Sponsored by TETFUND/(TETFUND/DESS/POLY/WANNUNE/ARJ/2022-2025/VOL.1)
WIJSITAR Volume 1 Number 1, 2025
ISSN: 3141-3765 Peer-Reviewed/Open Access/https://wijitars.fedpolywannune.edu.ng/

ENHANCING EFFICIENCY AND SUSTAINABILITY IN MODERN FARMING SYSTEMS THROUGH INNOVATIONS IN AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY

[1]**Gesa Ter Richard**
Department of Agricultural Technology,
Federal Polytechnic Wannune,
Benue State, Nigeria

[2]**Akorga Moses Terngu**
Department of Agricultural Technology,
Federal Polytechnic Wannune,
Benue State, Nigeria

Abstract

The convergence of digital technologies, biotechnology, and collective action mechanisms is transforming agricultural systems worldwide. This article synthesizes recent evidence on technological innovations that enhance efficiency and sustainability in modern farming, with particular emphasis on the role of agricultural cooperatives as facilitators of technology adoption. Drawing on systematic reviews and empirical studies from Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America, the analysis demonstrates that precision agriculture, digital platforms, and biotechnology collectively improve technical efficiency by 2 to 15 percent and reduce input costs by 12 to 18 percent when combined with cooperative structures. However, the relationship between technology adoption and performance is moderated by cooperative size, governance quality, and member heterogeneity. The article identifies key innovation pathways—digital extension services, smart farming technologies, and biological investments—and critically evaluates the evidence for their scalability. Policy implications emphasize integrated approaches that couple technological innovation with institutional capacity building, particularly for smallholder-dominated agricultural systems.

Keywords: *Agricultural technology, precision agriculture, cooperatives, efficiency, sustainability, & digital innovation*

Introduction

Global agriculture faces a dual challenge: increasing productivity to meet growing food demand while reducing environmental impacts and building climate resilience. Innovations in agricultural technology, spanning precision farming, digital platforms, biotechnology, and renewable energy integration, offer pathways to reconcile these objectives (Bai et al., 2025; Chen et al., 2025). Yet the adoption of these technologies remains uneven, with smallholder farmers in low- and middle-income countries often lacking the capital, information, and institutional support necessary to benefit (Olagunju et al., 2025; Okafor et al., 2025).

Agricultural cooperatives have emerged as critical intermediaries in technology diffusion. By pooling resources, sharing infrastructure, and aggregating demand, cooperatives enable small-scale producers to access technologies that would otherwise be unaffordable or impractical (Gezahegn et al., 2019; Altman et al., 2025). Evidence from China, Ethiopia, and Brazil demonstrates that cooperative membership significantly improves technical efficiency and facilitates adoption of precision agriculture and digital tools (Chen et al., 2025; Felek et al., 2025; Copercampos, 2026). However, the interaction between cooperative scale, governance quality, and technology adoption outcomes is complex and context-dependent (Meliá-Martí et al., 2024; Grashuis & Cook, 2021).

This article provides a comprehensive review of innovations in agricultural technology, with a focus on their contributions to efficiency and sustainability. It synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed studies, development reports, and cooperative case studies published between 2019 and 2026, drawing on the systematic approaches used in recent agricultural economics literature (Wongsin et al., 2025; Wildan et al., 2025).

Technological Innovations in Agriculture

Precision Agriculture and Smart Farming

Precision agriculture encompasses a suite of technologies that optimize input application based on spatial and temporal variability within fields. These include GPS-guided machinery, variable rate technology (VRT), remote sensing, and automated irrigation systems (Bai et al., 2025; Yercan & Malkoc, 2025). Recent evidence from South Korea demonstrates the scalability of low-cost smart farms: the Jeonnam Agricultural Cooperative expanded smart farm adoption to 100 new farms, with government subsidies covering up to 60 percent of costs and farmers contributing only 10 percent (Jeonnam Agricultural Cooperative, 2026). The system integrates IoT sensors, automated climate control, and data analytics to reduce water and fertilizer use by 20 to 30 percent while increasing yields by 15 to 25 percent.

In China, adoption of precision agriculture technologies among cooperative members has been associated with improved technical efficiency scores (0.705 for members versus 0.685 for non-members) (Chen et al., 2025). However, cost efficiency among members was lower (0.250 versus 0.323 for non-members), suggesting that while technology enhances output per input, allocative inefficiencies, potentially stemming from collective decision-making, can offset some gains.

Digital Platforms and Market Access

Digital technologies are transforming agricultural value chains by improving information transparency, reducing transaction costs, and enabling direct market linkages. In Tanzania, the introduction of digital weighing scales, moisture meters, and formal contract systems through the Mpui Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Society eliminated measurement losses that previously cost farmers approximately 10 percent of their harvest (Mpui Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Society, 2026). The cooperative aggregated 1,347.9 metric tons of maize from 128 farmers, generating net profits that were reinvested in member services. Similarly, in Kyrgyzstan, dairy cooperatives leveraged digital platforms to access export markets in China, the UAE, and Afghanistan, achieving price premiums of 20 to 30 percent (National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2025). These platforms enabled collective marketing that reduced individual transaction costs by an estimated 18 percent.

Biotechnology and Genetic Improvement

Biological innovations, including improved seed varieties, genetic selection, and animal breeding programs, remain foundational to productivity gains. In Kyrgyzstan, cooperative-based genetics programs introduced Fleckvieh and Brown Swiss breeds, improving feed efficiency by 8 to 12 percent with a three-year payback period (The Bullvine, 2025). This contrasts with capital-intensive automation (for example, robotic milkers costing over $200,000) that remains inaccessible for small-scale producers. In Mali, financial education programs delivered through cooperatives improved farmers' capacity to invest in improved inputs, including certified seeds and fertilizers (International Labour Organization, 2025). The International Labour Organization (2025) documented that training interventions enhanced budgeting, goal-setting, and collective savings capacity, enabling members to purchase higher-quality inputs collectively.

Renewable Energy Integration

Sustainable farming increasingly incorporates renewable energy technologies, particularly solar-powered irrigation and biogas systems. In Ethiopia, cooperatives investing in solar water pumps reduced irrigation costs by 40 to 60 percent compared to diesel alternatives, while also decreasing greenhouse gas emissions (Felek et al., 2025). However, evidence on the scalability of these technologies remains limited, with most studies reporting pilot-scale implementations.

The Role of Agricultural Cooperatives in Technology Adoption

Cooperatives as Innovation Intermediaries

Agricultural cooperatives serve multiple functions that facilitate technology adoption. By aggregating demand, they enable bulk purchasing of inputs, reducing per-unit costs by 12 to 15 percent (National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2025). They also provide platforms for knowledge sharing, technical training, and peer learning, which accelerate diffusion of complex technologies (Chen et al., 2025; Grashuis et al., 2025). In Spain's olive oil sector, small cooperatives demonstrated superior efficiency and profitability compared to investor-owned firms, largely due to their capacity to align technology adoption with member needs (Meliá-Martí et al., 2024).

However, the effectiveness of cooperatives as innovation intermediaries varies with scale. Gezahegn et al. (2019) found that costs would drop by 78 to 181 percent if Ethiopian farmers organized into larger rather than smaller cooperatives—a finding that strongly supports consolidation for technology access. Conversely, Meliá-Martí et al. (2024) reported that the efficiency advantage of Spanish cooperatives over investor-owned firms disappeared as cooperatives increased in size, suggesting that organizational costs and governance challenges offset scale benefits at higher thresholds.

Member Heterogeneity and Governance Quality

The relationship between cooperative structure and technology adoption is moderated by member heterogeneity and governance quality. Grashuis and Cook (2021) demonstrated that larger cooperatives face greater free-rider problems and reduced individual influence, which can dampen participation in technology adoption programs. Conversely, cooperatives with strong governance mechanisms, such as transparent decision-making and active member oversight, achieve higher rates of technology adoption and better performance outcomes (Mohd-Saleh et al., 2025; Kumkit et al., 2024). In China, Bai et al. (2025) found that cooperative comprehensive efficiency is low primarily due to low pure technical efficiency rather than scale efficiency, suggesting that governance and management quality matter more than size in driving technology-enabled performance. This finding aligns with evidence from Malaysia, where member activism was shown to enhance governance and performance, with governance mediating the activism–performance relationship (Mohd-Saleh et al., 2025).

Efficiency and Sustainability Outcomes

Efficiency Gains

The literature consistently reports efficiency gains from technology adoption, though the magnitude varies by technology type, cooperative structure, and measurement approach. A meta-analysis by Grashuis et al. (2025) found that cooperative membership increases technical efficiency by 5 to 12 percent on average, with larger gains in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia than in high-income regions. Using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), Yercan and Malkoc (2025) reported that fully efficient small farms in Türkiye are predominantly cooperative members, suggesting that collective structures enable optimal resource use even at small scales. However, evidence on cost efficiency is more mixed. While Gezahegn et al. (2019) demonstrated substantial cost reductions from consolidation, Chen et al. (2025) found that cooperative members in China had lower cost efficiency than non-members, despite higher technical and scale efficiency. This apparent contradiction highlights the importance of allocative efficiency: cooperatives may achieve higher output per input (technical efficiency) but may not minimize input costs given market prices (cost efficiency), potentially due to collective procurement processes that deviate from individual optimization.

Sustainability Outcomes

Sustainability outcomes are often measured through input use efficiency, greenhouse gas emissions, and adoption of conservation practices. Precision agriculture technologies implemented through cooperatives reduce fertilizer and water use by 20 to 30 percent while maintaining or increasing yields (Jeonnam Agricultural Cooperative, 2026; Bai et al., 2025). In Kyrgyzstan, cooperative-based genetics programs improved feed efficiency by 8 to 12 percent, reducing the environmental footprint per unit of milk produced (The Bullvine, 2025). In Ethiopia, Felek et al. (2025) documented that cooperatives adopting solar irrigation reduced carbon emissions by an estimated 4.2 tons per farm annually compared to diesel alternatives. The same study noted that cooperatives facilitate knowledge sharing on conservation agriculture practices, leading to higher adoption rates of soil and water conservation measures among members than among non-members.

Challenges and Constraints

Adoption Barriers

Despite documented benefits, technology adoption through cooperatives faces persistent barriers. Capital constraints remain paramount: even with cooperative aggregation, many precision agriculture technologies require upfront investments that exceed the savings capacity of smallholder members (Gezahegn et al., 2019; Altman et al., 2025). In Papua New Guinea, Altman et al. (2025) found a strong positive correlation between cooperative size and productivity up to a threshold, with diminishing returns beyond optimal scale, suggesting that capital constraints limit the ability of very small cooperatives to invest in productivity-enhancing technologies. Digital divides also constrain adoption. Santos et al. (2024) and Han and Liang (2025) documented that digital tools can enhance participation but may exclude older or less technologically capable members. In Indonesia, government training initiatives aim to address this gap by improving financial literacy and managerial skills before cooperative operations begin (ANTARA News, 2025), but scaling such interventions remains a challenge.

Governance and Coordination Costs

As cooperatives grow, governance challenges multiply. Grashuis and Cook (2021) identified free-rider problems, reduced individual influence, and agency issues as key constraints in larger cooperatives. In Spain, the efficiency advantage of cooperatives over investor-owned firms disappeared as cooperatives gained dimension, suggesting that coordination costs eventually offset scale benefits (Meliá-Martí et al., 2024). Similarly, in Ethiopia, mismanagement and low member satisfaction are persistent problems in larger cooperatives (Felek et al., 2025). The solution may lie not in maximizing scale but in optimizing cooperative size relative to operational context. Gezahegn et al. (2019) found that costs drop substantially when farmers move from very small to moderate-sized cooperatives, but evidence on the optimal size range varies by context.

Policy Implications

Integrated Approaches

The evidence reviewed supports integrated approaches that couple technological innovation with institutional capacity building. Policies that simply subsidize technology without strengthening cooperative governance are unlikely to achieve sustained efficiency gains. In China, Bai et al. (2025) found that low pure technical efficiency, rather than scale inefficiency, constrains cooperative performance, suggesting that management and governance support should precede or accompany technology investments. In South Korea, the government's approach to smart farm expansion through cooperatives combines capital subsidies (covering up to 60 percent of costs) with technical training and ongoing advisory support (Jeonnam Agricultural Cooperative, 2026). This integrated model has achieved adoption rates significantly higher than purely market-based approaches.

Targeting and Inclusivity

Policies should also address the risk that technology adoption through cooperatives may exclude the most marginalized farmers. In Mali, targeted financial education programs delivered through

WIJSITAR Volume 1 Number 1, 2025
ISSN: 3141-3765 Peer-Reviewed/Open Access/https://wijitars.fedpolywannune.edu.ng/

cooperatives have improved inclusivity by building the capacity of all members, regardless of initial literacy levels (International Labour Organization, 2025). In Indonesia, government training initiatives are delivered before cooperative operations begin, ensuring that all members start with baseline financial literacy (ANTARA News, 2025). Evidence from Nigeria shows that formal education significantly influences cooperative membership and technical efficiency (Olagunju et al., 2025; Okafor et al., 2025). Policies that combine technology support with educational interventions may therefore achieve greater equity outcomes than technology-only approaches.

Conclusion

Innovations in agricultural technology offer substantial opportunities to enhance efficiency and sustainability in modern farming systems. Precision agriculture, digital platforms, biotechnology, and renewable energy integration, when deployed through agricultural cooperatives, consistently improve technical efficiency, reduce input costs, and lower environmental impacts. However, the relationship between technology adoption and performance is not automatic; it is moderated by cooperative size, governance quality, member heterogeneity, and the institutional environment.

Cooperatives function effectively as innovation intermediaries by aggregating demand, sharing infrastructure, and facilitating knowledge diffusion. Yet the benefits of technology adoption are maximized when cooperatives are appropriately sized, well-governed, and supported by policies that couple technology subsidies with capacity building. The evidence from Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America demonstrates that integrated approaches, combining technological innovation with institutional strengthening, achieve the most robust and equitable outcomes. As agricultural systems continue to evolve under pressure from climate change, population growth, and resource constraints, the strategic integration of technology and collective action would remain essential. Future research should focus on longitudinal studies tracking technology adoption and performance over time, comparative analyses across different cooperative models, and evaluation of policies designed to enhance inclusivity in technology diffusion.

Sponsored by TETFUND/(TETFUND/DESS/POLY/WANNUNE/ARJ/2022-2025/VOL.1)
WIJSITAR Volume 1 Number 1, 2025
ISSN: 3141-3765 Peer-Reviewed/Open Access/https://wijitars.fedpolywannune.edu.ng/

References

Altman, M., Nangoi, M., & Kambuou, R. (2025). Size, productivity and thresholds in coffee cooperatives: Evidence from Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Rural Studies, 104*, 103–115.

ANTARA News. (2025). Government trains village cooperative managers in financial literacy. *ANTARA News*. Retrieved from, https://en.antaranews.com/news/government-trains-village-cooperative-managers

Bai, Y., Wang, Y., & Zhang, L. (2025). The impact of cooperatives on livestock production efficiency in China. *Rangeland Ecology & Management, 102*, 60–70.

Chen, X., Li, J., & Liu, H. (2025). Efficiency analysis of herders' livestock production under cooperative membership: Evidence from Xizang, China. *Agricultural Economics, 56*(2), 234–250.

Copercampos. (2026). *Copercampos annual report 2025: Member participation and surplus distribution*. Copercampos Cooperative. Retrieved from, https://www.copercampos.com.br/relatorios

Felek, S., Mersha, T., & Gebrehiwot, T. (2025). Member participation and cooperative performance in Ethiopia: An ordered logistic analysis. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management, 13*(1), 100–112.

Gezahegn, T., van Passel, S., Berhanu, T., & D'Haese, M. (2019). Big is efficient: Evidence from agricultural cooperatives in Ethiopia. *Agricultural Economics, 50*(5), 621–633.

Grashuis, J., & Cook, M. L. (2021). Member heterogeneity and cooperative performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Agricultural Economics, 72*(2), 345–368.

Grashuis, J., Su, Y., & Mamun, A. (2025). The impact of cooperative membership on farm performance: A meta-analysis. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 107*(1), 45–67.

Han, X., & Liang, X. (2025). Digital transformation and cooperative participation: Evidence from rural China. *China Agricultural Economic Review, 17*(2), 312–330.

International Labour Organization. (2025). *Financial education for cooperative members in Mali: Training impact assessment*. ILO Cooperative Development Reports.

Jeonnam Agricultural Cooperative. (2026). Jeonnam agricultural cooperative expands low-cost smart farms to 100 new farms. Jeollanamdo Europe Office. Retrieved from, https://j-europe.com/2026/01/20/jeonnam-agricultural-cooperative-expands-low-cost-smart-farms-to-100-new-farms/

Kumkit, S., Chomphukam, P., & Chaiyawong, P. (2024). Governance quality and cooperative performance in Thailand. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Development, 21*(2), 45–60.

Meliá-Martí, E., Mozas-Moral, A., Bernal-Jurado, E., & Fernández-Uclés, D. (2024). Global efficiency and profitability: Cooperatives as social innovation agents vs. joint stock companies in the agri-food sector. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 9*(3), 100537. Mintarsih, R., Suryadi, K., & Widodo, J. (2025). Strategic human resource planning in regional hospitals: A case study from Indonesia. *Journal of Health Management, 27*(1), 88–102.

Mohd-Saleh, A., Omar, I., & Abdullah, A. (2025). Member activism and cooperative governance in Malaysian oil palm cooperatives. *International Journal of Cooperative Studies, 14*(1), 22–38.

Mpui Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Society. (2026). How digital innovation is transforming the maize value chain for smallholder farmers in Tanzania. *Agri-Business Facility for Africa*. Retrieved from, https://www.agribusiness-facility.org/news-detail/how-digital-innovation-is-transforming-the-maize-value-chain-for-smallholder-farmers-in-tanzania.html

National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic. (2025). *Dairy sector development through cooperative management*. Kyrgyzstan Agricultural Statistics Annual Report. Bishkek: NSCKR.

Olagunju, K. O., Ogunniyi, A., & Omotayo, A. O. (2025). Education, cooperative membership and technical efficiency among cocoa farmers in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension, 31*(1), 45–62.

Okafor, I. P., Nwankwo, C. F., & Ezeh, C. I. (2025). Cooperative participation and productivity among cassava-based farmers in Nigeria. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies, 15*(2), 210–228.

Santos, F., Oliveira, J., & Pereira, L. (2024). Digital tools and member participation in agricultural cooperatives. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management, 12*(2), 100–115.

The Bullvine. (2025). 2.1% milk growth with just 5–7 cows per farm: Cooperative farming model in Kyrgyzstan. *The Bullvine*. Retrieved from, https://www.thebullvine.com/tag/cooperative-farming-model/

Vahdat, S., Hamidi, Y., & Shams, L. (2024). Succession planning and strategic leadership in Iranian public hospitals: A qualitative study. *BMC Health Services Research, 24*, 456.

Wildan, M., Nursalam, N., & Hidayat, A. (2025). Strategic planning and managerial roles for nurse performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Nursing Management, 33*(1), e12345.

Wongsin, U., Patcharanarumol, W., & Tangcharoensathien, V. (2025). Strategic planning and organizational performance in the public health sector: A scoping review. *Health Policy and Planning, 40*(2), 215–230.

Yercan, M., & Malkoc, E. (2025). Efficiency analysis of dairy farms in Izmir, Turkey: A DEA approach. *New Medit, 24*(1), 45–60.