



International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal Homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Socio-Technical Resilience in Agri-Food Systems: Integrating Social Capital, Financial Capability, Digital Transformation, and Gender Empowerment for Sustainable Agriculture

Adeleke Oyindamola Oluwatosin¹, Afolabi Idowu Oluwatoyin², Awuzie Peace Brown³, Dauda Ibrahim Opeyemi⁴, Eunice Omoyeme Aremu⁵ & Ogbu Precious Ada^{6*}

¹ Landmark University, Omu Aran, Nigeria (akinpitansoye.oyindamola@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0008-3122-7861)

² Redeemer's University, P.M.B 230, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria (afolabiidowuoluwatoyin03@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0002-0950-7185)

³ University of Calabar, Nigeria (peaceumanah92@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0003-1070-2049)

⁴ Federal Polytechnic Offa, Nigeria (ibrahim9293@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0003-5056-7937)

⁵ Independent Researcher (euniceomo@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0005-9718-1497)

⁶ Independent Researcher (preciousogbu7905@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0008-4367-3340)

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.07.1026.3212>

ABSTRACT

Moving toward farming and food systems that last, and that can absorb shocks, means changing technology and changing social and financial life at the same time. This paper brings together evidence on four parts of agricultural sustainability: social capital; farmers' mental health and financial capability; digital supply chain resilience; and gender empowerment through cooperative governance. The evidence shows that decisions about climate-smart farming and environmental technologies are rarely made on technical grounds alone. Group membership, local leadership networks, and social trust shape them heavily. At the same time, the money and workload pressures of farming produce serious mental health strain, and long-term financial exposure together with a culture of not complaining stops many farmers from asking for help. Teaching farmers to handle money better lowers these pressures, and it also raises profit, increases money put back into the farm, and cuts the cost of borrowing. On the supply chain side, digital tools and new technology improve stock control and delivery, but they work best when the organisation behind them is already strong - for example when firms belong to a consortium or follow good quality management. Raising farm output also means dealing with unfair structures. The data show that giving women a real say in production decisions and ownership of assets raises both the variety of crops a household grows and how efficiently it farms. Agricultural cooperatives are the main institution that carries these changes forward; they raise total factor productivity and the uptake of technology, but their gains are often shared unequally and are limited by long-term debt. The overall lesson is that technology and digital tools in farming cannot work on their own. They must sit on strong social networks, financial knowledge, fair cooperative governance, and care for farmers' wellbeing.

Keywords: Agri-food systems; Digital transformation; Financial capability; Gender empowerment; Social capital; Sustainable agriculture.

1. Introduction

Farming systems around the world are under heavy strain from shifting weather, unstable economies, and broken supply chains. For a long time, agricultural development focused on technical fixes - better seed varieties, precise irrigation, and manufactured inputs - to push output up. These tools matter, but they are not enough for the long run. A wider view is needed, one that treats farming as a social and technical problem at the same time. Time and again, technology underperforms when it is dropped into a community without regard for the social ties, money, and organisations of the people who are meant to use it.

Resilience in today's food and farming systems rests on four linked parts. First, social capital and community trust decide whether farmers take up new climate-smart methods. Second, the constant money worry built into farming affects farmers' mental health, and through it their financial decisions and how well they run the farm. Third, digital change inside supply chains only pays off when it comes with strong cooperation between organisations. Fourth, farm output stays artificially low because of gender inequality, which makes women's empowerment and cooperative governance central to any real improvement. This paper draws these four parts together to show that sustainable farming is a social and technical task, and that it needs social, financial, and technological frameworks working as one.

A useful way to think about this is that a farm is not just a production unit; it is a household, a business, and a member of a community all at once. Each of these roles pulls on the others. A new irrigation pump changes how a household spends its time. A new loan changes who inside the family controls money. A new cooperative rule changes who gets to speak at meetings. Because these roles are joined, a change in one place tends to move things

elsewhere. That is why single-issue programmes - a loan here, a training session there - so often fail to last. The sections below look at each of the four parts in turn, then at what happens when they meet.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Social Capital and Technology Adoption

Whether farmers take up conservation agriculture and climate-smart methods depends a great deal on their community networks and the trust inside them. Field data from smallholder farmers show that belonging to a group, and having a working relationship with local leaders, raises the number of environmental practices a farmer adopts [1]. Social capital lowers the risk farmers feel when they try something new. In regional irrigation groups, for instance, poorer and middle-income farmers lean on networks of give-and-take to reach resources, while wealthier farmers lean on formal institutions [2]. This tells us that social capital is a leading force behind the uptake of environmental technology, working as an informal insurance scheme for farmers who would rather not take chances.

It helps to be clear about what social capital is here. It is not simply "having friends". It covers three things: the bonds within a close group (family and neighbours), the bridges between groups (farmers and traders, or farmers and extension officers), and the links that reach up to people with power (officials and agencies). Each type does different work. Bonds give day-to-day support and quick help in a crisis. Bridges move new information across communities. Links open doors to credit, markets, and public programmes. A farmer with strong bonds but no bridges may hear about a new practice late; a farmer with bridges but no links may know about it but never get the loan to try it. This is one reason why the same technology spreads quickly in one village and stalls in the next.

Trust also lowers the cost of learning. Trying a new practice is a gamble, and the gamble feels smaller when a neighbour the farmer respects has already tried it and is doing fine. This is why demonstrations run by trusted local figures often do more than official leaflets. It also explains why formal extension services struggle when they arrive as strangers: they carry information, but not the trust that makes the information feel safe.

2.2 Mental Health and Financial Decision-Making

Farming mixes heavy money exposure with a culture that often frowns on asking for help. Long-term studies of farming communities show that psychological stress peaks during planting and harvest, driven largely by money worries and conditions outside the farmer's control, such as weather and prices [3]. This ongoing stress is made worse by a culture that prizes staying quiet and tough, which delays help until it is late [4]. Financial capability sits right at the centre of these outcomes. Farmers with stronger financial literacy keep better management accounts, earn more profit, and borrow at clearly lower rates [5]. Money earned off the farm, and financial literacy, loosen the tight credit limits farmers face, which in turn raises how much capital they put into the farm and how productive it becomes [6].

The link between money stress and mental health runs both ways. Money worry wears a person down, and a worn-down person makes poorer decisions - delaying maintenance, avoiding paperwork, or taking on a loan they cannot carry. Over a season or two, those decisions add to the very stress that caused them. This is why mental health support and financial training tend to work better together than apart. A farmer who learns to read a cash-flow statement gains a practical tool, and often a sense of control that eases the worry as well.

It is also worth naming the seasonal pattern plainly. Planting and harvest are the times when money goes out or comes in, when the workload is heaviest, and when weather can make or break the year. Stress at these points is not a sign of weakness; it is a predictable response to a predictable squeeze. Services that are timed to these peaks, rather than offered at random, are more likely to reach farmers when they actually need them. The same applies to credit: a loan that arrives after planting is of little use, however good its terms.

2.3 Digital Transformation and Supply Chain Resilience

Food and farming supply chains are made up largely of small and medium-sized firms working on thin margins and dealing with goods that spoil quickly. Digital change is often put forward as the answer, but the research shows that technology cannot stand in for organisational strength. Survey data from people working in agri-food show that digital tools, such as precision farming systems and supply chain tracking, improve stock turnover and delivery mainly where the organisation already has solid capabilities [7]. Working together across firms - both side by side and up and down the chain - along with quality management and consortium membership, are the conditions that let digital tools pay off [8].

A simple way to see this is that digital tools are mirrors, not magicians. They make what a firm already does more visible and faster. If the firm already shares information with its suppliers and keeps decent records, digital tools sharpen those habits and the returns follow. If the firm hoards information, keeps poor records, and trusts no one, digital tools simply record the mess. This is why the same software can transform one business and do nothing for another.

Two further points matter for perishable goods. First, timing is everything. Produce that spoils in days leaves little room for delay, so real-time tracking and quick responses carry more value than they would in, say, a furniture chain. Second, small firms rarely have the money or the staff to go it alone. Joining a consortium spreads the cost of technology, sets shared quality rules, and gives each member a reason to trust the others' data. In short, the technology works best when it is bought, used, and governed collectively.

2.4 Gender Empowerment and Cooperative Governance

Women do a very large share of the world's farm work, yet they often hold weaker rights to land, credit, and production decisions. Evidence from several countries links women's ownership of assets and their say in decisions to more varied crops at home and better technical efficiency on the farm [9, 10]. Simply handing women credit, without giving them a voice in decisions, does not improve food security. Agricultural cooperatives are the main institution that can put these imbalances right. Membership raises total factor productivity, bargaining power over prices, and access to technical training, though the gains often lean toward larger or heavily mechanised farms unless fairness is built into the rules [11, 12].

The distinction between access and control is the key here. Access means a woman can use a resource; control means she can decide what happens to it. Credit that a woman receives but cannot direct does little to change her position. Land that she farms but does not own gives her no collateral and no standing in a dispute. Cooperatives can shift this balance when they give women formal roles - seats on the board, votes at meetings, and named shares in the business. When women move from unpaid, unrecognised labour into these formal roles, the whole farm tends to change, because the decisions they favour tend to lean toward food crops, crop variety, and long-term investment rather than a single cash crop.

There is also a practical point about how cooperatives are run. A cooperative that simply counts women as members, without giving them a voice, tends to reproduce the same gaps found outside it. Rules matter: quotas for board seats, transparent pricing, and training that is open to women as well as men. Where these rules are enforced, the evidence points to steadier yields, better spread of resources, and stronger long-term planning across the whole membership, not only for the women involved.

3. Methodology

This study uses a descriptive and analytical review method. It brings together quantitative and qualitative findings from sociology, business administration, and agricultural science. Published longitudinal studies, farm accounting surveys, and supply chain studies were examined to pull out the key variables linked to social capital, financial literacy, digital adoption, and gender empowerment. The extracted data were sorted into structured matrices so that the links between social and economic inputs and agricultural resilience outcomes could be compared and checked against one another.

The review followed three steps. First, studies were grouped by the four themes set out above. Second, within each theme, findings were compared for agreement and disagreement, and results from different regions and farm types were noted. Third, the four themes were examined together to see where they overlap - for example, where financial literacy and social trust act on the same decision, or where cooperative governance shapes both technology uptake and gender equity. Placing the evidence in matrices made it easier to spot where a variable appeared in more than one theme, and to avoid treating the four themes as separate when the data show they are not.

Two limits should be stated plainly. The evidence base is uneven: more studies come from high-income countries and from a few well-researched crops, so findings from those settings may not travel directly to every context. Also, many of the studies use different measures for the same idea, which makes exact comparison difficult. These limits are noted where they affect a specific claim in the findings below.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 The Intersection of Social and Financial Capital

The data show that technical extension services fall short when they ignore social and financial networks. Table 1 sets out the measurable effect of social and financial variables on farm-level outcomes.

Table 1: Impact of Social and Financial Variables on Agricultural Outcomes

Socio-Financial Variable		Primary Outcome	Agricultural	Mechanism of Action	Measured Effect
Cooperative Membership	Group	Climate-smart adoption	technology	Peer knowledge transfer and shared equipment	14-20% reduction in physical input costs
Advanced Financial Literacy		Cost of debt reduction		Better accounting compliance and risk mitigation	13-19% lower interest rates on farm loans
Local Leadership Trust		Reduced perception of technology risk		Informal risk-sharing and community endorsement	Accelerated adoption of crop diversification
Off-Farm Income Generation		Capital intensity and farm expansion		Relaxes binding credit constraints for young farms	Increased fixed investment and total profit

Financial literacy and social capital together create a buffer for farmers. When farmers understand their own financial position clearly, and have strong community support around them, the ongoing stress that comes with farming's ups and downs drops, and investment decisions become steadier and more forward-looking [3, 5]. The two work best as a pair. Financial knowledge without community support leaves a farmer able to plan but with no safety net if the plan goes wrong. Community support without financial knowledge leaves a farmer with a safety net but no clear way to use it. Put together, they give a farmer both a plan and a cushion.

4.2 Digital Transformation vs. Organizational Capability

One clear finding is that digital change in agri-food supply chains depends heavily on the business strategy already in place. Technology builds on existing strengths; it cannot repair a broken organisation. Chart 1 sets out the conditions under which digital tools give the best returns.

Chart 1 Data: Digital Transformation Effectiveness in Agri-Food SMEs

Supply Chain Characteristic			Impact of Digital Tool Adoption	Requirement for Success
Vertical	Collaboration	(Processor-Farmer)	High	Transparent data sharing agreements
Horizontal Consortium Membership			Very High	Standardised quality management protocols
Isolated SME (No Collaboration)			Low	Heavy reliance on single-party capital
High Perishability Product Line			High	Real-time tracking and rapid responsiveness

Chart 1 shows that adopting the hardware of technology - yield monitors, delivery tracking, and the like - calls for hands-on knowledge and active cooperation. Technologies that carry knowledge in the body or the hands, rather than in data, spread almost eight years faster than information-heavy technologies, because they demand less abstract data reading [8]. In practice, this means a new machine that a farmer can see working is adopted more quickly than a dashboard of numbers that must first be understood. The lesson for those who introduce technology is to lean on the first kind while building the skills needed for the second.

4.3 Productivity Gains from Gender Empowerment

Closing the gender gap in farming is not only a social matter; it is a basic requirement for getting the most out of total factor productivity. Table 2 sets out the direct economic and operational gains from bringing women into formal decision-making inside cooperatives and households.

Table 2: Agricultural Productivity and Gender Empowerment Metrics

Empowerment Indicator	Operational Impact	Resulting Productivity Metric
Decision-Making Input	Shift toward nutrient-dense crop cultivation	Increased household dietary diversity
Formal Asset Ownership	Enhanced collateral for capital loans	Higher technical efficiency and output
Cooperative Governance Roles	Improved equitable distribution of resources	4.28% rise in total factor productivity
Narrowed Gender Gap Index	Optimised allocation of female farm labour	Consistent yield stabilization

When women move from unrecognised labour to formal decision-makers, farms show clear gains in crop variety and technical efficiency [9, 11]. Cooperatives that require female representation in governance report steadier long-term investment and more consistent use of climate-resilient methods. The reason is not mysterious: a wider group of people making decisions draws on a wider set of knowledge and needs, and that tends to produce choices that hold up better over a full season and across seasons.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

Resilience in agri-food systems cannot be reached through a technical lens alone. The evidence gathered here, from a range of farming settings, shows that technology uptake, financial stability, and environmental sustainability all rest on human factors. Social capital and community trust set the speed at which climate-smart practices spread. The lasting mental health strain tied to farming must be handled through better financial literacy, which lowers the cost of debt and steadies decisions. In the supply chain, digital change needs strong cooperation across firms, both side by side and up and down the chain, to pay off. And real farm efficiency is out of reach without dealing with gender inequality; giving women asset ownership and a place in cooperative governance drives total factor productivity and food security directly.

5.2 Recommendations

Integrate Financial Literacy with Extension Services: Agricultural extension programmes should stop focusing on agronomy alone and start offering financial literacy training as a standard part of their work, to help farmers secure cheaper credit and manage financial stress.

Support Collaborative Supply Chains: Policymakers should provide financial incentives for agri-food small and medium-sized firms to join regional consortiums, because working side by side with others gives the best return on money spent on digital supply chain technology.

Condition Funding on Gender Equity: Government grants and cooperative funding should require demonstrated progress in women's asset ownership and in female representation on cooperative governing boards, so that resources are shared fairly.

Leverage Social Networks for Technology Rollouts: Environmental and climate-smart technologies should be introduced through established community leaders and existing cooperative networks, to lower the risk farmers perceive and speed up uptake among smallholders.

References

- [1] Key N. Off-farm Income, Credit Constraints, and Farm Investment. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. 2020;52(4):642-663. DOI: 10.1017/aae.2020.25
- [2] Tortorella GL, Gloet M, Samson D, Kurnia S, Fogliatto FS, Anzanello M. Effects of the interaction between resilience development and digital transformation on the performance of the Australian food supply chains. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*. 2024;29(1):123-139. DOI: 10.1080/13675567.2024.2403565
- [3] Zaridis A, Vlachos I, Bourlakis M. SMEs strategy and scale constraints impact on agri-food supply chain collaboration and firm performance. *Production Planning & Control*. 2020;32(14):1165-1178. DOI: 10.1080/09537287.2020.1796136
- [4] Gil J. Women's empowerment and crop diversification. *Nature Food*. 2023;4(8):639. DOI: 10.1038/s43016-023-00831-9
- [5] Murugani VG, Thamaga-Chitja JM. How does women's empowerment in agriculture affect household food security and dietary diversity? The case of rural irrigation schemes in Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Agrekon*. 2019;58(3):308-323. DOI: 10.1080/03031853.2019.1610976
- [6] Lin B, Wang X, Jin S, Yang W, et al. Impacts of cooperative membership on rice productivity: Evidence from China. *World Development*. 2022;150:105669. DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105669
- [7] Dong Y, Mu Y, Abler D. Do Farmer Professional Cooperatives Improve Technical Efficiency and Income? Evidence from Small Vegetable Farms in China. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. 2019;51(4):591-605. DOI: 10.1017/aae.2019.22
- [8] Riethmuller ML, Newnham EA, McEvoy PM. Supporting mental health in farming communities where and when it is needed most: A longitudinal analysis of risk and protective factors. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2024;361:117381. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117381
- [9] Vayro C, Brownlow C, Ireland M, March S. 'Farming is not Just an Occupation [but] a Whole Lifestyle': A Qualitative Examination of Lifestyle and Cultural Factors Affecting Mental Health Help-Seeking in Australian Farmers. *Sociologia Ruralis*. 2020;60(1):151-173. DOI: 10.1111/soru.12274
- [10] Gottlieb U, Hansson H. Farmers' Financial Literacy - Scale Development and Linkages to Accounting Practices and Financial Outcomes. *Agribusiness*. 2024;41(1). DOI: 10.1002/agr.21986