedness is manifested in different types of groups at the local level from guilds and mutual aid societies, to credit groups, labor-sharing groups, mutual support groups, informal financial groups, women groups and common celebrations groups, such as prayers, marriages, and funerals. Such types of social networks may have the advantage of allowing members for a greater access to new knowledge and practices, which would trigger the process of novelty creation and innovations. The impact of climate change is increasingly affecting the daily lives of poor farmer households. An

understanding of the social dimension profoundly shapes the way in which policy-makers develop adaptation policies. Result suggest following implications are worthy of consideration for improving farmers' adoption of adaptation strategies: improving the institutions' communication and sharing of information with farmers and investing in programmes that build links across groups in communities and up to those in authority (Belay and Fekadu, 2021).

Today agricultural sector does not need only the supply of inputs and technologies, rather it requires also considerations of different institutional arrangements existing in agrarian societies. With this paper tried to review different articles that consider social capital as one main input in Ethiopian agriculture and looked at their different role. One of the most celebrated social capitals in Ethiopian rural agrarian society is Debo. Debo is a labor sharing mechanism among Ethiopian farmers. The system allows either neighbors or relatives to share the available labor force for any members of Debo during preparation, plough, seedling, weeding, harvesting or for any kind of farming or livestock rearing activities. It is obvious that it lowers the labor cost that the farmers or the entity would incur for hiring a labor. Hence it reduces the production cost. Nizam A.,et al (2017) analyzed the effect of being membership of Debo for soil and water conservation practices (SWC) and productivity enhancing technologies (PET) adopters and non-adopters. The paper employed data collected in a socio-economic household survey that is carried out during March to May 2014 among Ethiopian farmers. The sample is limited to 398 households living in a 200 km radius around Hawassa town. Accordingly, the members of Debo, and adopters and non-adopters of both SWC and PET were nearly 23%. In this regard, the study debates that for adoption Soil and Water Conservation practices, it has typical governance challenge which is a free riding problem. This means, the final results of the common pool resource will be shared among all the participants regardless of their level and frequency of participation. However, argument regarding productivity enhancing technologies is that Debo might have positive effects on adoption since the farmers can control the performance of the Debo members. In general, through such a system farmers also help those who fall sick during a planting or harvesting season. Sentiments like "sharing experiences in times of joy and sadness" constitute the most important aspect. Though the contribution of Debo could vary among Ethiopian rural society, its immense contribution during labor shortage period and its effective communication ways for members of Debo makes it still to be a long- lasting social capital in Ethiopian rural agrarian societies.

Another strongest type of social capital practiced in Ethiopian rural agrarian society is Jarsumma. The Jarsumma is derived from the word "Jaarsa" in Afan Oromo (the language of Oromo people) which means elders. The Jarsumma is the procedure of solving dispute among individuals, groups or tribes on common or private resources or ethnic based conflicts through truth and win-win mechanism (Bayeh, 2015). Hence for any local farmers, in the view of the community, being a member of Jarsumma is considered as prestige and respect due to the fact the decision passed by such system is almost accepted by those members and the community. Hence, its contribution in local conflict resolution and adopting new agricultural technology practices is huge. For example, in recent period the Ethiopian government have introduced and advised a row planting practice. There was resistance among the farmers in practice, even though not all. In most part of the country, the benefit and the effect of row planting was solved via Jarsumma (though a different kind of name is given to it in different parts of the region). The other is "Idir and Ikub". Idirl is a social activity for provision of social and economic insurance for the members in the events of death, accident, damages to property, and the like. ; Idir help cover costs incurred during a funeral and other emergency situations, and as such, are insurance organizations. A result it is considered as a means, if for example, the farmer or member of the idir is in the short money due to either crop failure or seasonality of production from which income is generated, it acts as insurance. Hence, belonging to Idir, having some form of relationship with network members in terms of kinship or informal forms of insurance, or having a high frequency of meetings with a network member, all seem to increase the probability of forming an information link. With this premise, they can all also talk the existing practices and/or problems about their daily of agriculture.

"Ikub" is "an economic association by a group of individuals who agree to make regular contributions to a fund which is given, in whole or in part, to each contributor in rotation". The basic principle upon which Ikub is organized is that a fixed amount of money is collected from each participant, and this fund is given to one of the participants in turn. Hence it is considered as a rotating savings and credit association. The person who receives the fund at a particular meeting is determined by drawing a lottery. The drawing of the lottery, however, may not coincide with the credit needs of the members. Accordingly, if one members of Ikub (farmer) is in need of credit, with some monetary reward for the winner and agreement, then the farmer will take this round. As a result Ikub serves as one of the safe and nearby source for financing his/her agricultural activities either in absence or presence of formal credit institutions. Farmers' association (often referred to by its former name, peasant association): This association, based in a rural kebele, is a semi-autonomous entity that is directly involved in decisions regarding the land, water, natural resources and other productive, social and political issues that affect

the lives of all community members. Besides the major ones, there are also other social capital indicators emerging and practiced in rural Ethiopian agrarian society. Among those, agricultural producer's cooperatives, water use group, watershed group, forest use group, business group and women association the major one. In general, those social capitals, whether they do have a positive or negative effect, they should be modeled or considered as one of the input in agricultural production, since in either or indirect way, their existence is inevitable where the social norms and networks are huge in rural Ethiopia.

Gaps on literature

While the literature extensively covers social capital's impact on cooperation and knowledge sharing, there is a lack of in-depth research exploring its role in technological innovation in agriculture. Specifically, the interaction between social capital and advanced agricultural technologies, such as precision farming and digital tools, remains underexplored. This gap is particularly critical as technological adoption is a key factor in improving agricultural efficiency and addressing global food security challenges. Future studies should investigate how social networks and trust among farmers can facilitate the adoption of such technologies, especially in regions where financial and technical barriers are prominent.

Future Direction

Addressing social capital gaps will require a multidisciplinary approach that combines insights from sociology, economics, and agricultural sciences. Expanding the scope of research, exploring the intersection of social capital with technological innovation, and critically assessing the potential drawbacks of social capital are essential steps toward a more comprehensive understanding of its role in agriculture. Moreover, future studies should seek to incorporate longitudinal analyses to assess how social capital evolves over time and its long-term effects on agricultural productivity and community resilience.

4. CONCLUSION

Social capital has been focus of many researchers in recent year's dynamic social process. Development of communities is a continuous process in order to sustain communities through utilizing their assets in a world that is increasingly becoming unpredictable and difficult in terms of togetherness and caring concerns for sustainability and productivity. Social capital in agriculture was reviewed from community perspectives and seen as a motivating and attaching force for the agrarian societies that benefits the agriculture.

Social capital, and the synergy from community members' interactions, improve food security status both directly and indirectly. It is tried to review a comprehensive and integrated picture of how social capital affects agricultural innovation adoption. In other words, this review main contribution is to show how social capital can improve agricultural innovation adoption. A detailed review of articles published in the field of food security and social capital found that social capital enhances food security through two mechanisms of knowledge sharing and product sharing.

Social capital is more widely accepted as one asset not only by the academics but people in the business world, its applications and measurement systems have been developed and used with specific objectives on community levels and national levels. Social capital in agriculture is its role and place when farmers and non-farming people live in the same community. Farmers might attempt to develop social capital or neighborly relations with non-farming neighbors in order to mitigate social constraints created by non-farming concerns within farming communities. Relationships from the non-farming people, when it indicates support and tolerance of agriculture to be high, especially when non-farmers appreciate the existence of social capital with majority of the practicing farmers, it will lead to creating synergy between the two groups and subsequently leading to beneficial relationships for both the two components of the community, creating develop well-being and cordiality. In this conception of social capital, the key issue in the community is not social ties per se, but rather the "scaling up" of these ties to form organizations that are economically effective for enhancing agricultural productivity within the various strata of the community. But in Ethiopian context, its role and significance is almost ignored. Thus, identifying the types and dimensions of the social capital in order to estimate their probable effects is important. Finally, their practicability standards and measurement should be a future research focus with particular emphasis in rural and urban Ethiopian agrarian society.

5. REFERENCES

Ab Yajid, M. S. (2020). Mediating Role of Organizational Culture on the Association between Business Social Responsibility and Organization Performance in Nigeria. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(1), 646-653.

ATA (Agricultural Transformation Agency) 2016. Promising investment opportunities in Ethiopian agribusiness. WEF Grow Africa, Ethiopia.

Arsal, I Karim², D Salman³, I M Fahmid³, Mahyudin³, and A. A. (2020) “Social capital and maize farmers’ income.”

Alemayehu Derbe (2019) “Social Capital in Rural Ethiopia Agrarian Society,” *Developing Country Studies*

Amaia Albizua, Elena M. Bennett, Guillaume Larocque, Robert W. Krause, U. P. (2021) “Social networks influence farming practices and agrarian sustainability,” pp. 1–18.

Ayo Fatimoh AYOANLERE, Olubunmi Abayomi OMOTESHO, A. M.-L. (2018) “Socio – Economic Determinants of the Level of Social Capital among Small-Scale Farming Households in Kogi State , Nigeria.”

Balogun, O.L; Ogunina, I.J., Ayo-Bello, T.A; Afodu, O. an. O. (2017) “Effect of social capital on productivity of cassava farmers in j.jebu north-east local government area of ogun state, nigeria 1,” pp. 822–827.

Belay, D. and Fekadu, G. (2021) *Influence of social capital in adopting climate change adaptation strategies: empirical evidence from rural areas of Ambo district in Ethiopia, Climate and Development*. Taylor & Francis.

Birir, A. K. (2021) “Influence of social capital on adoption of climate smart,”

Busthanul, N. *et al.* (2021) “The Role of Social Capital of the Urban Farming Community in the Development of Horticulture in Makassar (Case Study : Women ’ s Group Dewi Sari Lorong Garden , Tamalanrea District.

Coleman, J. S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95–S120.

Collins-Sowah, Peron A.; Adjin, K. Christophe; Henning, Christian H. C. A. (2019). Complementary impact of social capital on the adoption of productivity enhancing technologies: Evidence from Senegal, Working Papers of Agricultural Policy, No. WP2019-03, Kiel University, Department of Agricultural Economics, Chair of Agricultural Policy, Kiel.

Clark, L. (2019) “Seeing the social capital in agricultural innovation systems : using SNA to visualise bonding and bridging ties in rural communities .

Daniel Belay Tesfaye (2018). Social Capital and Smallholder Farmers’ Collective action: the Case of Primary Dairy Cooperatives in West Shoa Zone, Ethiopia.

Deressa, T., Hassan, R., Ringler, C., Alemu, T., Yesuf, M., 2009. Determinants of farmers’ choice of adaptation methods to climate change in the Nile Basin of Ethiopia. *Glob. Environ. Change*. 19, 248–255.

Dercon, S., De Weerd, J., Bold, T., & Pankhurst, A. (2006). Group-based funeral insurance in Ethiopia and Tanzania. *World Development*, 34(4), 685–703.

Dzanja, Joseph; Christie, Fazeya, Ioan; T. (2015) “The Role of Social Capital in Rural Household Food Security : The Case Study of Dowa and Lilongwe Districts in Central Malawi,” *Journal of Agricultural Science*.

Endris, G. S., Kibwika, P., Hassan, J. Y., & Obaa, B. B. (2017). Harnessing social capital for resilience to livelihood shocks: Ethnographic evidence of indigenous mutual support practices among rural households in eastern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Population Research*.

Esther, B., Aline, M., Géraldine, B., Támas K And Petr, H. 2016. Developing country-wide farm typologies: An analysis of Ethiopian smallholders’ income and food security. the paper presented at the 5th International Conference of the African Association of Agricultural Economists, September 23-26, 2016, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Fikrewoold Yeneneh, 2021. An Assessment of Social Capital in Rural Ethiopia: The Case of Aresi and Menze: A Dissertation Submitted in the fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Public Administration University of the Western Cape.

Gabriela Cofré-Bravo, Laurens Klerkx, A. E. (2019) *Combinations of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital for farm innovation: How farmers configure different support networks, Journal of Rural Studies*.

Goldin, C. (2016). Human Capital. In C. Diebolt & M. Hauptert (Eds.), *Handbook of Cliometrics* (pp. 55- 86).

Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Jackson, M. O. (2011). An Overview of Social Networks and Economic Applications. In Handbook of Social Economics, Volume 1A Chapter 12. Elsevier.

Jordan, J. B. and Jordan, J. B. (2015) "A Study in How Linking Social Capital Functions in Community Development by."

Kehinde, A. D., Adeyemo, R. and Ogundeji, A. A. (2021) *Does social capital improve farm productivity and food security? Evidence from cocoa-based farming households in Southwestern Nigeria*, Heliyon. Elsevier Ltd.

Kreuter, M., & Lezin, N. (2002). Social capital theory. Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research: Strategies for improving public health. Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research, 228-254.

Lin, N. (2008). A network theory of social capital. The handbook of social capital, 50(1), 69.

Liu, C. and Zheng, H. (2021) "How social capital affects willingness of farmers to accept low-carbon agricultural technology (LAT)? A case study of," (41901196).

Lulu, A. B. (2020) "Role of social capital in agricultural producers' cooperatives for commercialization: in the case of Ethiopia Amelawork Biresaw Lulu."

Mekonnen, D. A., Gerber, N. and Matz, J. A. (2018) "Gendered Social Networks, Agricultural Innovations, and Farm Productivity in Ethiopia," *World Development*, 105, pp. 321–335.

Mekuria, W., 2018. The link between agricultural production and population dynamics in Ethiopia: a review. *Plants Agric Res*.

Mutenje, M. *et al.* (2016) *Agricultural innovations and food security in Malawi: Gender dynamics, institutions and market implications*, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. Elsevier Inc.

Niles, M. T. *et al.* (2021) "Household and Community Social Capital Links to Smallholder Food Security," 5(March), pp. 1–14.

Portes, A. (2014). Downsides of social capital. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(52), 18407-1840

Pratiwi, A. and Suzuki, A. (2017) "Effects of farmers' social networks on knowledge acquisition : lessons from agricultural training in rural Indonesia," *Journal of Economic Structures*.

Putnam, R.D., 2000. *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster, New York.

Rida Shibli, Sobhia Saifan, Ali Khatibi, Mohd Shukri, 2021. Social Capital, Agriculture Extension Services and Access of Resources toward Innovation Adoption in Household Farming in Malaysia.

Sseguya, H. *et al.* (2017) "Social capital dimensions in household food security interventions : implications for rural Uganda United States Department of Agriculture," *Agriculture and Human Values*.

Uphoff, N., & Wijayaratna, C. M. (2000). Demonstrated benefits from social capital: The productivity of farmer organizations in Gal Oya, Sri Lanka. *World Development*, 28(11), 1875-1890.

Wedajo, D. Y. and Jilito, M. F. (2020) "Cogent Food & Agriculture Innovating social connectedness for agricultural innovations in eastern Ethiopia Innovating social connectedness for agricultural innovations in eastern Ethiopia," *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 6(12).

Wedajo, D. Y., Belissa, T. K., & Jilito, M. F. (2019). Harnessing indigenous social institutions for technology adoption: 'Afoosha' society of Ethiopia.

Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *The World Bank research observer*, 15(2), 225-249.

World Bank .2015. *Doing Business 2015: Going Beyond Efficiency*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. (2012). World Development Indicators. Washington, D.C. The World Bank

Wuepper, D., Yesigat Ayenew, H. and Sauer, J. (2018) *Social Capital, Income Diversification and Climate Change Adaptation: Panel Data Evidence from Rural Ethiopia*, *Journal of Agricultural Economics*.

Yaméogo, T. B., Fonta, W. M. and Wünscher, T. (2018) *Can social capital influence smallholder farmers' climate-change adaptation decisions? Evidence from three semi-arid communities in Burkina Faso, West Africa*, *Social Sciences*.