Role of Organizational Diversity, Research and Innovation for Sustainable Agriculture and Agroecology

Nishani Silva

Rajarata University of Sri Lanka

Abstract

Sustainability in agriculture relies on complex interplay of multiple stakeholders and organizations working in unison to push the limits of technological research and innovation. There are competitive pressures, economic and geopolitical tensions, changing regulatory standards, and evolving consumer demands. This article discusses the nature of multifaceted support needed to create a sustainable agriculture ecosystem. Beyond creating a mutually beneficial ecosystem, it is also necessary to regularly adapt and adopt changes to address the impeding challenges while empowering the weakest communities in developing and underdeveloped countries. Academic institutions play a critical role in the generation of knowledge and workforce development for the future agro-food industry. The role of socioeconomic and political factors is also critical for creating and supporting the infrastructure needed for agricultural sustainability. This article summarizes the role of multiple factors in agricultural sustainability with particular emphasis on promoting diversity of opinions, and research and innovation.

Introduction

Farmers and businesses need to constantly adapt to the rapidly changing agricultural landscape. Viewing agricultural research with a dynamic innovation framework could facilitate the creation and maintenance of environments conducive to scientific adaptation and progress [1-7]. This article discusses the multiple dimensions of this strategy which involves refining the current methods and behaviors of individuals, farmers, businesses and organizations, along with constructing supportive incentives, structures, and policies to encourage innovation for sustainable agriculture. This innovation arises from a complex interplay of a wide range of organizations and mutually beneficial activities. These interactions and operations must evolve continuously to meet the changing needs of sustainability in agriculture. Academic universities play a pivotal role in this process, ensuring that research institutions and researchers remain pertinent and continue to introduce innovations that generate knowledge and positively impact the lives of agricultural communities and society as whole [2-5].

Agroecology and Social Diversity

Agroecology requires participation and engagement of a broad range of stakeholders who recognize and learn from each other [7-12]. There is an emphasis on amplifying a broader spectrum of voices, especially those frequently marginalized by mainstream society (e.g., farm workers, smallholders, indigenous communities, and rural women). Diversity has its profound importance within agriculture where we redirect focus towards biota, landscapes, and social structures. Examples of diversity management at the farm level include diverse practices in the fields such as intercropping, crop rotations, polycultures, and integrating animals, cultivars, and genetic variability [5-13]. On a larger scale, diversity extends to landscape features such as buffer zones, forest fragments, rotational grazing, and various tillage methods. The essence lies not only in the presence of diverse species or agricultural techniques but in their synergistic interactions, which provide vital ecosystem services like pollination, pest control, and nutrient cycling crucial for agricultural productivity and farmers' livelihoods [12-20]. Social diversity domains prompt agroecologists to consider various forms of farmer organization, government regulations, and the diverse market structures and alternative agro-food networks comprising agro-food systems. The existence of alternative distribution systems and a wide array of social institutions and economic relationships in agriculture—such as farmer's markets, community-supported agriculture, cooperatives, and both subsistence and commercial production—offer numerous incentives that could be enhanced by a supportive policy framework [12-20].

Agroecology and Sociopolitical Frameworks

A new perspective on agroecology involves critiquing the political and economic frameworks that shape the current agro-food system [5-12]. This standpoint necessitates that agroecologists broaden their scope beyond individual farms to encompass the wider influences—such as market dynamics and governmental policies—that undermine farmers' cultural traditions, economic autonomy, and the ecological foundation. In part, the emergence of agroecology as a discipline stemmed from the recognition of the social and environmental repercussions stemming from the industrialization of agriculture and the adoption of Green Revolution technologies [21-33]. Approaches that narrowly define agroecology as merely an ecologically mindful agronomic science have overlooked the significance of social considerations in its evolution.

Agroecology has continuously evolved towards a more comprehensive approach to both the theory and application of agroecology, engaging closely with critiques of rural development from scholars, practitioners, and social movements [21-28]. Particularly, political ecologists have demonstrated how external influences at international, national, and regional levels affect local practices. This marked a pivotal shift towards a multi-scalar analysis, connecting local social and ecological phenomena with broader regional and global dynamics. Political ecologists emphasize power dynamics governing natural resources, often resulting in marginalized farmers lacking access to essential productive resources due to factors like class, gender, or ethnicity. Without access to these resources, dispersed across territories and subject to overlapping power structures, farmers struggle to maintain or establish sustainable agroecosystems. A politically engaged agroecology acknowledges the intricate social and ecological challenges confronting smallholders in their pursuit of sustainability [13-18].

Marginalized communities advocating for food sovereignty have explicitly linked agroecological practices with the equitable distribution of resources and the assertion of self-determination. Ecological sustainability has become central to their demands for the preservation of rural livelihoods and culturally specific ways of life, threatened by deepening capitalist relations that commodify labor and natural resources. Addressing these challenges necessitates a broader conception of knowledge and learning, recognizing a community of practice that encompasses both farmer scientists and academically trained researchers. As both a scientific discipline and a social movement, agroecology provides a fertile ground for constructing relevant frameworks that address asymmetrical power relations [20-27].

These intertwined strategies have the potential to drive a fundamental shift in the existing agro-food system, placing ecological and human well-being at the forefront across all stages and fostering integration among its various components to enhance long-term resilience. It is imperative to adopt a comprehensive approach when formulating agricultural policies, recognizing that farming practices exert significant influence on landscape and environmental quality, alongside other critical factors [13-19]. Decision-makers must possess the foresight to anticipate the full spectrum of effects resulting from policy interventions to prevent unforeseen repercussions. Interventions aimed at landscape management, such as the introduction or reintroduction of specific landscape elements, may yield outcomes divergent from initial expectations. Consequently, directing subsidies towards farm typologies or farming methods demonstrated to positively impact landscape quality represents a more dependable approach.

Farming extends beyond mere economic and productive outcomes, and exerts considerable influence on the environmental and landscape integrity. Evaluating the farm performance necessitates consideration of a broader set of indicators beyond economic metrics [5-9]. Embracing this holistic perspective should encourage researchers and policy-makers to proactively anticipate the potential effects of agricultural interventions when setting up specific objectives. It is essential to employ tools capable of assessing farm performance comprehensively, encompassing aspects of landscape, natural resource utilization, environmental quality, and agricultural output.

Economics and Innovation in the Agricultural Landscape

Innovation stands as a critical imperative for the survival and competitiveness of farmers and businesses within the dynamic contemporary agricultural landscape [2-9]. The current agricultural environment is characterized by fluidity and dynamism driven by various factors. Agriculture is increasingly intertwined with regional and domestic markets, competitive pressures, and accommodating consumer demands and regulatory standards. Additionally, societal shifts such as urbanization and changing food preferences further contribute to the dynamic nature of the agricultural sector. Addressing the needs of a burgeoning global population necessitates a focus on agricultural intensification, which in turn brings challenges associated with pests and crop diseases.

A significant population in underdeveloped countries relies on agriculture for sustenance, and making innovations to improve their poverty levels is important for global sustainability [12-30]. Despite the pivotal role of agricultural research in fostering innovation, there is growing apprehension that its impact is not commensurate with the increasing demand. Traditional assessments, such as analyzing the economic ramifications of research, offer limited insight into avenues for improvement. However, there are indications of a rising recognition of the dynamic and multifaceted nature of modern agricultural science and the imperative to address institutional aspects of its efficacy. These concerns have spurred recent endeavors to apply the innovation system concept as a framework to understand and improve the research and development.

Sustainable Process of Agricultural Innovation

In contrast to conventional economic paradigms that primarily emphasize production outputs, newer frameworks concentrate on the processes of innovation. Innovation is frequently confused with research and often gauged by scientific or technical outputs [3-10]. Yet, the innovation systems framework emphasizes that innovation transcends research or science and technology; rather, it encompasses the application of diverse forms of knowledge to attain desired socio-economic outcomes. This knowledge acquisition may stem from learning, research, or experience, but it only qualifies as innovation when put into practice. The processes of learning and knowledge acquisition are interdependent, often necessitating extensive linkages between various knowledge sources. Academic universities and institutional settings play a pivotal role in shaping the crucial processes underpinning innovation: interaction, learning, and knowledge dissemination.

Policies wield a considerable influence on human behavior as well [21-28]. An environment conducive to fostering innovation does not stem from a single policy but hinges on a comprehensive set of policies synergistically shaping innovative conduct. Moreover, established habits and practices interact with policies; thus, effective policy design necessitates accounting for the habits and practices of the affected individuals. For instance, the introduction of a participatory research approach often proves ineffectual unless scientists adapt their habits and work practices accordingly. The framework underscores the significance of involving stakeholders and ensuring organizational and policy responsiveness to stakeholder agendas and demands. Innovation focus and direction are molded by demand, which extends beyond market forces to encompass non-market drivers like collaborative relationships between knowledge users and producers. Policy interventions, such as offering incentives for adopting specific technologies or management practices, can stimulate demand for particular types of innovation, particularly in cases where key stakeholders lack social and economic influence or when addressing adverse environmental impacts of development is paramount.

The habits and practices crucial for innovation are acquired behaviors that may undergo gradual or abrupt changes. These are often institutionalized through innovative practices like farmer field schools or participatory plant breeding, arising from scientists' experimentation and learning. Such novel approaches to research and development often necessitate forging new partnerships alongside adopting fresh methodologies. Successful innovation systems exhibit a tendency for component organizations to forge new partnerships and alliances when confronted with external disruptions [21-29]. Examples of such disruptions include novel pest challenges requiring interdisciplinary collaboration, emerging technologies like biotechnology necessitating public-private sector partnerships or shifts in international trade regulations and competitive pressures compelling changes in relationships between local enterprises and research institutions. As the nature of future disruptions remains inherently uncertain, it's challenging to predict the specific networks, links, and partnerships required. However, organizations equipped with both flexibility and the capacity to rapidly establish new partnership patterns dictated by evolving circumstances could be better positioned to navigate future shocks effectively.

Planners and researchers must elevate their focus on policies and institutions, acknowledging their dynamic interplay and recognizing their indispensable role as critical factors in analyses. This entails adopting a broader perspective on the spectrum of innovation-related policies and how various policy domains can be harmonized. Merely concentrating on research policy as the primary driver of innovation is no longer sufficient; instead, policy frameworks must encompass the incentives, triggers, and support structures necessary to foster and sustain creativity. Moreover, it's crucial to acknowledge that achieving policy imperatives, such as poverty reduction, hinges on the presence of entrenched habits, practices, and institutions geared towards such objectives, potentially at the expense of competing agendas.

The holistic, multifaceted knowledge essential for sustainable, equitable development cannot be generated by solitary organizations, nor can market mechanisms alone fulfill the needs of impoverished communities. Therefore, the logical response is to forge new alliances through linkage, networking, and consortium building. Hence, it's imperative that all agricultural research organizations possess the requisite skills and incentives to embrace this collaborative strategy. Moreover, research institutions must extend their role beyond mere research to act as brokers, bridges, and catalysts within the broader innovation ecosystem. The capacity for innovation must no longer be viewed solely in terms of human and physical scientific and technological resources. Instead, it should be conceptualized in terms of policies and practices that foster learning and innovation within networks of organizations. While agricultural research institutions retain significance, they are insufficient in isolation. Furthermore, policies and practices must be instituted to enhance the adaptability and flexibility of innovation systems.

Adopting a partnership-oriented approach to fostering innovation necessitates fostering working practices and institutions conducive to nurturing trust and cooperation among individuals and organizations in pursuit of shared objectives – in essence, social capital [6-10]. This can be achieved by designing policies and programs that enhance interaction levels among key stakeholder groups. However, this does not imply a mechanistic approach where everyone partners with everyone else; rather, the primary objective is to cultivate trust and confidence, thereby lowering barriers to partnership and facilitating swift responses when circumstances prompt realignment of partnerships.

Sustainable Decision-Making and Organizational Structure

Assessing the economic impact of research investments can offer only limited insights into devising more effective strategies for goals like poverty reduction [30-36]. Instead, a continual process of institutional learning and adaptation is essential. In this regard, scientists and their collaborators must engage in ongoing reflection on both successes and failures – particularly the latter, as learning from failures is pivotal for improvement. Practices, institutions, and incentives must be tailored to encourage research organizations to embrace this reflective approach, which may encompass purposeful reflective exercises ranging from workshops to staff appraisal procedures. Moreover, fostering an organizational culture that legitimizes and fosters such reflective activities is crucial.

Within the subject of landscape production and preservation, there are significant challenges in implementing successful and impactful interventions, which underscores the importance of offering guidance to decision-makers. While some decision-makers may lean towards preserving the landscape status quo to avoid any alterations, this approach may only be feasible for small-scale areas or regions with specific characteristics. Conversely, the complexity of landscape management lies on the intricate relationships among its elements, rather than mere summation of individual components. Providing subsidies for maintaining or improving existing landscape elements could prove effective. However, a more cautious approach is warranted when decision-makers aim to introduce elements absent from the landscape, as farmer responses to such interventions may yield unforeseen outcomes vastly different from initial expectations. Therefore, supporting farm typologies (e.g., mixed crops) or farming styles (e.g., organic farming) proven to positively impact landscape quality and other attributes might be a more dependable strategy rather than subsidizing individual landscape elements.

Conclusion

Distinguishing between an agricultural research system and an agricultural innovation system reveals both differences and similarities. While acknowledging the significance of research systems, it's crucial to recognize the essential characteristics of an agricultural innovation system and emphasize the need to enhance the effectiveness of agricultural research organizations in driving innovation. An agricultural innovation system does not adopt an administrative or bureaucratic structure. Rather, the innovation system should be perceived as a policy tool—a framework for policymakers to conceptualize how innovation can be fostered and appropriate capacities can be cultivated. The innovation system needs to be continually evolving and expanding in capacity to meet the growing demands of agri-based products for the ever-increasing world population. It is equally important to promote equity of land, resources, labor, and knowledge to have a healthy and balanced system of shared opportunities.

References

[1]. Ashley, C. and Maxwell, S. 2001. Rethinking rural development. Development Policy Review 19(4): 395–425.

[2]. Biggs, S.D. 1990. A multiple sources of innovation model of agricultural research and technology promotion. World Development 18(11): 1481–1499.

[3]. Guzmán, G. I., and A. M. Alonso. 2008. A comparison of energy use in conventional and organic olive oil production in Spain. Agricultural Systems 98(3): 167–176.

[4]. Byerlee, D. and Alex, G.E. 1998. Strengthening National Agricultural Research Systems: Policy Issues and Good Practice. Washington DC, USA: World Bank.

[5]. Chambers, R. 1983. Rural Development: Putting the Last First. London, UK: Longman Scientific.

[6]. A. Joseph, R. Lycke, Decision-making by nematodes in complex microfluidic mazes, Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology. 2(6) (2011) 409-415.

[7]. Akwete Bortei-Doku, Marvin H. White, Simulation of biological ion channels with technology computer-aided design. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine, 85, 1 (2007) 1-7.

[8]. Kloppenburg, J. 1991. Social theory and the reconstruction of agricultural science: local knowledge for an alternative agriculture. Rural Sociology 56: 519–548.

[9]. A. Parashar, S. Pandey, Plant-in-chip: Microfluidic system for studying root growth and pathogenic interactions in Arabidopsis, Applied Physics Letters, 98, 263703 (2011).

[10]. Francis, C., G. Lieblein, S. Gliessman, T. A. Breland, N. Creamer, R. Harwood, L. Salomonsson, J. Helenius, et al. 2003. Agroecology: The ecology of food systems. Journal of Sustainable Agriculture 22(3): 99–118.

[11]. J. Saldanha, A. Parashar, J. Powell-Coffman, “Multi-parameter behavioral analyses provide insights to mechanisms of cyanide resistance in Caenorhabditis elegans”, Toxicological Sciences 135(1):156-68. (2013).

[12]. Beeman, Z. Njus, G. L. Tylka, “Chip Technologies for Screening Chemical and Biological Agents against Plant-Parasitic Nematodes”, Phytopathology, 106 (12), 1563-1571 (2016).

[13]. Beeman AQ, Njus ZL, Tylka GL. Chip Technologies for Screening Chemical and Biological Agents Against Plant-Parasitic Nematodes. Phytopathology. 2016 Dec;106(12):1563-1571.

[14]. Jensen JP, Beeman AQ, Njus ZL, Kalwa U, Tylka GL. Movement and Motion of Soybean Cyst Nematode Heterodera glycines Populations and Individuals in Response to Abamectin. Phytopathology. 2018, 108(7), 885-891.

[15]. Wezel, A., S. Bellon, T. Dore, C. Francis, D. Vallod, and C. David. 2009. Agroecology as a science, a movement and a practice. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 29: 503–515.

[16]. C.M. Legner, G.L. Tylka, Robotic agricultural instrument for automated extraction of nematode cysts and eggs from soil to improve integrated pest management. Scientific Reports, 2021, 11(1), 3212.

[17]. Cuéllar-Padilla, M., and Á. Calle-Collado. 2011. Can we find solutions with people? Participatory action research with small organic producers in Andalusia. Journal of Rural Studies 27: 372–383.

[18]. Kalwa, U., Legner, C. and Kong, T., Skin Cancer Diagnostics with an all-Inclusive Smartphone Application. Symmetry, 11(6), (2019) 790.

[19]. X. Ding, Z. Njus, T. Kong, et al. Effective drug combination for Caenorhabditis elegans nematodes discovered by output-driven feedback system control technique. Science Advances. 2017, eaao1254.

[20]. S. Pandey, Marvin H White, Parameter-extraction of a two-compartment model for whole-cell data analysis, Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 120(2), 131-143, 2002.

[21]. R. Lycke, A. Parashar, Microfluidics-enabled method to identify modes of Caenorhabditis elegans paralysis in four anthelmintics. Biomicrofluidics. 2013, 7(6), 64103.

[22]. Tomich, T. P., S. Brodt, H. Ferris, R. Galt, W. R. Horwath, E. Kebreab, J. H. J. Leveau, D. Liptzin, et al. 2011. Agroecology: A Review from a global change perspective. Annual Review of Environment and Resources 36: 193–222.

[23]. A.Q. Beeman, Z. L. Njus, G. Tylka, The Effects of ILeVO and VOTiVO on Root Penetration and Behavior of the Soybean Cyst Nematode, Heterodera glycines. Plant Diseases (2019), 103(3):392-397.

[24]. J.P. Jensen, U. Kalwa, G.L. Tylka, Avicta and Clariva Affect the Biology of the Soybean Cyst Nematode, Heterodera glycines. Plant Dis. 2018 Dec;102(12):2480-2486.

[25]. Hall, A.J., Sivamohan, M.V.K., Clark, N.G., Taylor, S. and Bockett, G. 2001. Why research partnerships really matter: innovation theory, institutional arrangements and implications for developing new technology for the poor. World Development 29(5): 783–797.

[26]. S. Pandey, Analytical modeling of the ion number fluctuations in biological ion channels, Journal of nanoscience and nanotechnology, 12(3) (2012), 2489-2495.

[27]. Wezel, A., and V. Soldat. 2009. A quantitative and qualitative historical analysis of the scientific discipline of agroecology. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability 7: 3–18.

[28]. J. Saldanha, J. Powell-Coffman. The effects of short-term hypergravity on Caenorhabditis elegans. Life Science Space Research. (2016) 10:38-46.

[29]. Hall, A.J., Sulaiman, R.V., Clark, N.G. and Yoganand, B. 2003. From measuring impact to learning institutional lessons: An innovation systems perspective on improving the management of international agricultural research. Agricultural Systems 78: 213–241.

[30]. Njus Z, Kong T, Kalwa U, et al. Flexible and disposable paper- and plastic-based gel micropads for nematode handling, imaging, and chemical testing. APL Bioengineering. 2017 Dec;1(1):016102.

[31]. Hall, A.J., Sulaiman, R.V., Clark, N.G., Sivamohan, M.V.K. and Yoganand, B. 2000. New agendas for agricultural research in developing countries: policy analysis and institutional implications. Knowledge, Technology and Policy 13(1): 73–91.

[32]. V. Patel, A. Chesmore, C. M. Legner, S. Pandey, Trends in Workplace Wearable Technologies and Connected-Worker Solutions for Next-Generation Occupational Safety, Health, and Productivity, Advanced Intelligent Systems, Article ID 2100099, 2021.

[33]. S. Pandey, U. Kalwa, T. Kong, B. Guo, P. C. Gauger, D. Peters, K.-J. Yoon, Behavioral Monitoring Tool for Pig Farmers: Ear Tag Sensors, Machine Intelligence, and Technology Adoption Roadmap, Animals, 11(9), pp. 2665, 2021.

[34]. Mytelka, L.K. 2000. Local systems of innovation in a globalized world economy. Industry and Innovation 77(1): 15–32.

[35]. J.P. Jensen, A.Q. Beeman, Z.L. Njus et al. Movement and Motion of Soybean Cyst Nematode Heterodera glycines Populations and Individuals in Response to Abamectin. Phytopathology. 2018 Jul;108(7):885-891.

[36]. Whitmer, A., L. Ogden, J. Lawton, P. Sturner, P. M. Groffman, L. Schneider, D. Hart, B. Halpern, et al. 2010. The engaged university: providing a platform for research that transforms society. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 8: 314–321.