

# Examining Members Commitment, Heterogeneity and Social Capital Within the Membership Base of Agricultural Cooperatives in Udenu Local Government Area Enugu State

Okafor, Ogochukwu Esther<sup>1</sup>, Michael Maureen Chinenye<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Okafo OKOREAFFIA<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Cooperative Economics & Management, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

<sup>2&3</sup>Federal Polytechnic Nekede Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria

\*Corresponding Author

Received: 26 February 2023; Revised: 09 March 2023; Accepted: 16 March 2023; Published: 18 April 2023

**Abstract:** - The study examined the membership commitment, heterogeneity and social capital within the membership of agricultural cooperative in Udenu Local Government Area. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the societies from which the samples were drawn. The main research instrument used for the collection of data was the questionnaire. The sample size used was 100. The result revealed that social capital influences sustenance of capacity for collective action, lowers transaction costs in contracting via trust, offers access information via networks of contacts, helps companies enhance their competitive advantage and promote performance, facilitates information exchange and resource flow and motivates product innovation. It was also revealed that gender of agricultural cooperative membership has no effect on social capital. Thus men and women have equal structural social capital, social connections and relationships with other members, and have equal extent of sharing information and resources that can improve their participation in economic activities in the cooperatives. Social capital diversity impact agricultural productivity and economic sustainability. Finally, it was revealed that social capital diversity enhances social responsibility by promoting the use of sustainable agricultural farming practices and thereby contributing to environmental sustainable development. The study recommended that attention to should be given on gender differences in social network formation.

**Keywords:** Members Commitment, Heterogeneity, Agricultural Cooperative and Social Capital

## 1.1. Background to the Study

Cooperative may be seen as an independent and voluntary association of people with a common goal that pool their resources together for the purpose of improvement of its members in terms of economic, social welfare and otherwise. Nigeria as a developing nation, relies mostly on Agricultural product thus, has many agricultural cooperatives but not limited to Consumers Cooperatives, Supply, Purchasing Cooperatives and Marketing Cooperatives etc. It is worth to note that for any cooperative to be fully functional and seeks to actualize its' objectives, there must be member commitment and Social capitals between and among the members of the Cooperatives. Yining, Qiao, and Zuhui (2018) categorized social capital into bonding and bridging social capital which would be extensively discussed with respect to Agricultural Cooperative in Udenu Local Government in the preceding chapters. More so, the existence of strength in diversity could be positive realization of heterogeneity among the membership cooperatives. On the contrary, heterogeneity may be an impediment to cooperatives' progress if not properly handled. Member heterogeneity in cooperative is of various dimension; gender, farm size and geographic dispersion, time horizons, risk attitudes and perceptions, contractual relationship of each member to the cooperative, distribution of honorary posts among members and products delivered to the cooperative.

In view of social capital, it was noted the core idea of social capital is "relationship matters" or "social networks value" (Field, 2008). The term "social capital" is believed to have been first used by Hanifan in 1916 to highlight the role of community in improving school performance in the neighbourhood. Fukuyama (1999), presents a definition of social capital as being an informal norm that promotes cooperation between two or more individuals, possibly those norms varying from reciprocity between two friends even the complex doctrines like that of Christianity or Confucianism. Social capital is productive, making possible the realization of certain goals which, in their absence, would not be possible. Therefore, while evaluating the Agricultural cooperatives in Udenu Local Government Area, the aforementioned variables would serve as the key variables so as to understand their impacts on the cooperatives.

The celebrated success of cooperatives in many countries around the world during the last 100–150 years has been accompanied by major challenges caused by secular changes in the institutional environment for example (Höhler and Kühn, 2017). Symptoms of these challenges include but are not limited to, eroding member commitment, member heterogeneity, deprived social capital, member apathy, lack of incentives to invest risk capital in cooperatives, excessive agency and influence costs and so on. Effective

solutions to these challenges are conspicuous by their absence, while the solutions that are currently on offer fail primarily in view of the pervasive member preference heterogeneity problems for example. In the scientific literature on cooperative activities, the degree of membership commitment and heterogeneity in membership is attentive (Cook and Iliopoulos, 2016). A risk presented by differences between members is that these differences can contribute to conflicts (Bijman *et al.*, 2012). In a heterogeneous membership there is room for different ideas that can innovate business operations (Höhler and Kühl, 2017). Members within a cooperative may differ in aspects, such as age, location, size and risk-taking. These aspects can later be reflected in the members' attitudes and beliefs. Attitudes play a crucial role in members' decision making regarding strategies and goals. The differences also combine and create individual beliefs. These beliefs play a crucial role in individuals' attitudes, norms and behavioural control and later affect individual behaviour and decision making. There is research on members' commitment and heterogeneity in cooperatives, but the focus has only been on a single aspect.

### Statement of Problem

Agricultural cooperatives around the world are facing major structural challenges as they respond to a more industrialized agriculture, globalization, and freer trade. Cooperatives are responding to these changes by merging, by finding new ways of raising capital, and by developing new organizational forms such as New Generation Co-ops. Important issues co-ops face as they undergo this transformation is member commitment, heterogeneity and social capital.

According to Höhler and Kühl, (2017) These interdependencies between the heterogeneity and commitment of a cooperative's membership and its success have yet to be examined." Therefore, there is an absence in the existing theory to understand the extent to which heterogeneity and membership commitment affects a collective strategic decision, and today there are no empirical studies that can support either or the other. No research has yet been done to gain an overall understanding of the extent to which members' commitment and heterogeneity can affect the cooperative (Höhler and Kühl, 2017). In addition, there is an absence of knowledge of how membership commitment, heterogeneity and social capital in different dimensions affects a collective strategic decision. Identifying preferences among members of cooperatives and the level of membership commitment, heterogeneity and social capital for different attributes is fundamental to gain a greater understanding of the cooperative.

Despite the significance of co-operatives in general and agricultural co-operatives in specific to the Udeno L.G.A. of Enugu State economy, not much research has been done in studying member commitment, heterogeneity and social capital. Therefore, this study sought to examine how member commitment, heterogeneity and social capital are vital to the formation of cooperatives in Udeno L.G.A.

### Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to examine the membership commitment, heterogeneity and social capital within the membership of agricultural cooperative in Udeno Local Government Area.

The specific research objectives of the study include:

1. To investigate the effect of social capital on performance of agricultural cooperative in Udeno Local Government Area.
2. To examine the effect of gender of agricultural cooperative membership on social capital in Udeno Local Government Area.
3. To assess the effect of social capital diversity on member's farm size within membership of agricultural cooperative in Udeno Local Government Area.

## II. Conceptual Review

### Concept of Membership Commitment

Meyer and Herscovitch (2011), define commitment as a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets. In more specific terms, commitment refers to joint values, goals and actions in a relationship leading to the intention of relationship continuation and deployment of resources (Mäkelä and Maula, 2005). Commitment has been identified to be quite important in business relationships (Scheer, Steenkamp and Nirmalya, 1995). For example, commitment has been associated with stronger cooperation and a desire for mutual profitability greater access to market intelligence and loyalty, and being important for successful long-term relationships. Commitment can also influence the preferences for dealing with existing partners and a propensity for relation continuity although alternatives exist.

Commitment can occur on different levels such as between individuals, between individuals and organizations, and between organizations (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky, 2012). Meyer and Allen (1990), argue that members of an association differ greatly in their degree of commitment to the organisation. Moreover, apart from the degree of commitment, there is also a difference in the form of commitment; and three distinct forms of commitment –affective, continuance and normative have been

identified. It has been suggested that by knowing the differences in the form (as well as amount) of commitment an individual has to a group are likely to affect the degree and kind of influence that the group can exert upon him (Meyer and Allen, 1990).

As co-operatives rely on long-term and repeated exchange relationships with their members to generate a collective benefit that is greater than the sum of inputs of individual members (Jussila and Goel, 2012); commitment has been identified to be important in co-operatives. More specifically, one pre-requisite for successful agricultural co-operatives is that the farmer-members are willing to supply the co-operative with raw products, capital and managerial inputs; and member commitment is likely to be important for this to happen.

### **Concept of Membership Heterogeneity**

Heterogeneity (or Homogeneity) has an important bearing on collective action; and several studies have explored the relationship between group heterogeneity and the performance of common property institutions (Michael and Ostrom, 2014). Studies have suggested that heterogeneity can have diverse sources. The major sources of heterogeneity result from racial, ethnic, or other kinds of cultural divisions, and the differences in the nature of economic interests among individuals. Five forms of heterogeneity: (1) heterogeneity in endowments; (2) political heterogeneity; (3) wealth and entitlements; (4) cultural heterogeneity; and (5) economic interests.

Scholars have found that heterogeneous groups have more difficulty in reaching a common definition of group goals, managing flow of work, sustaining members' attention and cooperation, minimizing turnover, and encouraging knowledge sharing over time (Bechky and Okhuysen, 2011). Similarly, studies have indicated that group heterogeneity, which is derived from member differences in knowledge, expertise, or experience, can increase group creativity, but only if group members bridge their social and intellectual differences and work on behalf of the group as a whole (Van Kleef and De Dreu, 2004). Further, it is argued that group heterogeneity creates barriers to identification with the group as a whole because members do not feel psychologically connected to those who are different.

Similarly, Hinds and Mortensen (2015) observed that group members are more likely to remain more identified with their smaller and more homogeneous group than with a larger heterogeneous group. Olson (1998) argues that members involved in collective action often strive to influence corporate structure and decisions to reflect their preferences, resulting in organizational policies that fail to benefit the membership as a whole. Similarly, according to Varughese and Ostrom (2001), when the interests of appropriators differ, achieving a self-governing solution to common pool resource problems is particularly challenging.

A core feature of co-operatives is that it's characterized by collective decision making and self-governance. As heterogeneity affects this feature, it significantly impacts co-operatives. Hansmann (2016) argues that a fundamental characteristic of co-operatives is that members (patrons) have highly homogenous interests. This ensures that the cost of collective decision making is relatively lower for co-operatives; and this comparative advantage is one of the most important reasons for firms taking up a co-operative form (Hansmann and Starimer 2016). It also provides an explanation as to why co-operatives tend to stick to just one commodity or service.

### **Concept of Social Capital**

Adler and Kwon (2009) state that the concept of social capital has been increasingly turning popular in an extensive number of subjects in social science and a growing number of sociologists, political scientists, economists who use the concept of social capital, in the search for answers to a vast extension of questions which are being confronted in their own fields. The concept cannot be considered new, but has been frequent in discussions of authors like Coleman (1988) Adler and Kwon (2009), of which some of these authors are pioneers of that term.

Fukuyama (1999), presents a definition of social capital as being an informal norm that promotes cooperation between two or more individuals, possibly those norms varying from reciprocity between two friends even the complex doctrines like that of Christianity or Confucianism. The author states that they are not just any sets of norms that constitute social capital; they should lead to collaboration in groups. They are related to traditional virtues such as honesty, compromise, fulfillment of functions of trust, reciprocity and others related to these (Fukuyama, 1999).

Norms strengthen social trust and considers reciprocity the most important. The author divides reciprocity into two types: balanced or specific and generalized or diffused. Balanced reciprocity concerns simultaneous exchange of items of equal value; for example, when work colleagues exchange their days off, that is, the exchange in this case occurs at the same instant between parts. Generalized reciprocity concerns a continuous relation of exchange which at any moment shows unbalance or lack of correspondence, but assumes mutual expectations that a favor today will be repaid in the future. In other words, in this case, the exchange does not occur immediately between parts. One of the parts concedes a favor without, at that moment, receiving something

in exchange. This, however, acquires a “credit” with the other part. Thus, that reciprocity has direct relation with social capital, the rule of generalized reciprocity is a highly productive component of social capital.

In an ampler perspective, Yining *et al.* (2018) defines social capital by its function not being a sole entity, but a variety of different entities, with two common elements: all of them consist of some aspect of social structures and facilitate certain actions of the actors within the structure. According to the author, like other forms of capital, social capital is productive, making possible the realization of certain goals which, in their absence, would not be possible. The same author states that social capital occurs by means of changes in relations between the people who facilitate the action. If physical capital is totally tangible, of visible material form, and human capital is less tangible, for being allied to the abilities and knowledge of an individual, social capital is even less tangible, for existing in relations between people (Yining *et al.*, 2018). According to Yining *et al.* (2018), like physical capital and human capital facilitate productive activity; social capital does too and very well. For the author, a group within which ample credibility and mutual trust exist is capable of realizing much more than compared to a group without credibility and trust. The same author shows, by means of practical examples, four main sources of social capital which include: Strong ties by means of the community, church or school; cultural origin; resulting from market relations.

### **Effect of Social Capital on Performance in Agricultural Cooperative**

Social capital plays an important role in agricultural economies, including by sustaining capacity for collective action, lowering transaction costs in contracting via trust, and offering access information via networks of contacts (Park *et al.*, 2017). According to Johnson *et al.* (2013), agriculture firms can improve their economic performance by investing in the social capital which can lead to higher firm-level returns than in the human or physical capital. Social capital is a “relationship glue” that effectively supports supply chain partnerships and helps companies enhance their competitive advantage and promote performance (Park *et al.*, 2017). In practice, companies have realized the benefits of social capital in supply chain management. For example, Dell (a personal computer manufacturer) and its suppliers seamlessly communicate quality, design and production requirements as well as inventory levels through real-time information systems to promote production. Toyota (an automotive manufacturer) forms a good network of relationships with its major suppliers, thus achieving effective cooperation (Dyer and Nobeoka, 2010). Many researchers have also recognized the positive effects of social capital on performance by exploring how social capital is created and how it can affect strategic performance or operational performance (e.g., cost, flexibility, satisfaction, etc.) (Carrey *et al.*, 2011).

### **Effect of Gender of Agricultural Cooperative Membership on Social Capital**

Gender-related social capital is an emerging theme in the literature, as studies have shown that gender plays an important role in social capital formation. There is gender inequality in the mobilization of social capital, or the potential use of resources embedded in social networks (Karhina *et al.*, 2009). Social capital accrues to, or is accessed by men and women differently, and thus the benefits derived are also unevenly distributed. Gender norms and practices may play a role in constraining women's participation and ability to reap benefits from cooperatives. The literature attributes this to the fact that women are more likely to be socioeconomically disadvantaged compared to men, and these existing gender inequalities create difference in social capital between women and men. This results in a difference in the economic benefits that men and women are able to derive cooperatives, which in turn, perpetuates gender inequality. Consequently, differences in social capital between men and women constrain the effectiveness of collective action (Westermann *et al.* 2015). In recent years, cooperatives have become the subject of a growing social capital literature (Ruben and Heras, 2012). Despite its importance, few studies have examined social capital as farmers' propensity to engage in collective marketing within cooperatives. Gender inequalities in particular, have not been adequately addressed in the literature on social capital in cooperatives.

Gender is defined as a structure of social relations that builds on the perceptions of differences between males and females that are reflected in everyday social practices" (Karhina *et al.* 2009). Literature on gender highlights how entrenched inequalities impact control over productive resources and access to markets, which can in turn, undermine sustainable and inclusive development (World Bank, 2019). Previous studies show that there is gender difference in social capital. Social capital is not distributed equally between men and women, and this unequal distribution can perpetuate further inequalities (Karhina *et al.* 2009). Social, cultural, and economic factors make men and women act differently in different settings, thus in influencing the formation and levels of social capital. This, in turn, exacerbates gender inequalities in access to information, resources, and opportunities within societies.

### **Effect of Social Capital Diversity in Members Farm Size within Membership of Agricultural Cooperative**

One of the sources of an organization's competitive advantage resides in social capital. Intra-organizational bridging social capital facilitates information exchange and resource flow, saves transaction costs, and motivates product innovation (Schiele *et al.*, 2012). To put it in another way, it reduces the risk of opportunism and maintains smooth cooperation (Lins *et al.*, 2016). As Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) stress, the information one possesses determines the resources available. Bonding social capital within organizations positively influences the intellectual capital creation, commitment justification, and work flexibility (Nahapiet and

Ghoshal, 1998). The productive potential of social capital lies in its ability to promote the building of human capital or intellectual capital (Semrau and Hopp, 2016). Ties among organization members can facilitate coordination of tasks and overcome the dilemmas of cooperation (Gargiulo and Benassi, 2000). Edelman (2014) express a similar view, arguing that social capital can give members a sense of cohesion and identity. Members therefore tend to be committed to the organization featured by a high level of social capital. In addition, fewer contracts are needed to maintain the cooperation and there is more flexibility.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study is anchored on the “Collective Action Theory”.

Marshall (1988) defined collective action as an action taken by a group (either directly or on its behalf through an organization) in pursuit of members’ perceived shared interests. Members can contribute in various ways to achieve the shared goal: money, labour or in-kind contributions (food, wood). The action can take place directly by members of a group, or on their behalf by a representative or even employee. The coordination can take place through a formal organization, through an informal organization, or, in some cases, through spontaneous action. Thus, an organization may contribute to collective action, but the two concepts are not the same. In the context of natural resource management, the collective action of deciding on and observing rules for use or non-use of a resource can take place through common property regimes or by coordinating activities across individual farms. Three major tenets of collection action are that (1) It requires the involvement of a group of people; (2) it requires a shared interest within the group; and (3) it involves some kind of common action which works in pursuit of that shared interest.

The nature of cooperative society is easily explained by the social action theory. Cooperatives are made up of individual who through a combination of resources are able to confront and overcome several socio-economic challenges confronting them. Putnam’s (2016) three components of social action as explained above appears to be the essential values on which cooperative societies thrive on and which to a large extent determine their success.

Clearly, the collective action theory is relevant to this study since it enhances our understanding of the cooperative as a self-help organization that depends on member contribution, commitment and participation for its success.

### **Empirical Studies**

Loof and Sigurd (2020), in their studies explored how heterogeneity in the members of a cooperative affects the collective strategic decisions. An empirical study was conducted in Sweden's smallest dairy cooperative, Gäsene Mejeri. This study can be regarded as a case study of Gäsene Mejeri. Data were collected through 21 semi-structured interviews with members of Gäsene Mejeri. Thus, almost the entire membership was interviewed. The respondents were asked about their position on two strategic decisions, namely the introduction of differentiated milk prices and the contractual agreement to deliver private-labelled cheese to a large supermarket chain. The study indicated that the membership of Gäsene Mejeri is characterized by heterogeneities in different aspects. The members differ considerably as concerns age, farm size and investments. These dimensions have an impact on the members expressed support or opposition of the collective strategic decisions. However, these differences have only a minor influence on the actual strategic decisions, because the members at large have high level of trust in the board of directors. The members think that the board, just as well as they themselves, prioritize the interests of the cooperative. All the members are dependent upon each other, whereby there is little room for divergent opinions, no matter if the members are different in socioeconomic terms.

Shaoling, Kim, Yuanzhu, Yalan and Wene (2018), examined and compared the relationship among variables from a binary perspective, namely from companies’ and farmers’ perspectives in China. Their study selected the companies and farmers in “A company + farmers” model. The data analysis was based on a sample of 184 companies and 414 farmers. The results showed that shared values and communication have a significant positive effect on reciprocity. In terms of the influence on reciprocity, communication is higher than shared values from both the corporate and farmer perspectives. The three dimensions of social capital have different effects on quality performance of agricultural products. On the company side, communication and reciprocity in social capital have a significant positive effect on the quality performance of agricultural products, with the order of effect being communication first followed by reciprocity. On the farmer side, reciprocity and shared values have a significant positive effect on the quality performance of agricultural products, with the order of effect being reciprocity first followed by shared values. These findings have positive theoretical and practical significance for companies and farmers aiming to improve the quality of agricultural products.

### **Gap in literature**

From the empirical literature reviewed, a myriad of factors has been identified that effect of membership commitment, heterogeneity and social capital within the membership of agricultural cooperative. Most of the studies reviewed were conducted in different socio-economic, cultural and geographical settings which arguably can relate to the performance of agricultural cooperatives. However, considering the socio-economic and environmental differences across regions, it is necessary to carry out a thorough

investigation of various aspects through which membership commitment, heterogeneity can affect social capital within the membership of agricultural cooperative because of the importance of this information to farmers and policy makers. Hence, the major concern of this study in supplementing previous research and bridging the knowledge gap is to focus on, study and analyse the unique population in the Udenu Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria in order to identify the major socio-economic and institutional factors that can effect membership commitment, heterogeneity and social capital within the membership of agricultural cooperative.

**III. Methodology**

The descriptive survey design was adopted for the study.

For this study, the primary source of data was employed through the use of questionnaire.

Purposive sampling technique was used to select the twenty (20) Cooperative societies out of the total cooperative societies operating in Udenu local government area and also 5 members were selected from each of the 20 cooperatives selected. Then the sample size is 100 members of Agricultural cooperatives. They were selected for accessibility and functionality.

**IV. Method of Data Analysis**

The response from the respondent were organized into frequency distribution and the collected data was tabulated and converted into mean rating using 4-point liker scale as shown below

Formula for mean:  $\sum \frac{FX}{N}$

- Where  $\sum$  - Sum of
- F - Frequency
- X - Normal Value
- N - Total number of respondent

The nominal values assigned to the different scaling items used are as follows,

- Strongly Agree = 4
- Agree = 3
- Disagree = 2
- Strongly Disagree = 1

$$\frac{4 + 3 + 2 + 1}{4} = 2.5, \text{ the cut-off point is } 2.5$$

**Decision Rule**

The cut-off point mean is 2.5. Any response that has a mean score of 2.5 and above is accepted while any response with a mean score below 2.5 is rejected.

Using SPSS package, regression analysis was run at significance level of 0.05 with the degree of freedom (df) = (n-1)

**Mean Scores on Effects of Social Capital on Performance of Agricultural Cooperative**

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	DECISION
		4	3	2	1			
1.	Sustenance of capacity for collective action	34	29	17	20	100	2.77	Accepted
		136	87	34	20	277		
2.	It lowers transaction costs in contracting via trust	42	26	13	19	100	3.33	Accepted
		210	78	26	19	333		

3.	Social capital offers access information via networks of contacts	27 108	39 117	20 40	14 14	100 279	2.79	Accepted
4.	Social capital helps companies enhance their competitive advantage and promote performance	22 88	44 132	19 38	15 30	100 288	2.88	Accepted
5.	Social capital facilitates information exchange and resource flow	31 124	34 102	22 44	13 13	100 283	2.83	Accepted
6.	Social capital motivates product innovation	26 104	29 87	25 50	20 40	100 278	2.78	Accepted

**Data from Table 4.1** showed that high mean score items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 had the mean values of 2.77, 3.33, 2.79, 2.88, 2.83 and 2.78 respectively. The value was up to 2.50 and above which was interpreted as accepted, and therefore indicates that the social capital has a great effect on performance of agricultural cooperative in Udeno Local Government Area. The result revealed that social capital influences sustenance of capacity for collective action, lowers transaction costs in contracting via trust, offers access information via networks of contacts, helps companies enhance their competitive advantage and promote performance, facilitates information exchange and resource flow and motivates product innovation.

**Research Question Two:** What are the effects of gender of agricultural cooperative membership on social capital in Udeno Local Government Area?

**Table 4.2: Mean Scores on Effects of gender of Agricultural Cooperative Membership on Social Capital**

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	DECISION
		4	3	2	1			
1.	Male members have higher structural social capital than the female counterparts	19 76	30 90	32 64	19 19	100 249	2.49	Rejected
2.	Women have less social connections and relationships with other members than men.	17 68	22 66	32 64	29 29	100 227	2.27	Rejected
3.	Compared to men, women have lower linkage (network tie) with other members	21 84	15 45	23 46	41 41	100 216	2.16	Rejected
4.	Women have less extent of sharing information and resources that can improve their participation in economic activities in the cooperatives.	15 60	17 51	34 68	34 34	100 213	2.13	Rejected

**Data from Table 4.2** showed that high mean score items 1, 2, 3 and had the mean values of 2.49, 2.27, 2.16 and 2.13 respectively. The value was not up to 2.50 which was interpreted as rejected, and therefore indicates that gender of agricultural cooperative membership has no effect on social capital. Thus men and women have equal structural social capital, social connections and relationships with other members, and have equal extent of sharing information and resources that can improve their participation in economic activities in the cooperatives.

**Research Question Three:** What are the effects of social capital diversity in members' farm size within membership of agricultural cooperative in Udeno Local Government Area?

**Table 4.3: Mean Scores on Effects of Social Capital Diversity in Members’ Farm Size within Membership of Agricultural Cooperative**

S/N	ITEMS	SA 4	A 3	D 2	SD 1	N	$\bar{X}$	DECISION
1.	Good attendance of cooperative members to meetings leads to large farm size	11 44	17 51	29 58	43 43	100 196	1.96	Rejected
2.	Decision makings on loans has a direct impact on members farm size	20 80	29 87	27 54	24 24	100 245	2.45	Rejected
3.	The heterogeneity of the members can affect the member’s farm size	23 92	29 87	27 54	21 21	100 254	2.54	Accepted
4.	Social capital diversity affects the economic sustainability of farmers by influencing farming practices and their propensity to adopt newer technologies via the supply of information through these networks.	19 76	20 60	34 68	27 27	100 231	2.31	Rejected
5.	It also impact agricultural productivity and economic sustainability	21 84	28 84	31 62	20 20	100 250	2.50	Accepted
6.	It enhances social responsibility by promoting the use of sustainable agricultural farming practices and thereby contributing to environmental sustainable development	20 80	31 93	29 58	20 20	100 251	2.51	Accepted

**Data from Table 4.3** showed that high mean score items 3, 5 and 6 had the mean values of 2.54, 2.50 and 2.51 respectively. The values were up to 2.50 and above which was interpreted as accepted, and therefore indicates that the heterogeneity of the members can affect the member’s farm size. The result also revealed that social capital diversity impact agricultural productivity and economic sustainability. Finally, it was revealed that social capital diversity enhances social responsibility by promoting the use of sustainable agricultural farming practices and thereby contributing to environmental sustainable development

### V. Conclusion

Social capital influences sustenance of capacity for collective action, lowers transaction costs in contracting via trust, offers access information via networks of contacts, helps cooperatives enhance their competitive advantage and promote performance, facilitates information exchange and resource flow and motivates product innovation. Social capital has a great effect on performance of agricultural cooperative in Udenu Local Government Area as men and women have equal structural social capital, social connections and relationships with other members, and have equal extent of sharing information and resources that can improve their participation in economic activities in the cooperatives

### VI. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Gender-sensitive social capital development should be provided to reduce the gender gap in structural social capital.
2. Attention to should be given on gender differences in social network formation to ensure equal participation for the progress of their Cooperative business.
3. Government should make policy that will ensure that women Cooperative members have access to land for agricultural purpose just like their male counterpart.

### References

1. Adler P.S. & Kwon S.W. (2009) Social Capital: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. *SSRN Electronic Journal* DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.186928
2. Bechky, B. A., & Okhuysen, G. A. 2011. Expecting the unexpected? How SWAT officers and film crews handle surprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 239–261.



3. Bijman, J., and Hanisch M. (2012). Support for Farmers' Cooperatives; Developing atypology of cooperatives and producer organisations in the EU. Wageningen:Wageningen UR. (16) (PDF) *Support for Farmers' Cooperatives : developing a typology of cooperatives and producer organisations in the EU*. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283419411\\_Support\\_for\\_Farmers'\\_Cooperatives\\_developing\\_a\\_typology\\_of\\_cooperatives\\_and\\_producer\\_organisations\\_in\\_the\\_EU](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283419411_Support_for_Farmers'_Cooperatives_developing_a_typology_of_cooperatives_and_producer_organisations_in_the_EU) [accessed Feb 23 2023].
4. Carey, S., Lawson, B. and Krause, D.R. (2011). Social capital configuration, legal bonds and performance in buyer–supplier relationships. *J. Oper. Manag.* 29: 277–288.
5. Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *The American Journal of Sociology* 94, S95-S120
6. Constantine I, Michael L,& Fabio C.(2016) Agricultural cooperatives in net chains. *Journal on Chain and Network Science* 16(1):1-6 DOI: 10.3920/JCNS2016.x003
7. Cook M.L. Iliopoulos1, & Chaddad F. (2016) Agricultural Economics Research Institute, Terma Alkmanos Street, 11528 Athens, Greece; Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211-6200, USA; 3INSPER, Rua Quatá, 300, Vila Olímpia, São Paulo, SP, CEP04546-042, Brazil; (16) (PDF) *Agricultural cooperatives in netchains*. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308124999\\_Agricultural\\_cooperatives\\_in\\_netchains](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308124999_Agricultural_cooperatives_in_netchains) [accessed Feb 23 2023].
8. Dyer, J.H. and Nobeoka, K. (2010). Creating and managing a high-performance knowledge-sharing network: The Toyota case. *Strateg. Manag. J.* 21: 345–367
9. Edelman, D. J. (2014). *Managing the Urban Environment—Mysore, India*. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing
10. Field, J. (2008). Job Satisfaction Model. Online. Available from:<http://talentedapps.wordpress.com/2008/04/11/job-satisfaction-model-for-retention/>. Date accessed: 31 October 2021.
11. Fukuyama F. (1999) Social Capital and Civil Society. The Institute of Public Policy George Mason University. International Monetary Fund. George Mason University. International Monetary Fund. All rights reserved. For requests for permission to reproduce articles
12. Gargiulo M. & Benassi M. Trapped in Your Own Net? Network Cohesion, Structural Holes, and the Adaptation of Social Capital *Organization Science* Vol. 11, No. 2 (Mar. - Apr., 2000), pp. 183-196 (14 pages) <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2640283>
13. Hansmann, R. & Steimer, N. (2016). A field experiment on behavioural effects of humorous, environmentally oriented and authoritarian posters against littering. *Journal of Environmental Research, Engineering and Management*, 72(1), 35-44. DOI: 10.5755/j01.ere.m.72.1.14974
14. Hinds, P. & Mortensen M. (2015) Understanding Conflict in Geographically Distributed Teams: The Moderating Effects of Shared Identity, Shared Context, and Spontaneous Communication
15. Johnson, N.L., Suarez, R. and Lundy, M. (2013). The importance of social capital in Colombian rural agro-enterprises. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Agriculture Economic (IAAE), Event Dynamics, Durban, Africa, 16–22 August 2003*; pp. 1152–1158.
16. Hohler J. & Kuhl R. (2018). "Dimensions Of Member Heterogeneity In Cooperatives and Their Impact on Organization – A Literature Review," *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics, Wiley Blackwell*, vol. 89(4), pages 697-712, December. Handle: *RePEc: bla: annpce: v:89:y:2018:i:4:p:697-712* DOI: 10.1111/apce.12177
17. Jussila I. & Goel S. (2012) Member Commitment in Co-operatives: The Utilitarian Approach (English) *In: World Review of Business Research*, ISSN 1838-3955, E-ISSN 1839-1176, Vol. 2, no 5, p. 86-9 DOI: 10.5430/bmr.v1n
18. Karina P. Aber J. & Audirac I. (2009.) *The future of shrinking cities - problems, patterns and strategies of urban transformation in a global context*. Institute of Urban and Regional International Research Network Monograph Series, 2009
19. Lins K.V., Henri S. & Tamayo A. (2016) Social Capital, Trust, and Firm Performance: The Value of Corporate Social Responsibility during the Financial Crisis. *The Journal of Finance* 72(4) DOI: 10.1111/jofi.12505
20. Loof, R. and Sigurd, K. (2020). *Membership Heterogeneity and the Cooperative's Choice of Strategy*. Uppsala: Sweden. 60pp
21. Mäkelä M. & Maula M. (2005) Cross-Border Venture Capital and New Venture Internationalization: An Isomorphism Perspective DOI: 10.1080/13691060500258877
22. Marshall. G. (1998) *Human-Capital Theory. A Dictionary of Sociology*.
23. Meyer, J. P.; Allen, N. J.; Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of current and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 710-720
24. Meyer J.P Herscovitch L. David J.S & Topolnvtsky L.(2002) Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 61(1):20-52 DOI: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842
25. Michael D. M. & Ostrom E. (2014) Social-Ecological System Framework: Initial 19(2) DOI: 10.5751/ES-06387-19 Changes and Continuing Challenges *ECOLOGY AND SOCIETY* 0230

26. Nahapiet J. & Ghoshal S. (1998) Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage Academy of Management. *The Academy of Management Review*; Apr 1998; 23, 2; ABI/INFORM Global (19) (PDF) *Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage*. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228314367\\_Social\\_Capital\\_Intellectual\\_Capital\\_and\\_the\\_Organizational\\_Advantage](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228314367_Social_Capital_Intellectual_Capital_and_the_Organizational_Advantage) [accessed Mar 08 2023].PP 242
27. Olson DM, Dinerstein E. 1998. The Global 200: A representation approach to conserving the Earth's most biologically valuable ecoregions. *Conservation Biology* 12: 502–515 Varughese G. & Ostrom E.(2001) The Contested Role of Heterogeneity in Collective Action: Some Evidence from Community Forestry in Nepal. *World Development* 29(5):747-765 DOI: 10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00012-2
28. Park, H., Tsusaka, T.W., Pede, V.O. and Kim, K.M. (2017). The Impact of a Local Development Project on Social Capital: Evidence from the Bohol Irrigation Scheme in the Philippines. *Water* 9: 202 – 211.
29. Roxenhall, Tommy **Affective, Calculative and Normative Commitment: An Assessment of Relationship** Mid Sweden University, Faculty of Human Sciences, Department of Social Sciences.(Strategiska nätverk)ORCID iD: 0000-0001-9441-2919Andrésen, Edith Mid Sweden University, Faculty of Human Sciences, Department of Social Sciences. (Strategiska nätverk)
30. Ruben R.& Heras J (2012) Social Capital, Governance and Performance of Ethiopian Coffee Cooperatives First published: 26 October 2012 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8292.2012.00473.x> Volume83, Issue4 December 2012 Pages 463-484
31. Scheer L. K, Steenkamp E. M & Nirmalya. K (1995). "The Effects of Supplier Fairness on Vulnerable Resellers," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32 (February (19) (PDF) *The Effects of Perceived Interdependence on Dealer Attitudes*. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271690674\\_The\\_Effects\\_of\\_Perceived\\_Interdependence\\_on\\_Dealer\\_Attitudes](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271690674_The_Effects_of_Perceived_Interdependence_on_Dealer_Attitudes) [accessed Mar 08 2023].
32. Semrau T. & Hopp C. (2016) Complementary or compensatory? A contingency perspective on how entrepreneurs' human and social capital interact in shaping start-up progress. *Small Business Economics*, 2016, vol. 46, issue 3, No 4, 407-423. <http://www.springer...29/journal/11187/PS2> DOI: 10.1007/s11187-015-9691-8
33. Shaoling, F., Hua, L., Kim, H., Yuanzhu, Z., Yalan, D. and Wene, Q. (2018). How Social Capital Affects the Quality Performance of Agricultural Products: Evidence from a Binary Perspective of China. *Sustainability* 10: 30 - 39.
34. Scheele D., Nadine S.,Gunturkun O & Hurlmann R. (2012) Oxytocin Modulates Social Distance between Males and Females. *The Journal of Neuroscience : The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 32(46):16074-16079 DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2755-12.2012
35. Van Kleef G.A , De Dreu C.K.W(2004) The Interpersonal Effects of Anger and Happiness in Negotiations *The Academy of Management Annals* Vol. 3, No. 1, 2009, 463–502 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 43 463 ISSN 1941-6520 print/ISSN 1941-6067 online © 2009 Academy of Management DOI: 10.1080/19416520903047533 <http://www.informaworld.com> 10 Coordination in Organizations: An Integrative Perspective GERARDO A. OKHUYSEN\* David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah BETH A. BECHKY *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 86(1):57-76 DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.57
36. Varughese G. & Ostrom E.(2001) The Contested Role of Heterogeneity in Collective Action: Some Evidence from Community Forestry in Nepal *World Development* 29(5):747-765 DOI: 10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00012-2
37. Westermann S., Claude D., Guido G. & Kaab A. (2015) Remote sensing of permafrost and frozen ground. *GIAGEM - The Role of Green Innovation Areas in Revitalizing German and Mexican City*.
38. World Bank (2019) 2019 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433 Telephone: 202-473-1000; Internet: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)
39. Yining, X. Qiao, L. and Zuhui, H. (2018). Benefits and pitfalls of social capital for farmer cooperatives: evidence from China. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* 21 (8): 1137 – 1152.