

LEWIS-BECK, M.S., eds. The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour. London: SAGE Publications Ltd., pp. 606-629.

27. AYTAÇ, S.E., 2018. Relative economic performance and the incumbent vote: a reference point theory. *THE JOURNAL OF POLITICS*, 80(1), pp. 16-29.

28. ERDOGAN, E., 2013. Revising the equation: partisan bias and economic voter hypothesis in the Turkish context. *Iktisat İşletme ve Finans*, 28(325), pp. 27-60.

29. LEWIS-BECK, M.S. and STEGMAIER, M., 2019. Economic voting. In: CONGLETON, R.D., GROFMAN, B.N., and VOIGT, S., eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Choice*, 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 247-265.

30. FIDRMUC, J., 2000. Economics of voting in post-communist countries. *Electoral Studies*, 19(2-3), pp. 199-217.

31. JASTRAMSKIS, M., KUOKSTIS, V. and BALTRUKEVIČIUS, M., 2019. Retrospective voting in Central and Eastern Europe: hyper-accountability, corruption or socio-economic inequality? [online] *Party Politics* [viewed 20 Jan 2021] Available from: <https://doi.org/10.25384/SAGE.c.4709144.v1>.

32. LEWIS-BECK, M.S. and RATTO, M.C., 2013. Economic voting in Latin America: a general model. *Electoral Studies*, 32(3), pp. 489-493.

33. BECKER, G.S., 1983. A theory of competition among pressure groups for political influence. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 98(3), pp. 371-400.

34. STEENBERGEN, M.R., and COLOMBO, C. 2018. Heuristics in political behavior [online] In: MINTZ, A., and TERRIS, L., eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Behavioral Political Science* [viewed 5 Jan 2021]. New York:

Oxford University Press. Available from: <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190634131.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190634131-e-9>.

35. SLUKHAI, S., 2018. Economic wars within the Russia-Ukraine confrontation. *Ante-Portas – Studia nad Bezpieczeństwem*, 2(11), pp. 299-325.

36. RAZUMKOV CENTRE, 2018. Riven' poinformovanosti naselennia Ukraïny pro reformy, otsinka vplyvu reform na osobyste stanovyshe hromadian [online] [viewed 18 Dec 2020] Available from: <http://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/riven-poinformovanosti-naselennia-ukrainy-pro-reformy-otsinka-vplyvu-reform-na-osobyste-stanovyshe-hromadian>.

37. KAHNEMAN D., 2012. *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Penguin Books.

38. KIIS, 2019. Za tyzhen' do vyboriv prezidenta: reïtnhy kandydativ, motyvatsii vyboru, ochikuvannia hromadian [online] [viewed 22 Dec 2020] Available from: <https://www.kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=840&page=6&t=3>.

Received: 11/01/2021
1st Revision: 22/01/2021
Accepted: 19/02/2021

Author's declaration on the sources of funding of research presented in the scientific article or of the preparation of the scientific article: budget of university's scientific project

С. Слухай, д-р экон. наук, проф.

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ПОЯСНЕННЯ ПОЛІТИЧНОГО ВИБОРУ: ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ТЕОРІЇ

Досліджено внесок економічної теорії в аналіз політичного вибору. З'ясовано, що політичний вибір характеризується ірраціональністю, що дає простір для різних способів зовнішнього впливу на думку виборців. Продемонстровано, що економічне голосування не присутнє в українському політичному контексті.

Ключові слова: теорія суспільного вибору, економічне голосування, недосконала інформація, політичний вибір, раціональне невідання, теорія суспільного вибору, ірраціональність.

С. Слухай, д-р экон. наук, проф.

Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко, Киев, Украина

ОБЪЯСНЕНИЕ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ВЫБОРА: ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕОРИИ

Исследован вклад экономической теории в анализ политического выбора. Выяснено, что политический выбор характеризуется иррациональностью, что дает простор для различных способов внешнего воздействия на предпочтения избирателей. Продемонстрировано, что экономическое голосование не присутствует в украинском политическом контексте.

Ключевые слова: теория общественного выбора, экономическое голосование, несовершенная информация, политический выбор, рациональное неведение, теория общественного выбора, иррациональность.

Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Economics, 2021; 1(214): 27-34

УДК 332.13:338.32

JEL classification: D01, E710

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2667.2021/214-1/5>

N. A. Sofoluwe, PhD (Agricultural Economics), Lecturer
ORCID ID 0000-0003-2566-4340

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria,
L. O. Oyelami, PhD (Economics), Lecturer

ORCID ID 0000-0002-9958-1815

University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos, Nigeria,
O. Adisa, PhD (Agricultural Economics)

ORCID ID 0000-0002-9780-8027

Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria

FACTORS INFLUENCING SOCIAL CAPITAL IN RURAL COMMUNITIES IN NIGERIA

Social capital has become an important aspect of most rural communities in developing nations. But, the dimensions of social capital vary across rural regions while little is known about the factors influencing it in rural areas. This study aimed to identify the prevalent social capital dimensions in rural areas and examine the factors determining rural people involved in those dimensions. A field survey which consists of structured and self-administered questionnaire was carried out with rural households. The information of the survey was obtained from 220 rural households in the study area between August and October, 2019. The descriptive analysis identified social networks (3.875), norms (societal values) (3.390), trust and solidarity (4.115), and cooperation and group action (4.139) as the prevailing social capital dimensions in the rural communities. The results further suggest that cooperation, trust and solidarity, and networks are respectively the dominating social capital dimensions in the rural areas. The results from probit model estimates show that the factors that are more likely to be associated with social capital in rural areas include education, access to credit and ownership of farm (cash crop). Since social capital is becoming a prerequisite for rural development, our findings lead to the suggestion that cooperation, build-up of networks should be facilitated for people in the rural areas. Furthermore, policy direction towards access to education, credit provision and development of primary occupation in the rural areas should also be enhanced. Economic policy makers and rural development agencies are invited to continuously work on the identified factors to promote the individual, community and national development on equitable basis.

Keywords: cooperation, social networks, norms, rural development.

Introduction

The importance of social capital as a strategy for the development of rural areas has attracted interest in recent years. Increasing rural-urban migration in most developing

countries, poverty and the decline of agriculture which form the base of most rural economic activities are part of the reasons for the renewed call on ways to strengthen the base of rural areas [1, 2, 3]. Also, the ineffectiveness of various

measures to address rural development challenges in developing nations has strengthened the call for understanding social capital issues in rural areas. The relevance of social capital includes the facilitation of coordination, identity and purpose among the group of people. Social capital could be viewed as all forms of relationship between people that "shapes their interactions". The relationships are usually built on mutual understanding, bonds, common values which determine the directions of development and livelihood engagement of individuals, groups, institutions, associations, and communities [4, 5, 6].

Unlike other forms of capital, social capital is considered more important for developmental changes especially in developing regions with a high percentage of the rural population [7]. But, the need for social capital also requires appropriate information on the underlying factors driving social capital acquisition in rural areas. This is more important since the benefits that could be derived from social capital covers all the resources an individual could derive from being a member of a group. The concept of social capital could be viewed as "the capital of cooperation, joint action, mutual trust and assistance. They are also formed as a result of economic interactions among individuals" [8]. In essence, social capital is meant to create economic value among individuals.

Strengthening the social base of rural communities through social capital could serve as a survival path for the poor and the less privileged. The opportunity arising from social capital could be a source of sustainable networks, linkage for better livelihood opportunities and a source for credit for business activities [9]. Social capital could also contribute to rural development by reducing the negative consequences of rural abandonment by the youths [10, 2]. Consequently, social capital is considered to affect both the individual and society at large [2]. Yet, the questions on determinants of social capital, especially in rural areas, remain unanswered.

Several advantages and disadvantages have been associated with social capital growth in rural communities. Benefits that are associated with social capital include reduction of social exclusion among the rural populace, sustenance of local governance structure, economic empowerment, and provision of support to the needy [11, 3]. On the contrary, studies (e.g., Phillips M. [13], Tregear A. and Cooper S. [9]) have also found the negative effects of social capital to include redundancy of knowledge, "over bonding" that could result in worse social exclusion and poor management of local governance issues.

Despite the well-acknowledged importance of social capital to the development of marginal regions such as rural areas, existing studies on social capital have not examined the driving factors of social capital in developing nations. Yet, adequate information on the characteristics of rural people who desire and deserve social capital is required for creating effective strategies for rural development. To this end, this study examines the social capital dimensions in rural areas and analyzes the factors determining social capital in rural areas, using rural communities in Southwest, Nigeria, as a case study. Specifically, this study examines the social capital dimensions in the rural areas. It also analyzes the socio-economic factors influencing social adoption in the rural areas. The influence of cooperation, social norms and values, trust and solidarity and social networks are highlighted. As a concept, social capital enables relationships among individuals in addition to cooperation and trust [14]. Social capital explains the interconnections, relationships, trust and networks that exist among individuals [15].

Some contributions are highlighted in this study. First, the study expands the literature on the components and structure of social capital in rural communities in developing nations, especially sub-Saharan Africa, using Nigeria as a case study. While there is increasing literature on social capital and its role in human development, little is known about its determinants. Since social capital has been found to include the potential for economic and social benefits to the rural populace, understanding the underlying factors of social capital may be beneficial to designing effective strategies for rural development.

The paper is structured in sections. The following section presents a critical review of social capital concepts, social capital and cooperatives, and social capital indicators in Nigeria. This is followed by the methodology of the study, and results and discussion. The paper ends with a conclusion.

Literature review

Literature on social capital is expansive. But the coverage area is narrowed to studies on the adoption of agricultural technologies, and poverty [16, 17, 2, 3], neglecting the underlying characteristics of individuals that could determine the sustainability of the benefits inherent in social capital.

In the last decade, social capital remains one of the most important concepts that are of great interest in social science-related researches [18]. Despite different perspectives by researchers on what constitutes social capital, there seems to be general agreement that the concept relates to connections, networks, trust, norms, relationships, shared values, collective actions, reciprocity, institutions, cooperation, link, bond, and bridge [19, 20, 21, 15, 11]. The existing contentions on the concept revolve around the applicability of these indicators to all social-related settings. For instance, Liang Q. et al. [14] streamlined the concept of social capital to networks. This is based on the perception that the idea is more of community capital that is only relevant in facilitating interactions among the community members. Using this perspective, Christ A. and Niles M. [15] opined that the concept is relevant when there is the presence of social structure within a community. By implication, the views of the concept as networks are only relevant if there is the existence of both intra and interrelations among the people of a particular community. Meanwhile, Luo Q. and Wang Z. [12] believed that social capital is not more than a useful instrument for resolving the problems associated with collective action. Thus, the concept of social capital could be context-specific.

Different indicators have been used to measure social capital in different organizational contexts. The indicators that have gained prominence in the literature relating social capital to cooperatives activities are generally classified into three. For instance, Chloupkova J., Svendsen L. and Svendsen G. [22] highlighted civic participation, trust and membership in community groups as the three indicators. These indicators however differ from earlier literature which considered "networks, norms and trust" [23, 24, 25] as the three core indicators of social capital. In these latter categories, networks are considered the same as relationships that occur in a social setting. Norms relate to both acceptable and unacceptable actions while trust simply refers to confidence in people even in the presence of uncertainties.

The World Bank [26] categorized social capital into six dimensions: "groups and networks, trust and solidarity, collective action and cooperation, social cohesion and inclusion, and information and communication, empowerment and political action". However, the study

conducted by Musavengane R. and Simatele D. [27] excluded empowerment and political action from the World Bank definitions of social capital dimensions.

In an attempt to provide a concise description of social capital, some studies have adopted classification based on dimensions. Using this perspective, Liang Q. et al. [14] classified it into cognitive, relational and external dimensions. In all these, the authors attempted to link social capital to cooperative structures. Consequently, these three dimensions are discussed based on organizational networks from both the intra and interrelationship perspectives. The external dimension is considered to be "inter-organizational" links of cooperatives while the cognitive and the relational dimensions are intra-networks of cooperative entities. Nonetheless, the contexts of these dimensions are related to trust and collective orientation which are part of the general indicators highlighted in the existing literature.

Some studies across the world affirmed the importance of cooperation in social capital to human capital development [28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33]. Social capital cooperation is known to create non-financial assets which could help in shaping individuals' behaviour [29]. Social capital can be described as a "bond, bridge and link" [34]. The "bond" relates to trust and cooperative relationships among individuals with shared characteristics. It is often more effective among homogenous groups of people most especially, those within a defined entity such as rural areas. However, a beneficial relationship is generally tied to gaining access to opportunities and resources which can only be facilitated by "bridge and link" [35]. While "bond" could bring people of similar characteristics together, "bridge" and "link" can facilitate and expand benefits and access in various heterogeneous settings. Social capital also enables the linkage of people with formal institutions (e.g., financial) that can provide support for personal development [36]. Hence, social capital can help connect people with available resources and benefits within and outside their operating environment.

Social capital enables the acquisition of livelihood capitals through the creation of relationships among individuals. The essential elements of social capital including networks, norms and trust are considered crucial to cooperative success and the attainment of shared objectives [37, 38, 29, 34]. Although social organizations are generally considered as constituting social capital, the relevance of social organization in such context depends on its ability to facilitate benefits and meet the needs and aspirations of members. Consequently, social capital facilitates cooperation just as cooperation among people of certain communities enables the acquisition of wealth [39, 40].

The interaction between economic success and social capital acquisition is mutually reinforcing [29]. This interaction could lead to the successful actualization of poverty reduction objectives among the poor in vulnerable areas. Ruben R. and Heras J. [19] considered factors like operational, organizational and financial as key success or factors of social capital and development. These factors encompass delivery commitment, effective management and access to finance at both internal and external scales. Hence, cooperatives as social and human capital can help reduce the poverty index through organization, facilitation and delivery of transactions among the needy. The platform created by social capital can in turn facilitate collective actions and decisions that help the poor [41, 29].

A more effective role of social capital is related to poverty changes across the globe [42]. The scope of benefits from social capital has become multidimensional because most people at the grass-root consider it a form of social enterprise with strong potentials in helping the needy.

Methodology

A field survey was carried out in the Southwestern region of Nigeria, between August and October, 2019. The region is an important geographical area in Nigeria with close to 50 percent of the population living in rural areas. Rural communities are targeted in the study areas. Twenty-two (22) rural communities are selected for the study. The average size of the villages in the selected rural communities is 15. For the study, 10 villages are randomly selected in each of the communities representing about 67 percent of the entire villages in the study area. Thus, a total of 220 rural households are sampled. At 95% confidence level and 0.5 margin of error with a sparse rural population of less than 1000, sample size above 200 is considered appropriate [49]. The rural communities are purposively sampled based on two factors. The first is the existence of a relationship with local government authorities. This factor is crucial to determining the activeness of the rural communities and their capacity to protect the social capital that exists among them. The second is the proximity of the selected areas to urban centres. This is essential to affirm the relevance of social capital to the development of rural areas. This framework is part of the critical social dimensions needed to facilitate and coordinate the anticipated benefits and performance of the cooperatives.

Household data for the study are collected using a structured questionnaire that is self-administered with the assistance of rural headship. The design of the questionnaire follows the integrated framework for the measurement of social capital developed by the World Bank [43]. A 5-point Likert scale is used. The scale of the questions ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to strongly agree (5). This scale is used to examine the social capital dimensions in the study area. A binary scale is also used to analyze whether the respondents adopt the social capital dimensions or not. Furthermore, the sets of responses were alternated between positive and negative to ensure that the answers are not systematic. The respondents willingly agreed to cooperate with the research procedures. The data contain information on characteristics of rural households, dimensions of social capital which are classified as networks, norms, trust and solidarity, and cooperation and group action members' level of participation in social capital groups. Data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics and the probit method. The probit model is specified to analyze the factors determining social capital dimensions in rural areas.

The social capital dimensions in the rural areas are examined using mean, standard deviation and factor analysis. The influence of socio-economic factors influencing social adoption in the rural areas is analyzed using the probit model. The probit model is used to explain the behaviour of the dependent variable that is dichotomous. Based on normality assumption, the probability estimate in the probit model is based on cumulative distribution function (CDF) [44]. The model is specified as follows:

The general form of the probit model is:

$$P_i^* = F(\beta'X) = 1/[exp(-\beta'X)] \quad [45] \quad (1)$$

The original functional relationship is specified as

$$Y_i^* = \beta_0 + \sum \beta_i X_{ij} + u_i \quad (2)$$

where Y_i^* is not observed, i.e., a latent variable.

The dependent variable of the probit model is binary (1 if a respondent belongs to a social capital group and 0, otherwise). This binary model is used to determine whether a respondent adopts a social capital or not. The independent variables include the set of socio-economic characteristics of the respondents. These include age (measured in years), gender (binary), household size

(numbers), education and years of experience. Since the coefficients of the probit model cannot be used to determine the effect sizes, the marginal effect is estimated.

Results and Discussion

The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1. Most of the sample rural populace are above 40 years of age. Specifically, less than 10 percent (6.7 percent) of the sample are less than 30 years of age. About 14 percent of the respondents are between 30 and 40 years of age while 28.6 percent are between 41 and 50 years of age. In the age bracket of 51 and 60 years, there are 41.4 percent and 9.0 percent of the rural populace that is greater than 60 years of age. The results suggest a big age gap between the young and old population in the rural areas. The results on gender show that 58.1 percent of the rural sample are female while 41.9 percent are male. This shows there are more females in the rural areas than males. The rural household size also differs; 11.9 percent are in the range of 1 and 3 household members while 21.4 percent have between 4 and 5 members of the rural household. The majority (66 percent) have a household size above 5 members.

The attainment of a good level of education is quite discouraging. 14.3 percent have no formal education, 47.2 percent have primary or elementary education,

31.4 percent have secondary education while 7.1 percent have post-secondary education. The descriptive statistics also cover respondents' access to credit, years of farming experience, being the primary occupation in most rural communities and the type of crops cultivated given that agricultural crop production is also dominant. A larger percentage of the respondents (62.8 percent) have access to credit while 37.2 percent of the rural sample claimed they do not have any access to credit. The years of experience in their primary occupation of farming vary among the respondents. A very high percentage of the sample have above 10 years of experience in the farming operation. Specifically, 13.8 percent reported their experience between 1 and 10 years. Close to the average of the sample (48.4 percent) reported that they have been in farming for over 10 years and up to 20 years in their rural communities. Meanwhile, 37.8 percent reported greater than 20 years of farming experience. In terms of the type of crops chosen as the primary area of agrarian operation, 51.4 percent reported their concentration on food crop while 32.6 percent indicated that their preference is a cash crop. Overall, the characteristics of the respondents present an opportunity to assess the social capital dimension in the rural areas and possible factors determining the social capital.

Table 1. Characteristics of the respondents

Items	Description	percent
Age (Years)	< 30	6.7
	30-40	14.3
	41-50	28.6
	51-60	41.4
	> 60	9.0
Gender	Male	41.9
	Female	58.1
Household Size	1-3	11.9
	4-5	21.4
	> 5	66.7
Level of Education	No Formal Education	14.3
	Elementary	47.2
	Secondary	31.4
	Post-Secondary	7.1
Access to credit	Yes	62.8
	No	37.2
Years of farming experience	1-10	13.8
	11-20	48.4
	>20	37.8
Types of crop owned/cultivated	Cash crop	32.6
	Food crop	51.4
	Both cash and food crop	16.0

Source: Field Survey, 2019.

Social capital dimensions in the rural areas.

The descriptive assessment of social capital dimensions is presented in Table 2. The 'social network' dimension of social capital has an average value of 3.875. The dimension is represented by two items. The first highlights the opportunity available to the rural households for having 'peers, friends and connections in the neighbouring communities'. With an average response of 3.753, most of the respondents agreed to have relations that could be termed 'external' to their close area of living. Since having friends outside the community is not sufficient to determine the relevance of such social assets, we asked the question of whether there is a visit to those friends and

peers frequently. The response with an average mean value of 3.997 shows that most of the rural populace consider visit on regular basis as part of their habit.

The 'norm' factor accounts for 3.390 as the average value of the social capital dimension. This dimension is represented by five social capital items. The results show a variation in the acceptance of the norm items among the sample rural households. For instance, the question of whether 'everyone receives support from the community' returns a non-definite answer of an average of 3.23. This indicates a non-agreement by the majority of the respondents on the existence of that type of social capital. Similarly, the response on amicable resolution of conflicts

and disagreements among all also returned a low average value of 2.687. This also suggests a disagreement on the existence of such social capital in rural areas. In the case of the need for compensation, there is general agreement (3.607) among the respondents that the rural peers are honourable and conservative. There is also evidence of respect for the local law in most rural communities (3.857).

The social capital dimension of 'trust and solidarity' accounts for an average of 4.115. All the three items of 'trust and solidarity' capital dimension return a mean average of 4.00, suggesting that most of the respondents agree with the existence of 'mutual trust among the villagers' (4.00), trust of strangers in their communities (4.155) and trust for government authorities and their agencies (4.191). The social capital dimension of 'cooperation and group action' accounts for an average of 4.139. This suggests that every rural household groups

work with others in the community (4.167), and there is a joint execution of most rural projects (4.238), just as there is a 'joint response to unpleasant issues in the rural community (4.012).

Consequently, cooperation and group action among the rural people is highest followed by trust and solidarity. Cooperation enables different household groups to work with others in the community. It also permits the execution of rural projects in a joint way. Furthermore, unpleasant issues that occur in the rural community receive a joint response. This has great implication for the development of rural areas. The 'norm' is found to be very low among the rural populace. The lower average value of 'norm' among the rural populace suggests that supports from the community is not the privilege of every member of the rural community. Also, conflicts and disagreements in rural communities are not necessarily resolved amicably.

Table 2. Social capital dimensions

Social capital	Mean	S.D
Social Networks	3.875	1.049
I have peers, friends and connections in the other town	3.753	1.076
Frequently, I visit the other town to interact and relate with my friends	3.997	1.022
Norm	3.390	1.151
Everyone receives support from the community	3.230	1.465
Conflicts and disagreements are resolved amicably	2.687	1.2862
The rural peers are honourable and conservative with compensation	3.607	1.182
There exist defined efforts to boost the development of the rural community	3.571	1.0446
There is respect for the law of the land	3.857	0.778
Trust and solidarity	4.115	0.617
There is mutual trust among the villagers.	4.000	0.746
The rural residents trust strangers	4.155	0.559
Government authorities and representatives are normally trusted	4.191	0.548
Cooperation and group action	4.139	0.725
Every household groups work with others in the community	4.167	0.569
Community projects are jointly executed	4.238	0.533
There is a joint response to unpleasant issues in the rural community	4.012	1.074

Source: Data Analysis, 2020.

Factor analysis of social capital dimensions

The variables of social capital are tested with factor analysis (Table 3). The adequacy of the analysis is tested with both the Barlett's test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test. Respectively, the two tests measure the sphericity and the sampling adequacy to determine whether factor analysis is suitable for the data. The diagnostics tests suggest the rejection of the hypothesis that the correlation coefficient matrix is zero [1]. The total variance of the different factors with social capital variables is 74.46 percent which agrees with the recommendation of Hair J. et al. [45]. There are four broad categories of social capital dimensions; social

networks, norm, trust and solidarity and cooperation. Each of these dimensions consists of different items. The first dimension which is a 'social network' has a Cronbach's value of 0.77. The second social capital dimension which is 'norm' has a Cronbach's value of 0.75. The third dimension is 'trust and solidarity' has a Cronbach's value of 0.75 while the fourth dimension 'cooperation' has a Cronbach value of '0.859'. The results show that the measures of the social capital dimension used for the study are reliable. A total number of thirteen (13) items constitutes the entire four dimensions of the social capital.

Table 3. Social capital dimensions

Social capital	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Cronbach's value
Social Networks		3.621	27.855	0.77
I have peers, friends and connections in the other town	0.638			
On a frequent basis, I visit the other town to interact and relate with my friends	0.777			
Norm		2.218	17.065	0.75
There is cohesion in the village. Everyone receives support from the community	0.461			
Conflicts and disagreements are resolved amicably	0.817			
The village peers are honourable and conservative with compensation	0.785			
There is a joint effort to boost the development of the rural community	0.846			
Everyone respects the law of the land	0.696			
Trust and solidarity		1.464	11.262	0.75
There is mutual trust among the villagers.	0.673			
The rural residents trust strangers	0.663			
Government authorities and representatives are normally trusted	0.822			
Cooperation and group action		1.258	9.675	0.859
Every household groups work with others in the community	0.840			
Community projects are jointly executed	0.850			
There is a joint response to unpleasant issues in the rural community	0.812			

Source: Data Analysis, 2020.

Determinants of social capital

In order to investigate the determinants of social capital in rural areas, a probit model is used. The diagnostics of the model such as Log-Likelihood and LR chi2 are high and significant suggesting that the specified model is fit and appropriate to determine the factors influencing social capital in the rural areas. The likelihood ratio chi-square of 158.54 with a p-value of 0.000 tells us that our model is statistically significant. Both the probit model and the marginal effect after the probit are presented in Table 4. Several factors are hypothesized to influence access to social capital in rural areas. However, the findings of the study show that education, access to credit and the type of crop cultivated by farmers are significantly ($p < 0.05$) related to whether social capital will be accessible to the rural populace.

The results show that years of education have a direct relationship with social capital group participation. Rural people with a higher level of education have a higher probability of belonging to a social capital group. The results highlight the need for education in social capital involvement in rural areas. Education as a human capital asset is crucial to access useful information and become aware of existing benefits within the community. Rural households with the educational asset are more aware of

the importance of social capital and the potentials advantages of its various dimensions [47].

Access to credit shows a positive and significant ($p < 0.05$) influence on the probability of belonging to a social capital group. The results suggest that the need for credit by the rural people drives their interests in social capital participation. Rural households with greater access to credit have a higher probability of gaining an advantage from social capital. Iyanda [50] found access to credit to be related to social capital and by extension welfare outcomes of rural households. Access to sufficient credit could also improve efficient decisions on investment opportunities. The finding of the study is in agreement with Nwosu et al. [48].

Furthermore, rural people who are engaged in agriculture and who concentrate on cash crop production such as coffee, cocoa and palm oil have a higher probability of belonging to a social capital group. This is found to be significant at a 5 percent level. The results suggest that cash crop production attracts a higher level of returns to farming in most rural areas. Most of the general socio-economic factors such as age, gender and household size do not have any significant influence on the probability of belonging to a social capital group. This result finds agreement with studies such as Park D. et al. [1].

Table 4. Probit estimates of the factors determining the social capital

	Probit regression estimates		Marginal effect after probit	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Age	-0.373	0.299	-1.24	0.214
Gender	0.152	0.347	0.44	0.662
Education	0.459	0.059**	-7.72	0.000*
Household size	-0.382	0.267	1.43	0.153
Access to credit	0.162	0.048**	-3.40	0.001*
Years of farming experience	-0.304	0.263	-1.15	0.249
Cash crop ownership	0.376	0.059**	6.38	0.000*
Food crop ownership	-0.006	0.112	-0.05	0.959
Constant	1.654	1.164	1.42	0.155
LR chi2 (8) = 158.54				
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000				
Log likelihood = -136.394				
Pseudo R2 = 0.3676				

* $p < 0.05$

Source: Data Analysis, 2020

The marginal effect of the probit model is presented in Table 5. The result shows that education could significantly (5 percent) raise the probability of adopting social capital by approximately 18 percent. Similarly, access to credit has the potential to significantly (5 percent) increase the probability of adoption of social capital by approximately 6 percent. The agrarian nature of most rural areas and part of its indicator of wealth-crop ownership- is also

significantly (5 percent) related to the decision of the rural populace to participate in the social capital adoption. The marginal estimate of cash crop ownership shows about 15 percent increase in the probability of adopting social capital in the rural areas. The overall prediction value of the probability to adopt social capital given the significant socio-economic factors is approximately 55.1 percent.

Table 5. Marginal effects after probit

	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P > z
Age	-0.148	0.119	-1.24	0.214
Gender	0.0599	0.137	0.44	0.662
Education	0.1819	0.024	-7.55	0.000*
Household size	-0.1509	0.106	1.43	0.153
Access to credit	0.0640	0.019	-3.39	0.001*
Years of farming experience	-0.12012	0.104	-1.15	0.249
Cash crop ownership	0.1485	0.023	6.37	0.000*
Food crop ownership	-0.0022	0.044	-0.05	0.959
LR chi2 (8) = 158.54				
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000				
Log likelihood = -136.394				
Pseudo R2 = 0.3676				
y = Pr(y) (predict)				
=0.551				

* $p < 0.05$

Source: Data Analysis, 2020

Conclusion

Using rural communities in Nigeria, this study identifies the social capital dimensions that are prevalent in the rural areas and determines the influencing factors. Most rural communities still depend largely on agrarian activities and hence agricultural activities still prevail in these communities. Due to the geographical isolation of these rural communities from modern infrastructure and frequent Government interventions, social capital remains one of the key sources of support for their economic and general livelihood activities. Consequently, the existence and promotion of social capital are required to avert the continuous social and economic exclusion of most rural populace. In the absence of beneficial social capital, the characteristics of the rural populace portend a lack of opportunities and hence limitation to rural development. The results show that most of the respondents are already existing an active age bracket with a possible effect on the future productivity of the rural communities. Furthermore, there are more females than males indicating the responsibilities of rural development, if not reversed, will fall on the extent to which the women can work. The household size is also relatively large, indicating that the population of the rural communities may go beyond the managerial capacity of the women who constitute the majority in the rural areas. Educational attainment is also not encouraging with a possible potential negative effect on human capital development in the nearest future.

The prevailing social capital dimensions in the rural communities include cooperation and group action, and trust and solidarity. The findings from the study lead to the conclusion that rural communities can ensure that households bind together to jointly execute community projects and also pay attention to the joint reaction to unpleasant issues that might arise in the communities. Trust is still being held for authorities and strangers suggesting that both local and international support agencies and their activities would receive warm inception for developmental interventions in the rural areas. The existence of networks across close rural neighbours suggests an advantage for integrated support services across several communities. These opportunities are driven by some factors. The most significant of these factors include improvement of access to education, credit opportunities and extension of the experience of crop ownership to other aspects of rural businesses.

This study is limited in the aspect of investigating the consequence of social capital assets on various outcomes in rural communities. Hence, it is suggested that future studies should focus on identifying and isolating the effect of each of the dimensions on the potential economic and livelihood dimensions of the rural populace, especially in developing nations.

References

1. Park, D., Lee, K., Choi, H., & Yoon, Y. (2012) Factors influencing social capital in rural tourism communities in South Korea, *Tourism Management*, 33: 1511-1520.
2. Usman, M., & Ahmad, M.I. (2018), Parallel mediation model of social capital, learning and the adoption of best crop management practices: Evidence from Pakistani small farmers", *China Agricultural Economic Review*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/CAER-01-2017-0002>.
3. Pisani, E., & Micheletti, S. (2020) Social capital and rural development research in Chile. A qualitative review and quantitative, *Journal of Rural Studies*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.08.002>.
4. Ahlerup P, Ola, O. & David YA 2009 "Social Capital vs Institutions in the Growth process." *European Journal of Political Economy* 25 (1): 1-14.
5. Ntume, B., Nalule, A. S., & Baluka, S.A (2015) The role of social capital in technology adoption and livestock development, *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 27 (9): 1-18.

6. Husen, N. A., Loos, T.K., & Siddiq, K.H.A (2017) Social Capital and Agricultural Technology Adoption among Ethiopian Farmers, *American Journal of Rural Development*, 5 (3): 65-72.
7. Iyanda, J.O., Afolami, C.O., Obayelu, A.E., & Ladebo, O.J (2014) Social Capital and Access to Credit among Cassava Farming Households in Ogun State, Nigeria, *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences*, 3(2): 175-196.
8. Cvetanovic, S., Despotovic, D., & Filipovic, M (2015) The concept of social capital in economic theory, *EKOHOMIKA*, 61(1): 73-84.
9. Tregear, A. and Cooper, S. (2016), "Embeddedness, social capital and learning in rural areas: The case of producer cooperatives", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 44, pp. 101-110.
10. Westlund, H., Kobayashi, K., 2013. *Social Capital and Rural Development in the Knowledge Society*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA.
11. Rivera, M., Knickel, K., Diaz-Puente, J.M., & Afonso, A. (2019) The role of social capital in agricultural and rural development: lessons learnt from case studies in seven countries, 'Accepted Article', doi: 10.1111/soru.12218.
12. Luo, Q., & Wang, Z. (2010). Social capital and governance of collective action dilemma in farmer cooperative economic organization. *The Chinese Cooperative Economic Review*, 10: 107-114.
13. Phillips, M., (2015). Assets and affects in the study of social capital in rural communities. *Sociologia Ruralis* 56(2) 220-247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12085>.
14. Liang, Q., Huang, Z., Lu, H., & Wang, X. (2015) Social Capital, Member Participation, and Cooperative Performance: Evidence from China's Zhejiang, *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* 18(1): 49-78.
15. Chriest, A., & Niles, M. (2018) The role of community social capital for food security following an extreme weather event, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 64:80-90.
16. Miao, S., Heijman, W., Zhu, X. and Lu, Q. (2015), "Social capital influences farmer participation in collective irrigation management in Shaanxi Province, China", *China Agricultural Economic Review*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 448-466.
17. Nato, G.N., Shauri, H.S. and Kadere, T.T. (2016), "Influence of social capital on adoption of agricultural production technologies among beneficiaries of African Institute for capacity development training programmes in Kenya", *International Journal of Social Science and Technology*, 1 (1): pp. 124-132.
18. Engbers, T.A., Thomson, M.F., & Slaper, T.F., (2017) Theory and measurement in social capital research, *Social Indicator Research*, 537-558.
19. Ruben, R & Heras, J (2012) social capital, governance and performance of Ethiopian coffee cooperatives, *Annals of Cooperative Economics*, 83 (4): 463-484.
20. Midgley, J. (2013) *Social development: Theory and practice*. Sage.
21. Snider, A., A. Afonso-Gallegos, I. Gutiérrez, and N. Sibelet, (2017). Social capital and sustainable coffee certifications in Costa Rica. *Human Ecology*, 45(2), pp. 235-249.
22. Chloupkova, J.G., L.H. Svendsen, and G.T. Svendsen.2003. Building and destroying social capital: The case of cooperative movements in Denmark and Poland. *Agriculture and Human values* 20 (3): 241-252.
23. Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
24. Misztal, B.A. 1996. *Trust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
25. Lyon, F., (2000). Trust, networks and norms: the creation of social capital in agricultural economies in Ghana. *World Development* 28 (4): 663-681.
26. World Bank (2003). *Poverty Assessment*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
27. Musavengane, R., and Simatele, D. (2017), "Significance of social capital in collaborative management of natural resources in Sub-Saharan African rural communities: A qualitative meta-analysis", *South African Geographical Journal*, 99(3): 267-282
28. Sentime, I. (2019), Co-operatives in the Democratic Republic of Congo: A literature review, *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcom.2018.11.002>
29. Mojo, D., Fischer, C. and Degefa, T. (2015), "Social and environmental impacts of agricultural cooperatives: evidence from Ethiopia", *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 388-400.
30. Mojo, D., Fischer, C. and Degefa, T. (2017), "The determinants and economic impacts of membership in coffee farmer cooperatives: recent evidence from rural Ethiopia", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 50 pp. 84-94.
31. Ma, W. & Abdullai, A. (2016), "Does cooperative membership improve household welfare? Evidence from apple farmers in China", *Food Policy*, 58: 94-102.
32. Verhofstadt, E. and Maertens, M. (2014), "Can agricultural cooperatives reduce poverty? Heterogeneous impact of cooperative membership on farmers' welfare in Rwanda", *Applied. Economic. Perspective and Policy*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 86-106.
33. Bharadwaj, B. (2012) Roles of Cooperatives in Poverty Reduction: A Case of Nepal, *Administration and Management Review*, 24(1): 120-139.
34. Tenzin, G. & Natsuda, K. (2016), "Social capital, household income and community development in Bhutan: a case study of a dairy cooperative", *Development in Practice*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 467-480.

35. Woolcock, M. and Narayan, D. (2000), "Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy", *The World Bank Research Observer*, Vol. 15, No 2, pp. 225–249.

36. Szreter, S., Woolcock, M., (2004). Health by association? Social capital, social theory, and the political economy of public health. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 33, 650–667.

37. Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.

38. Putnam, R. (1995). Tuning in, tuning out: the strange disappearance of social capital in America. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 28, 664-683.

39. Dinda, S., (2008) Social capital in the creation of human capital and economic growth: A productive consumption approach, *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 37, 2020–2033.

40. Grootaert, C. and van Bastelaer, T. (2002), "Understanding and measuring social capital: a multidisciplinary tool for practitioners". Washington (DC): World Bank.

41. Bhukuth, A., Roumane, A. and Terrany, B. (2018), "Cooperative, human capital and poverty: A theoretical framework", *Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 11-18.

42. Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V.N., & Woolcock, M., (2003) Measuring Social Capital, An Integrated Questionnaire, World Bank Working Paper No. 18.

43. Gujarati, D. & Sangeeta, N. (2007). *Basic Econometrics*. Tata McGraw-Hill Limited. New Delhi, India.

44. Maddala, G.S. (1983). *Qualitative and limited dependent variables in econometrics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

45. Hair, J., Black W., Babin, B., Anderson, R. and Tatham, R. (2006) *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 6th Edition, Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.

46. Gao, Y., Liu, B., Yang, H., & Yin, S (2019) Social capital, land tenure and the adoption of green control techniques by family farms: Evidence from Shandong and Henan Provinces of China, *Land Use Policy*, 89: 1-11.

47. Nwosu, E.O., Orji, A., Urama, N.E, Emecheta, C., Chukwuma, Q.O., & Chukwuma, J.N (2020) Social Capital, Credit Access and Household Non-farm Enterprises in Nigeria: A new Empirical Evidence, *Forum for Social Economics*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/07360932.2020.1825983>.

48. Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.

Received: 03/02/2021

1st Revision: 10/02/2021

Accepted: 03/03/2021

Author's declaration on the sources of funding of research presented in the scientific article or of the preparation of the scientific article: budget of university's scientific project.

Н. А. Софолуве, д-р філософії з економіки сільського господарства, викладач

Університет Олабизи Онабанджо, Аго Івоє штат Огун, Нігерія,

Л. О. Оєламі, д-р філософії з економіки, викладач

Університет Лагосу, Акока, Лагос, Нігерія,

О. Адіса, д-р філософії з економіки сільського господарства

Університет Обафемі Аволау, штат Осун, Нігерія

ФАКТОРИ, ЩО ВПЛИВАЮТЬ НА СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ КАПІТАЛ У СІЛЬСЬКИХ ГРОМАДАХ НІГЕРІЇ

Соціальний капітал став важливим аспектом функціонування більшості сільських громад у країнах, що розвиваються. Однак вимірювання соціального капіталу в сільських регіонах різняться, а про фактори, що впливають на нього в сільській місцевості, відомо мало. Мета пропонованого дослідження – виявити вимірювання соціального капіталу в сільській місцевості, що переважають, і вивчити фактори, які визначають залученість сільських жителів у ці вимірювання. Польове дослідження, що складається зі структурованого і самостійно заповнюваного запитальника, було проведено серед сільських домогосподарств. Інформація в ході дослідження була отримана від 220 сільських домогосподарств у досліджуваному районі. Дескриптивний аналіз виявив соціальні мережі (3,875), норми (3,390), довіру і солідарність (4,115), співпрацю і групові дії (4,139) як домінуючі вимірювання соціального капіталу в сільських громадах. Результати також показують, що співпраця, довіра і солідарність, а також мережі є, відповідно, домінуючими вимірами соціального капіталу в сільській місцевості. Результати оцінки за пробіт-моделлю показують, що фактори, які з більшою ймовірністю пов'язані із соціальним капіталом у сільській місцевості, охоплюють освіту, доступ до кредитів і володіння фермою (товарна культура). Оскільки соціальний капітал стає необхідною умовою для розвитку сільських районів, то наші результати дозволяють припустити, що співпраця і створення мереж має бути полегшеном для людей у сільській місцевості. Крім того, необхідно також посилити політику, спрямовану на доступ до освіти, надання кредитів і розвиток основних професій у сільській місцевості.

Ключові слова: соціальний капітал, сільська місцевість, співпраця, соціальні мережі.

Н. А. Софолуве, д-р философии по экономике сельского хозяйства, преподаватель

Университет Олабизи Онабанджо, Аго Ивоэ штат Огун, Нигерия,

Л. О. Ойелами, д-р философии по экономике, преподаватель

Университет Лагоса, Акока, Лагос, Нигерия,

О. Адиса, д-р философии по экономике сельского хозяйства

Университет Обафемі Аволау, штат Осун, Нигерия

ФАКТОРЫ, ВЛИЯЮЩИЕ НА СОЦИАЛЬНЫЙ КАПИТАЛ В СЕЛЬСКИХ ОБЩИНАХ НИГЕРИИ

Социальный капитал стал важным аспектом функционирования большинства сельских общин в развивающихся странах. Однако измерения социального капитала в сельских регионах различны, а о факторах, влияющих на него в сельской местности, известно мало. Цель данного исследования – выявить преобладающие измерения социального капитала в сельской местности и изучить факторы, определяющие вовлеченность сельских жителей в эти измерения. Полевое исследование, состоящее из структурированного и самостоятельно заполняемого вопросника, было проведено среди сельских домохозяйств. Информация в ходе исследования была получена от 220 сельских домохозяйств в исследуемом районе. Дескриптивный анализ выявил социальные сети (3,875), нормы (3,390), доверие и солидарность (4,115), сотрудничество и групповые действия (4,139) как преобладающие измерения социального капитала в сельских общинах. Результаты также показывают, что сотрудничество, доверие и солидарность, а также сети являются, соответственно, доминирующими измерениями социального капитала в сельской местности. Результаты оценки по пробит-модели показывают, что факторы, которые с большей вероятностью связаны с социальным капиталом в сельской местности, включают образование, доступ к кредитам и владение фермой (товарная культура). Поскольку социальный капитал становится необходимым условием для развития сельских районов, то наши результаты позволяют предположить, что сотрудничество и создание сетей должно быть облегчено для людей в сельской местности. Кроме того, необходимо также усилить политику, направленную на доступ к образованию, предоставление кредитов и развитие основных профессий в сельской местности.

Ключевые слова: социальный капитал, сельская местность, сотрудничество, социальные сети.