

A Strategy of Organic Farming Technology Adoption at the Boyolali Organic Farming Association

Malik Cahyadin^{1,6}, Emi Widiyanti^{2,6*}, Yayan Suherlan^{3,6}, Raden Kunto Adi^{4,6}, Rendi Fathoni Hadi^{5,6}, Bakti Wahyu Utami^{2,6}

¹ Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

² Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

³ Department of Art, Faculty of Fine Arts and Design, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

⁴ Department of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

⁵ Department of Animal Nutrition and Feed Science, Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

⁶PSP-KUMKM LPPM Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author : emiwidiyanti@staff.uns.ac.id

Submitted: 20-07-2026; Accepted: 21-09-2026

ABSTRACT

The role of technology in the development of organic farming can be considered from the perspective of the entire process, from upstream to downstream. It is therefore significant to develop a technology adoption strategy for the Boyolali Organic Farming Association (APOB). Therefore, the objective of this activity is to assess the internal and external aspects of technology adoption strategy in APOB. The technology adoption strategy was formulated using the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) method, classified into internal factor evaluation (IFE) and external factor evaluation (EFE). The number of respondents was 15 APOB administrators and farmer members. The gender distributions of the respondents were 10 male participants (66.67%) and 5 female participants (33.33%). The findings reveal that the IFE scores prior to and following the training were 3.90 and 4.12, respectively. The mean difference in IFE scores was 0.22. Concurrently, the EFE scores prior to and following the training were 4.53 and 4.72, respectively. The mean difference in EFE scores was 0.19. A technology adoption strategy in both the pre- and post-training phases is diversification (S-T Strategy). The scores for the strategy in both the pre- and post-training were 4.67 and 4.82, respectively. The mean difference in strategy scores was 0.15. The implications of APOB's activities include the strengthening of internal organisational pressures and risk management for the challenges of business development and competition. Furthermore, APOB is in a position to diversify its range of organic products and target markets in Java Island.

Keywords: diversification, EFE, IFE, training

INTRODUCTION

The practice of organic farming has emerged as a strategy for developing a sustainable agricultural sector. The concept of sustainable agriculture signifies a novel paradigm that encompasses the integration of economic, social, and ecological interests (Hammada, 2024). It places significant emphasis on the sustainability of natural resources, the maintenance of ecosystem balance, and the

promotion of the social and economic well-being of farmers. The notion of sustainable agriculture is predicated on the vision of sustainable development that was articulated at the World Conference on the Environment in Stockholm, Sweden, from June 5-6, 1972 (Lullulangi et al., 2020). The notion of sustainable agriculture can be realised through the practice of organic farming.

The implementation of sustainable farming methods, such as organic farming,

mitigates the adverse environmental impacts by curtailing the utilisation of synthetic chemicals within agricultural practices. The potential of organic farming systems to enhance the quality of agricultural products and ensure consumer health is a subject of considerable interest.

The development of organic farming is contingent upon the integration of technological systems from upstream to downstream processes. The implementation of technologies such as transplanters, organic fertiliser and pesticide technology, biochar technology, and modern harvesting tools has the potential to enhance farm efficiency and productivity. The post-harvest and downstream stages of production can be supported by the implementation of packaging technology, which plays a role in increasing added value and enhancing the distinctiveness of the organic product.

The integration of technology within organic farming has the potential to enhance marketing opportunities through various channels, including healthy food labels, organic certification, agro-educational tourism, and e-commerce for agricultural products (Febriyanti, 2026). The marketing of organic products can be supported by digital-based marketing through e-commerce, which opens up opportunities for broad market access and increases product competitiveness. The utilisation of technology in business management can be exemplified by the implementation of bookkeeping applications and farming systems. These technological solutions have the capacity to facilitate effective and accountable farming processes.

Technological developments in organic farming are readily available, yet the level of technology adoption in organic rice farming in some regions remains relatively low. To illustrate this point, consider the technological challenges encountered by organic rice farmers in Banyuasin Regency. A prevailing perception among these farmers is that technological innovations in organic rice farming offer minimal benefits (Setiono et al., 2024). Another obstacle to technology adoption among organic rice farmers in Damarwulan Village, Kepung District, Kediri Regency is their lack of understanding of the use of cultivation technology (Setiono et al., 2024). Literature reveals a paucity of research into the barriers to the adoption of organic farming technology by Indonesian organic rice farmers. The extant studies identify a number of obstacles including:

a paucity of access to information; a deficiency in digital and technical literacy among farmers; high technology costs; inadequate extension services and weak policy coordination and institutional support (Hidayati et al., 2025).

Moreover, the Boyolali Organic Farmers Association (APOB) is an organisation that functions as a platform for dialogue and exchange among farmers and organic farming businesses in Boyolali Regency. APOB plays a strategic role in the development of organic rice, including institutional strengthening, farmer capacity building, and market development. APOB has collaborated with Rikolto in implementing the Sustainable Rice Platform (SRP) program. The challenges faced by APOB in adopting organic farming technology are twofold. Firstly, there is a limited supply of resources. Secondly, there is diverse characteristics of its members present a significant obstacle. In order to surmount these challenges, a suitable strategy is required to encourage the acceptance and utilisation of technology by APOB member farmers. It is anticipated that this strategy will enhance the competitiveness of organic rice in a sustainable manner.

The various challenges encountered by farmers growing organic rice in adopting new technology illustrate the notion that the acceptance of technology is influenced not only by the presence of innovations but also by farmers' perceptions of the technology. Within the paradigm of organic farming, the technologies associated with cultivation, post-harvest processing, and marketing are frequently perceived as intricate, expensive, and failing to offer direct benefits to farmers (Virianita et al., 2019). This condition is a contributing factor to the relatively low level of technology adoption in organic rice farming in various regions. Consequently, a theoretical approach is required to comprehensively explain farmers' behaviour in accepting and utilising organic farming technology.

The objective of this activity is to identify and assess internal and external aspects of technology adoption strategy in the Boyolali Organic Farming Association. In addition, the contribution of this activity can be articulated in several ways. Firstly, this activity identifies and measures the technology adoption strategy for organic farming businesses both before and after training on the use of rice filters and online marketing. Secondly, the findings of this activity

can be applied by the Boyolali Organic Farming Association (APOB) in order to strengthen technology adoption.

The technology acceptance and utilisation by organic rice farmers can be analyzed using the technology acceptance model (TAM) approach. The TAM model comprises two primary constructs cover the concepts of perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness are discussed in this text. The concept of perceived ease of use pertains to the extent to which farmers hold the conviction that organic farming technology is readily comprehensible and manageable. Conversely, perceived usefulness is defined as farmers' belief that the technology can enhance agricultural performance, specifically in terms of productivity, cost efficiency, and the quality of organic rice produced.

TAM posits that technology acceptance is determined by two key factors consist of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. The propensity to adopt organic farming technology is hypothesised to increase in cases where the technology is perceived as providing tangible benefits and is deemed to be easily implementable within farmers' existing farming conditions. Conversely, if the technology is perceived as complicated, risky, and not providing significant benefits, farmers tend to be reluctant to adopt it. This is pertinent to a range of empirical findings demonstrating that negative perceptions of technology act as a significant impediment to the advancement of organic farming ([Ningsih et al., 2025](#)).

Furthermore, the adoption technology factors under TAM framework were split into internal and external factors. Those factors can be analysed using SWOT method ([Rangkuti, 2001](#)). The condition means that the internal and external factors of adoption strategy for APOB are derived by considering TAM, while the analyze process of those factors use SWOT method.

METHOD

Data, Sample and Instrument

This community service activity utilises primary data from 15 APOB administrators and farmer members. They are the respondents of this activity. The respondents were selected by considering their active participation in the adoption training programme for organic rice business technology. Besides, they were selected

by considering the recommendation of the Head of APOB. In particular, the training period was conducted in October 2025. The condition means that the primary data were collected during October.

Primary data was obtained through interviews using indicators on the following aspects cover strengths (S), weaknesses (W), opportunities (O), and threats (T). These aspects are collectively referred to as SWOT analysis. The indicators under scrutiny were formulated on the basis of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) concept and previous literature. The following references are provided for further reading consist of ([Febrianda, 2021](#); [Massresha et al., 2021](#); [Mishra et al., 2024](#); [Antwi et al., 2025](#)).

Furthermore, each SWOT aspect is associated with a series of indicator formulations. The number of indicator formulations for the strengths (S), weaknesses (W), opportunities (O), and threats (T) aspects are six, seven, six, and five, respectively. Consequently, the total number of indicators is 24. The indicators are attached.

The SWOT Technique

The formulation of a strategy for the adoption of organic farming technology involves the utilisation of the SWOT method. Conceptually, [Rangkuti \(2001\)](#) developed this method through the utilisation of internal factor evaluation (IFE) and external factor evaluation (EFE) measurements.

The following steps are to be taken in order to measure IFE and EFE:

1. Identify internal and external factors

The preliminary phase in the creation of the IFE and EFE matrices is the identification of internal indicators (strengths and weaknesses) and external indicators (opportunities and threats) of the APOB organic farming business. Each indicator was assessed by respondents using the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat agree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, and 6 = strongly agree.

2. Determination of weight

The significance of each identified indicator, both internal and external, is then assigned a weighting, based on the importance attached to it. The weight is indicative of the extent to which the

indicator impacts the organisation's performance or the success of the strategy being formulated. The numerical values assigned to these weights range from 0.00 to 1.00, with the sum of all weights equaling 1.00.

3. Determination of rating

Subsequent to the determination of the weights, each internal and external indicator is assigned a rating. Ratings are assigned on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. A score of 5 is indicative of very strong, a score of 4 indicates strong, a score of 3 indicates average, a score of 2 indicates weak, and a score of 1 indicates very weak.

4. Assessment of weighted scores

The weighted score is derived by multiplying the weight by the rating assigned to each internal and external indicator. The weighted score is indicative of the contribution of each indicator to the organisation's internal and external conditions. The total score for the IFE and EFE matrices is then obtained by summing all weighted scores. For example, an indicator of strength has a weight value is about 0.08 and rating is about 4. The condition means that the score of the indicator is about 0.34.

5. Interpretation of IFE-EFE matrices

As the fundamental basis for determining APOB organic farming technology adoption strategies, the scores derived from the IEF and EFE matrix are of seminal importance. The ranking of these strategies is determined by their combined IFE and EFE scores, with the most effective strategies occupying the highest positions.

Independent Organic Agriculture Certification Center (LesSOS) Mojokerto, East Java Province. The primary business of APOB is not only rice production, but also a focus on the development of alternative products, including peanuts, mung beans, and soybeans. The rice processing capacity is 20 tons per harvest. The rice produced is categorised into two distinct types: white rice and brown rice. The price of rice is determined by its quality and is typically sold at a range between IDR 20,000 and IDR 23,000 per kilogram.

A total of 15 APOB administrators and members have participated in training on the adoption of rice filter technology and e-commerce. The respondents were categorised by gender as follows: The demographic composition of the sample is as follows: 10 men (66.67%) and 5 women (33.33%). The subjects were distributed across several age groups: 3 people aged 20-40 (20.00%), 10 people aged 41-60 (66.67%), and 2 people aged >60 (13.33%).

Technology Adoption Training

In October 2025, APOB administrators and members underwent training on the adoption of production technology (rice filters) and online marketing (e-commerce). The training programme was administered on three occasions: Weeks I, II, and IV. The training programme was designed to enhance the quality of organic rice products through the utilisation of filtering tools. In addition, the company was introduced to several e-commerce platforms with a view to expanding its marketing reach and market share.



Figure 1. The training activity

The delivery of rice filter components to APOB administrators is depicted at [Figure 1](#). The components in question consist of a fan and

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Profile of APOB and Respondent

The Boyolali Organic Farmers Association (APOB) is a cooperative of organic rice producers located at Bentokan RT 04/1, Dusun 1, Gombang, Sawit District, Boyolali Regency, Central Java Province. It was established in 2011. The APOB comprises 1,842 farmers operating within the Boyolali Regency area. In 2015, the APOB received organic certification, signifying a significant milestone in the realm of sustainable agriculture. Besides, the SNI (Indonesian National Standard) certificate for organic rice was issued by the

several magnet units. The device has been demonstrated to enhance the quality of organic rice by ensuring a clean and hygienic product.

The subsequent activity in this activity is concerned with the identification and measurement of technology adoption strategies, both prior to and following the training. This condition is achieved by providing a description and measurement of internal and external business factors as a reference in strategy formulation.

Result of IFE

The calculation of internal factors is contingent on a number of indicators of strengths (S) and weaknesses (W), otherwise referred to as IFE. The results of the IFE prior to the commencement of the training programme are presented in [Table 1](#). As demonstrated in the table, the total score for the strength's aspect is 2.25, whereas the weakness's aspect has a total score of 1.65. The difference between the two is 0.6 (strengths > weaknesses). Consequently, the total IFE score is 3.90.

Table 1. Results of IFE before the training activity

Strength (S)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
S1	62	0.08	4	0.34
S2	68	0.09	5	0.41
S3	72	0.10	5	0.46
S4	62	0.08	4	0.34
S5	65	0.09	4	0.38
S6	59	0.08	4	0.31
Total	388	0.52		2.25
Weakness (W)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
W1	51	0,07	3	0,23
W2	54	0,07	4	0,26
W3	47	0,06	3	0,20
W4	47	0,06	3	0,20
W5	53	0,07	4	0,25
W6	48	0,06	3	0,21
W7	58	0,08	4	0,30
Total	358	0,48		1,65
Total IFE	746	1,00		3,90

Source: Primer data (processes)

Note: The indicators can be traced at Appendix 1.

Furthermore, the total IFE score post-training was also calculated (see [Table 2](#)). The

objective of this study was to identify and measure the difference in IFE scores before and after the training. The table indicates that the strengths aspect score was 2.42. This score exhibited a marginal increase compared to the pre-training value, with a difference of 0.17. This finding suggests that the adoption of technology training is associated with an enhancement in the perceived strengths aspect of the assessment.

Following the administration of the training programme, the post-training score for the weakness's aspect was 1.70. This figure was slightly higher than the pre-training score, with a difference of 0.05. The aggregate of the strengths and weaknesses resulted in a post-training IFE score of 4.12, which is comparatively higher than the pre-training score, with a difference of 0.22.

Table 2. Results of IFE after the training activity

Strength (S)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
S1	63	0.08	4	0.33
S2	78	0.10	5	0.51
S3	84	0.11	5	0.53
S4	65	0.08	4	0.36
S5	65	0.08	4	0.36
S6	62	0.08	4	0.32
Total	417	0.53		2.42
Weakness (W)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
W1	53	0.07	4	0.24
W2	57	0.07	4	0.27
W3	48	0.06	3	0.19
W4	47	0.06	3	0.19
W5	56	0.07	4	0.206
W6	48	0.06	3	0.109
W7	64	0.08	4	0.305
Total	373	0.47		1.700
Total IFE	790	1.00		4.102

Source: Primer data (processes)

Note: The indicators can be traced at Appendix 1.

Result of EFE

The activity under scrutiny computed EFE scores both prior to and following the technology adoption training. Prior to the training, the opportunity (O) and threat (T) scores were 2.11 and 2.42, respectively (see [Table 3](#)). The mean difference between the two scores was 0.31. Consequently, the total EFE score was 4.53.

Table 3. Results of EFE before training activity

Opportunity (O)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
O1	67	0.09	4	0.41
O2	75	0.10	5	0.51
O3	63	0.09	4	0.36
O4	52	0.07	3	0.25
O5	63	0.09	4	0.36
O6	50	0.07	3	0.23
Total	370	0.50		2.11
Threat (T)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
T1	73	0.10	5	0.48
T2	75	0.10	5	0.51
T3	67	0.09	4	0.41
T4	69	0.09	5	0.43
T5	80	0.11	5	0.58
Total	364	0.50		2.42
Total EFE	734	1.00		4.53

Source: Primary data (processes)

Note: The indicators can be traced at Appendix 1.

In the following section, the results of the EFE score subsequent to the technology adoption training are elucidated in Table 4. The table illustrates that the EFE score was 4.72. This score demonstrates a marked improvement over the EFE score prior to the training intervention, with a significant difference of 0.19. Furthermore, the EFE score following the training was distributed between the opportunity aspect (2.32) and the challenge aspect (2.40).

Table 4. Results of EFE after training activity

Opportunity (O)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
O1	72	0.09	5	0.44
O2	82	0.10	5	0.57
O3	67	0.09	4	0.38
O4	56	0.07	4	0.27
O5	70	0.09	5	0.42
O6	54	0.07	4	0.25
Total	401	0.51		2.32
Threat (T)	Value	Weight	Rating	Score
T1	79	0.10	5	0.53
T2	84	0.11	5	0.53
T3	67	0.09	4	0.38
T4	69	0.09	5	0.40
T5	86	0.11	5	0.55
Total	385	0.49		2.40

Total EFE	786	1.00	4.72
-----------	-----	------	------

Source: Primary data (processes)

Note: The indicators can be traced at Appendix 1.

The Strategy Matrices

The calculation of IFE and EFE scores prior to the technology adoption training enables the subsequent determination of a strategy formulation score. As demonstrated in Table 5, the highest possible score for the technology adoption strategy formulation was 4.67, which corresponds to a diversification strategy.

Table 5. Results of the strategic formulation before training activity

IFE/EFE	Strength	Weakness
		Strategy (W-O)
	Strategy (S-O) =	= 1.65+2.11 =
Opportunity	2.25+2.11 = 4.36	2.76
	Strategy (S-T) =	Strategy (W-T)
	2.25+2.42 = 4.67	= 1.65+2.42
Threat	(Diversification)	=4.07

Source: Primary data (processed)

Table 6 illustrates the strategy formulation score subsequent to technology adoption training. The mean score obtained was 4.82, which was marginally higher than the score prior to the training intervention. The technology adoption strategy was diversified.

Table 6. Results of the strategic formulation after training activity

IFE/EFE	Strength	Weakness
		Strategy (W-O)
	Strategy (S-O) =	= 1.70+2.32 =
Opportunity	2.42+2.32 = 4.74	4.02
	Strategy (S-T) =	Strategy (W-T)
	2.42+2.40 = 4.82	= 1.70+2.40 =
Threat	(Diversification)	4.10

Source: Primary data (processed)

The results pertaining to the strategy formulation score calculations are set out in Table 5. These calculations may be continued by calculating the normalized strategy score, the details of which may be found in Table 7. The highest normalized strategy score result is 29% for the S-T (diversification) strategy.

Table 7. Results of the strategic normalization before training activity

IFE/EFE	Strength	Weakness
Opportunity	Strategy (S-O) = 4.36/15.86 = 0.28 or 28%	Strategy (W-O) = 2.76/15.86 = 0.17 or 17%
Threat	Strategy (S-T) = 4.67/15.86 = 0.29 or 29% (Diversification)	Strategy (W-T) = 4.07/15.86 = 0.26 or 26%

Source: Primary data (processed)

Table 8. Results of the strategic normalization after training activity

IFE/EFE	Strength	Weakness
Opportunity	Strategy (S-O) = 4.74/17.68 = 0.268 or 26.8%	Strategy (W-O) = 4.02/17.68 = 0.225 or 22.7%
Threat	Strategy (S-T) = 4.82/17.68 = 0.272 or 27.2% (Diversification)	Strategy (W-T) = 4.10/17.63 = 0.233 or 23.3%

Source: Primary data (processed)

Moreover, as demonstrated in [Table 8](#), the strategy score results presented in [Table 6](#) can be calculated as a normalized strategy score. The mean value of the normalized score is 27.2% for the S-T (diversification) strategy combination. This finding is comparatively lower in relation to the normalized score prior to the training period. However, the distribution of normalized scores between strategy combinations in [Table 8](#) appears to be more balanced in comparison to [Table 7](#).

Discussion

The outcomes of this activity indicate that APOB's suitable technology adoption strategy was the diversification of its portfolio. APOB has the capacity to fortify and enhance the organisation's strengths, while concurrently addressing both existing and prospective external risks. This strategy has the potential to generate opportunities for business development and target market identification in the future.

As posited by [Febrianda \(2021\)](#), the integration of technology can prove advantageous in the context of sustainable agricultural transformation. The adoption of simple technology can be facilitated by online applications that provide information on production (planting) and post-harvest processing. Moreover, technological adoption

has been demonstrated to have a positive impact on farmers' welfare, as evidenced by increased spending on nutrition, clothing, and health ([Adams & Jumpah, 2021](#)). Furthermore, the researchers found that the adoption of agricultural technology by farmers can be determined by a number of factors, including their geographical location, age, level of education, and membership of farmer groups. The impact of technology adoption on farmer welfare was also found by [Ernawatiningsih et al., \(2024\)](#) in Tabanan, Bali. In particular, the researchers asserted that the effectiveness with which agricultural technology is adopted has a moderating effect on the impact on farmer welfare.

The development of technology and its impact on the adoption of organic farming practices are significant factors in the establishment of a diversification strategy for this sector. Furthermore, the findings reveal that several challenges encountered by the technology adoption process from the external perspective of the organisation align with the challenge indicators analysed in this activity.

Furthermore, [Antwi et al. \(2025\)](#) posit several positive impacts of technology implementation in agricultural businesses, including increased productivity, income, and attracting the interest of the younger generation. The identification of key factors influencing the adoption of agricultural technology was also a key finding, with the research highlighting expanded services, collaborative support, capital, education, and agricultural area size as the primary drivers. Moreover, technological adoption in China has exhibited cost efficiency and accelerated business processes ([Li et al., 2024](#)). Besides, the study identified several positive impacts of agricultural technology adoption, including increased organic fertilizer purchases, improved community access to organic materials, and enhanced ecological literacy.

The adoption of technology has been demonstrated to have a positive impact on the increased production, productivity and sustainability of agricultural businesses ([Irfansyah et al., 2024](#)). This situation suggests the hypothesis that technological evolution and integration can generate prospects for the augmentation of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices, particularly within the domain of organic farming ([Li et al., 2025](#)). The utilisation of this technology constitutes an

integral component within the broader framework of agricultural business innovation.

Mishra et al., (2024) have expanded the understanding of agricultural business transformation within the Agriculture 5.0 framework. This framework delineates digital technologies that have been demonstrated to enhance the efficiency and profitability of agricultural businesses. A congruent standpoint is expressed by Ong et al., (2022), though without reference to the Agriculture 5.0 framework. The adoption of agricultural technology was emphasised, with the Technology Adoption Journey Map (TAJM), the Diffusion of Innovation (DOI) theory, and the Customer Journey Map (CJM) serving as the theoretical underpinnings.

CONCLUSION

This activity identified and measured the internal and external aspects of APOB organic farming technology adoption. The culmination of this process was the formulation of a technology adoption strategy. The internal aspect (IFE) comprised 13 indicators, while the external aspect (EFE) consisted of 11 indicators. Specifically, the TAM perspective provided the theoretical foundation for the study.

The findings indicated that IFE and EFE scores following the training exhibited a tendency to be marginally elevated in comparison to the scores prior to the training. In addition, the pre-training technology adoption strategy score and the normalized strategy score were found to be 4.67 and 29%, respectively. The score for the post-training technology adoption strategy was found to be 4.82, whereas the normalized strategy score was 27.2%.

This activity sets several implications. First, the APOB should concern on the business diversification. The diversification can consider the specific indicators of strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat. The diversification can be manifested in product and marketing diversification. Second, the next community empowerment activity pays more attention on the assessment of readiness and inclusion levels of technology adoption in cooperative association.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their gratitude to LPPM UNS for the financial support

provided through the UNS PKM Grant with Contract Number 370/UN27.22/PT.01.03/2025.

REFERENCES

- Adams, A., & Jumpah, E. T. (2021). Agricultural Technologies Adoption and Smallholder Farmers' Welfare: Evidence from Northern Ghana. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2021.2006905>
- Antwi, D. K., Gyamera, E., & Abdulshakur, M. (2025). The Adoption of Agriculture Technology in Small-Scale Farming in The Adumasa Community in Ghana. *Journal of Educational Technology and Learning Creativity*, 3(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.37251/jetlc.v3i1.1618>
- Ernawatiningsih, N. P. L., Budhi, M. K. S., Marhaeni, A. A. N., & Yuliarmi, N. N. (2024). The Effect of Agricultural Technology on Improving Farming Business Performance and the Welfare: Evidence from the Welfare of Rice Farmers in Tabanan Regency. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 12(4), 2357–2364. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.uscm.2024.5.031>
- Febrianda, R. (2021). Mobile App Technology Adoption in Indonesia's Agricultural Sector: An Analysis of Empirical View From Public R&D Agency. *STI Policy and Management Journal*, 6(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.14203/STIPM.2021.302>
- Febriyanti, F. D. (2026). Pemberdayaan Petani Melalui Penerapan Teknologi Pertanian Organik Ramah Lingkungan. *Jurnal Pengabdian Nusantara*, 1(1), 15–21.
- Hammada, M. A. S. (2024). Tantangan Pertanian Berkelanjutan di Indonesia: Suatu Tinjauan Lingkungan Hidup. *Jurnal Ekologi, Masyarakat dan Sains*, 5(2), 228–240. <https://doi.org/10.55448/8d0vdt32>
- Hidayati, A., Usman, A., Siddik, M., Ayu, C., Kasia, M. M., Mardiana, & Septiadi, D. (2025). Penguatan Kapasitas Petani melalui Penyuluhan Pupuk Organik Padat dalam Mendukung Pertanian Berkelanjutan di Desa Mertak Kabupaten Lombok Tengah. *Jurnal Pengabdian Magister Pendidikan IPA*, 8(3), 866–873. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jpmipi.v8i3.10307>
- Irfansyah, M., Wildayana, E., & Yamin, M. (2024). Pengaruh Adopsi Teknologi

- Budidaya Padi terhadap Produktivitas Padi di Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Social Economic of Agriculture*, 13(2), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jsea.v13i2.89225>
- Li, L., Han, J., & Zhu, Y. (2024). Empowering Sustainability: How Digital Agricultural Extensions Influence Organic Fertilizer Choices Among Chinese Farmers. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.123340>
- Li, Q., Mizuki, A., & Imoto, T. (2025). Understanding Japanese Rice Farmers' Preferences for Adopting Organic Agricultural System and Uptaking Innovative Machinery Using Best-Worst Scaling Method. *Smart Agricultural Technology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atech.2025.100863>
- Lullulangi, M., Arfandi, A., Hamzah, Kalengkongan, M. J., Aris, Salahuddin, M., & Pali, O. (2020). *Pembelajaran Lingkungan Hidup yang Kreatif dan Inovatif*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Negeri Makassar. <https://eprints.unm.ac.id/19038/1/BUKU LENGKAP FIX.pdf>
- Massresha, S. E., Lema, T. Z., Neway, M. M., & Degu, W. A. (2021). Perception and Determinants of Agricultural Technology Adoption in North Shoa Zone, Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 9(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2021.1956774>
- Mishra, N., Bhandari, N., Maraseni, T., Devkota, N., Khanal, G., Bhusal, B., Basyal, D. K., Paudel, U. R., & Danuwar, R. K. (2024). Technology in Farming: Unleashing Farmers' Behavioral Intention for the Adoption of Agriculture 5.0. *PLOS ONE*, 19(8). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0308883>
- Ningsih, N., Sobana, N. T. S., Dasipah, E., & Samantha, Y. (2025). Pengaruh Penerapan Teknologi Pertanian Organik Terhadap Efisiensi Penggunaan Input Produksi dan Efisiensi Usahatani Padi Organik (Kasus Pada Petani di Kecamatan Rawamerta, Kabupaten Karawang, Provinsi Jawa Barat). *OrchidAgri*, 5(1), 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.35138/orchidagri.v5i1.932>
- Ong, J. W., Rahim, M. F. A., Lim, W., & Nizat, M. N. M. (2022). Agricultural Technology Adoption as a Journey: Proposing the Technology Adoption Journey Map. *International Journal of Technology*, 13(5), 1090–1096. <https://doi.org/10.14716/ijtech.v13i5.5863>
- Rangkuti, F. (2001). *Analisis SWOT: Teknik Membedah Kasus Bisnis*. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Setiono, P., Sidhi, E. Y., Pamujiati, A. D., & Arissaryadin. (2024). Kendala Petani Padi Dalam Menerapkan Sistem Padi Organik (Studi Kasus: Desa Damarwulan Kecamatan Kepung Kabupaten Kediri). *JINTAN: Jurnal Ilmiah Pertanian Nasional*, 4(1), 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.30737/jintan.v4i1.5323>
- Virianita, R., Soedewo, T., Amanah, S., & Fatchiya, A. (2019). Persepsi Petani terhadap Dukungan Pemerintah dalam Penerapan Sistem Pertanian Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Ilmu Pertanian Indonesia*, 24(2), 168–177. <https://doi.org/10.18343/jipi.24.2.168>

Appendix 1

Indicators of IFE and EFE

Strenghts (S): 1. It is evident that young association administrators and members exhibit proficiency in technology adaptation, adoption, and responsiveness. (S1) 2. The integration of technology within the production process has been demonstrated to engender cost and time savings. (S2) 3. The integration of technological solutions into marketing endeavours has been demonstrated to facilitate market expansion and enhance efficiency. (S3) 4. The integration of technology within financial reporting has been demonstrated to enhance financial governance. (S4) 5. The integration of technological advancements within the domain of product packaging has been demonstrated to engender a number of notable benefits (branding and sales). (S5) 6. The adoption of technological solutions has been demonstrated to enhance business competitiveness and product performance. (S6)	Weaknesses (W): 1. The association lacks the necessary financial resources to optimise the digitalisation process of the business. (W1) 2. The management's digital literacy and inclusivity are suboptimal. (W2) 3. It is evident that the association has not been able to guarantee the optimum level of data security. (W3) 4. Digital marketing through e-commerce platforms has been found to be inadequate. (W4) 5. The utilisation of organic fertiliser production technology is suboptimal. (W5) 6. The utilisation of business financial reporting technology is suboptimal. (W6) 7. The utilisation of product packaging technology is suboptimal. (W7)
Opportunities (O): 1. The demand for organic food products is relatively high. (O1) 2. Marketing through social media and e-commerce has become pervasive. (O2) 3. The adoption of organic fertiliser production technology is readily facilitated. (O3) 4. There is an increasing body of evidence to suggest that local governments and universities are becoming increasingly supportive of this initiative. (O4) 5. The integration of technology in financial transactions has become pervasive and efficient. (O5) 6. There is growing public and farmer awareness of organic products. (O6)	Threats (T): 1. There is relatively a lot of competition among organic food producers. (T1) 2. Production costs have increased slightly due to limited availability of affordable organic fertilizers. (T2) 3. Organic food products are not yet widely sought after by children and the younger generation. (T3) 4. Climate change and plant pests can affect the quality and yield of organic food crops. (T4) 5. Local organic food products are not yet able to compete in the international market. (T5)