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Abstract
The purpose of this research was to identify the internal and external factors of MSMEs to map and formulate the right strategy required to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic in Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan, Kediri. This was qualitative and descriptive research and the snowball non-probability sampling method was used to collect primary data through questionnaires, in-depth interviews and focus group discussions (FGD). The data were analyzed using the SWOT analysis method. The results showed that these MSMEs’ strengths are associated with their quality soybeans, high processing capacity and production efficiency, labor skills and affordable product prices. Meanwhile, their weaknesses are their conventional marketing, business legality constraints, less desirable tofu products, lack of investors’ trust, poor productivity, easiness to imitate and deficient management systems. The opportunities for MSMEs have encouraged product peculiarities, tourism, proper waste management and educational support from universities in Kampoeng Tahu. Therefore, the deficit strategy W-T is more suitable for MSMEs in Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan. Its implementation aids MSMEs in avoiding and overcoming external threats associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.
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1. Introduction
Micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME) dominate the Indonesian business world, with more than 26 million businesses established in 2016. This is approximately 98.68% of the total non-agricultural enterprises [1]. These MSMEs play a very large role in Indonesia’s economy, as shown by their ability to absorb up to 97% of the workforce...
and contribute approximately 60% to the country’s GDP [2]. However, many MSMEs in Indonesia operate in a simple manner, thereby making them vulnerable to many obstacles, such as MSMEs’ production inefficiency, access to credit, survival rates, limited banking services, etc [3].

Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan is an educational tourism site formulated from the number of MSMEs tofu manufacturers in the area, thereby making it the center of the tofu industry. Previous research showed that these manufacturers act in accordance with the construction of MSMEs’ association and tourism executive [4]. Over the past few years, Kediri has experienced an increase in tourism activity, with the inception of many new tourist attraction sites. This has created an opportunity for tourists to visit the Tinalan area as a means of preserving the original culture of Kediri City. Generally, the tofu processing and marketing activities in Tinalan are classified conventional due to the creation of various obstacles and industrial competition, inside and outside the area [5].

The challenges repeatedly faced by MSMEs in Indonesia are divided into internal and external issues. The internal issues include lack of capital, limited human resources, frail networks, and compatibility of market penetration. Meanwhile, the external issues include a non-conducive business environment, limited business facilities, implementation of regional autonomy, low products’ lifespan, and limited market access [6]. Generally, the challenges and weaknesses of MSMEs in Indonesia include lack of access to productive resources, low-quality human resources, inadequate economies of scale for service provider institutions. This is because most MSMEs are micro-industry enterprises (MIE) with low productivity, high administrative and transaction costs, steep economic disparities, and greater competition in economic globalization and trade liberalization [7]. Therefore it is necessary to formulate a good strategy for the development of MSMEs.

The tourism industry before COVID-19 became a trend in society, with the placement of beautiful images on social media used to attract visitors to visit these destinations [8]. However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, almost the entire aspects were adversely and significantly affected, including production, marketing, finance, and support from stakeholders [9]. The MSMEs Educational Tourism “Kampoeng Tahu” Tinalan, Kediri City, was also affected by this pandemic. Therefore, this research determines the analysis of various internal and external factors responsible for the inherent problems of MSMEs in Indonesia and formulates competitive strategies to revitalize the sector.
2. Methodology

2.1. Sample and Research Data Collection

This research used the snowball nonprobability sampling technique, which means that the sample was selected based on recommendations from previous informants that provided adequate answers to questions. Data were obtained from a total of 32 MSMEs tofu producers in Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan, Kediri City, out of which 26 were valid. The data collection process was carried out through observation, in-depth interviews, distributing questionnaires, literature study, and FGD (Focus Group Discussion).

2.2. Data Analysis

The research used descriptive and qualitative analysis methods, with the researcher acting as an independent observer outside the environment. The observations made included financial situation, operational, marketing, and company activities of employees in the work process at MSMEs tofu production in Tinalan, Kediri City.

Several stages of this research used for the purpose of strategy formulation are as follows: (1) input, (2) matching, and (3) decision [10]. The input stage was used to identify the internal (IF) and external factors (EF) through questionnaires. The internal factors include views of the financial situation, human resources, operational, and marketing activities. Meanwhile, the external factors are views on government support, availability of suppliers, and related communities [11]. The matching stage prepares the SWOT matrix by analyzing the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of MSMEs. From these two matrices, the company environment's internal and external factors that strategically influence the development of MSMEs are identified. Tables 1 and 2 show the internal (main strengths and weaknesses in business) and external factors (economic, demographic, cultural, demographic, environmental, and competitive conditions) of MSMEs tofu producers in the Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan area. To develop a business, proper time, and planning of the internal and external factors are needed at various important stages [12]. After that, the factors of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats are analyzed to produce various compositions of the S-O, W-O, S-T, and W-T strategies.
### Table 1: S-W Internal Factors

| Strengths (S)                                                                 | Weaknesses (W)                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Comprises of PIRT number, Halal Certificate, and other supporting documents. | Lacks supporting documents for business feasibility.                         |
| 2. Skilled workforce that supports productivity.                             | Lacks workforce that supports productivity.                                   |
| 3. Good soybean quality and supports product quality.                        | Unsuitable soybeans quality which affected the products.                      |
| 4. Availability of raw materials with affordable prices.                     | Expensive prices of raw materials.                                            |
| 5. Production capacity can meet consumer needs on large scales.              | Production capacity does not meet consumer needs.                            |
| 6. Use of modern technology that supports production.                        | Still conventional production technology that is highly dependent on the performance of the tofu craftsmen. |
| 7. Production is carried out continuously.                                   | Constrained production and does not run continuously.                        |
| 8. Efficient production process.                                             | Inefficient production process.                                               |
| 9. Applied production quality assurance system as reference.                 | Lack of production quality assurance system.                                 |
| 10. Financial records are regularly and periodically performed.              | Financial records have not been properly performed.                          |
| 11. Massive promotion through social media or others mediums.                | Conventional promotion methods.                                               |
| 12. Reliable sales cooperation partner.                                      | Unreliable sales cooperation partner.                                         |
| 13. Modern, attractive packaging with logos and branding.                    | Unattractive packaging.                                                      |
| 14. Prices are relatively affordable for consumers.                          | Product prices are less accessible to all social levels.                      |
| 15. Products are varied and can be of interest to consumers.                 | Less-vary and less desirable products.                                        |
| 16. Wastes are processed into other derivative products.                     | Waste are not properly treated and disposed into the environment.            |
| 17. There is waste treatment process.                                        | Constrained waste handling that pollutes the environment.                    |

### 3. Result and Discussion

#### 3.1. Recapitulation of MSME Assessment and SWOT Analysis

##### 3.1.1. Internal Factor Assessment

Table 3 illustrates each respondent’s distribution and criteria, with the majority of respondents possessing dominant MSME strength in terms of human resources, production management, and marketing, as shown in Figure 1. This is clearly seen in several parameters with good criteria (score = 3), namely the majority of MSMEs supported by skilled workers (S2), availability of good quality tofu making raw materials (S3, S4),...
| Opportunities (O)                                                                 | Threats (T)                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 Numerous channels of quality soybean suppliers.                               | Difficulty in obtaining good quality soybeans products from suppliers.      |
| 2 The existence of Kampoeng Tahu Tourism attracts enthusiastic consumers and tourists. | Less impact on the existence of Kampoeng Tofu tourism for the sales of products. |
| 3 Excellent product that acts as unique food.                                   | Products are easy to imitate.                                               |
| 4 Wide market coverage.                                                          | Marketing coverage contributes less to product sales.                      |
| 5 Supports from related offices/ministries/institutions that support the productivity of MSMEs. | Interventions related to service/ministry/agency that hinders the productivity of MSMEs. |
| 6 Government regulations are in favor of MSMEs in Kampoeng Tahu.                | Government regulations hinder productivity and product sales.               |
| 7 Fund support from investors.                                                   | Lack of investor trust, or negligible investment.                           |
| 8 Intensive support for business development education and problem solutions from Universities. | Educational support from Universities has little impact without implementation. |
| 9 Local residents assisted by MSMEs development.                                 | Residents are busy in works and do not support MSMEs.                       |
| 10 Each MSMEs supports each other in terms of productivity                      | Competition among similar MSMEs in Kampoeng Tahu Educational Tourism        |
| 11 Good prospects of Kampoeng Tahu tourism, capable of empowering MSMEs         | Kampoeng Tahu tourism intervenes and hinders MSMEs and local residents.     |
| 12 Wastes are processed into alternative products.                               | Waste is a problem for local residents                                     |
| 13 The COVID-19 pandemic situation opens new opportunities for broader product marketing. | The CoVID 19 pandemic is a threat towards MSMEs’ productivity.             |

Table 2: O-T External Factors

relative production capacity to meet consumer demand (S5), a production process that can run continuously and more efficiently (S7, S8). The marketing and product aspects are also good in the marketing partnership aspect (S12), packaging (S13), and also prices that are quite affordable for all people (S14). Other parameters with sufficient value (score = 2) need to be improved to support the productivity of MSMEs, and this includes the use of technology in the tofu production process (S6), as well as processing waste which acts as alternative products that can be of interest to the community (S16).

Table 3 and Figure 1 show that the majority of MSMEs have significant weaknesses with dominant scores of 3 and 4. This is because they lack business legality (W1), quality assurance system (W9), management financial disadvantages (W10), and handling waste from the production process (W17). Another weakness parameter considered high (score = 3) by the majority of MSMEs is lack of product variation (W15) and improper handling of waste (W16).
**Table 3:** Tabulation of internal factors of S-W recapitulation assessment

| Score Parameters                          | Weaknesses (W) (%) | Strengths (S) (%) |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| (1) - SMEs’ Legality                    | 4 (50)             | 53.85             |
|                                          | 3 (30.77)          | 26.92             |
|                                          | 2 (15.38)          | 7.69              |
|                                          | 1 (3.85)           | 11.54             |
| (2) - Human Resources                    | 1 (53.85)          |                   |
|                                          | (30.77)            |                   |
|                                          | (65.38)            |                   |
|                                          | (3.85)             |                   |
| (3) - Quality of Raw Materials           | (15.38)            |                   |
|                                          | (65.38)            |                   |
|                                          | 0                  |                   |
| (4) - Availability of Raw Materials      | 0 (34.62)          |                   |
|                                          | (65.38)            |                   |
|                                          | 0                  |                   |
| (5) - Production Capacity                | 0.0 (3.85)         |                   |
|                                          | (46.15)            |                   |
|                                          | (23.08)            |                   |
| (6) - Production Technology             | (7.69)             |                   |
|                                          | (42.31)            |                   |
|                                          | (46.15)            |                   |
|                                          | (3.85)             |                   |
| (7) - Production Continuity             | (7.69)             |                   |
|                                          | (46.15)            |                   |
|                                          | (30.77)            |                   |
| (8) - Production Efficiency             | (23.08)            |                   |
|                                          | (3.85)             |                   |
|                                          | (65.38)            |                   |
| (9) - Quality Assurance System          | (61.54)            |                   |
|                                          | (26.92)            |                   |
|                                          | (11.54)            |                   |
| (10) - Financial Management             | (88.46)            |                   |
|                                          | (11.54)            |                   |
|                                          | 0                  |                   |
| (11) - Sales Promotion                  | (38.46)            |                   |
|                                          | (23.08)            |                   |
|                                          | (34.62)            |                   |
|                                          | (3.85)             |                   |
| (12) - Marketing Partnership            | (19.23)            |                   |
|                                          | (30.77)            |                   |
|                                          | (50)               |                   |
| (13) - Packaging                        | (30.77)            |                   |
|                                          | (11.54)            |                   |
|                                          | (50)               |                   |
| (14) - Price of Products                | (11.54)            |                   |
|                                          | (30.77)            |                   |
|                                          | (57.69)            |                   |
| (15) - Variation of Products            | (7.69)             |                   |
|                                          | (46.15)            |                   |
|                                          | (42.31)            |                   |
|                                          | (3.85)             |                   |
| (16) - Waste Processed Products         | (3.85)             |                   |
|                                          | (50)               |                   |
|                                          | (46.15)            |                   |
|                                          | 0                  |                   |
| (17) - Waste Production Handling        | (80.77)            |                   |
|                                          | (15.38)            |                   |
|                                          | (3.85)             |                   |
| Mean Score                               | (26.92)            |                   |
|                                          | (26.02)            |                   |
|                                          | (41.86)            |                   |
|                                          | (5.20)             | 25.11             |

Figure 2a shows that the majority of MSME respondents have strengths and weaknesses, which means that the tofu producers in the village know that their potential strengths still have weaknesses, which acts as an obstacle to the productivity and sustainability of the MSME business. In Figure 2b, it is clear that the dominant strength of MSMEs is in the aspects of human resources, production management, and product prices. This shows that the majority of MSMEs are supported by S2, S3, S4, S5, S7, S8, and S14. However, the value of the appraisal margin is still quite low (S-W margin ≤ 1), which means that the MSMEs tofu producers in the Kampoeng Tahu still have some weaknesses capable of hindering the productivity and sustainability of the MSMEs business. Therefore, there is a need for further development efforts to support the strengths and reduce the weaknesses of MSMEs, especially in the production sector.

On the other hand, the majority of MSMEs' weakness is dominant in W10, where the value of the assessment margin is high (W-S margin ≥ 2). Other weaknesses are dominancy in W1, W9 quality assurance system, promotion and sales of W11, and
Figure 1: Distribution of S-W MSMEs’ internal factors assessment

Figure 2: (a) The mean of accumulated MSMEs’ internal factor assessment (S-W); and (b) The margin of assessment for each parameter is based on the internal factors (S-W) for the Kampoeng Tahu MSMEs as a whole.

handling of waste from the W17 production process, with a high assessment margin (W-S margin ≥ 1). This reinforces the previous explanation that it is necessary to possess adequate knowledge and desire to develop MSMEs by strengthening business legality using completing supporting documents, compiling and implementing a quality assurance system in the production process and product control. This is also achieved by composing routine MSME financial books, improvising promotional and sales methods, as well as education and application of waste handling from the production process to avoid environmental pollution. Furthermore, a low rating margin (W-S margin ≤ 1) also needs to be considered in order to make it easier for MSMEs to overcome
problems associated with reaching an environmentally friendly and supporting market for business sustainability and productivity. The weaknesses with such low rating margins include W11, W12, W13, W15, and W16. In this case, there is a need for further efforts related to education and further development in the use of social media in marketing, establishing trustworthy and reliable sales cooperation relationships, and the use of designs and packages that are more attractive to consumers [14]. In addition, product improvisation in various variants is also needed to help attract consumer buying interest. The reuse of waste from production processes is also needed to help reduce environmental problems and increase the opinion of MSMEs.

3.1.2. External Factor Assessment

Table 4 illustrates the distribution of the criteria value of each respondent in Figure 3. The majority of MSME respondents play a dominant role in the aspects of the raw material supply network, market control, government and university support, and prospects for the formation of Kampoeng Tahu tourism. This can be seen clearly in several parameters with good criteria (score = 3), namely the majority of MSMEs which are supported by many quality soybean supply channels (O1), the existence of Kampoeng Tahu tourism, which helps to attract enthusiastic consumers and tourists (O2), the product becomes a superior and distinctive, (O3), wide market coverage (O4), support from government agencies and regulations (O5, O6), educational support for business development, product innovation, and problem solutions from the University (O8), and the formation of Kampoeng Tahu Tourism which is considered to have good prospects and help empower MSMEs (O11). Table 4 and Figure 3 also show that the majority of MSMEs have significant threat (score dominance = 4) on inverse support (T7), with competition between similar MSMEs (T9), and waste pollution in the environment (T13). Besides that, another significant threat (dominance score = 3) also exists in the implementation of education results from universities by MSMEs (T8), less citizen involvement (T9), and the COVID-19 pandemic situation is a threat to the productivity of MSMEs (T13).

Figure 4a shows that the majority of MSME respondents have both opportunities and threats in the same aspects. This means that the tofu MSMES producers in the village are aware that their potential opportunities have a threat gap acts as an obstacle to productivity and the sustainability of the MSME business. The high chances of MSMEs (O-T margin ≥ 1) are dominant in O1 and O11, as shown in Figure 4b. This aspect needs to be maintained and improved to ensure that this opportunity supports the
Table 4: Tabulasi rekap penilaian faktor-faktor eksternal O-T

| Score Parameters                          | Threads (T) (%) | Opportunities (O) (%) |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| (1) - Supplier Network                   | 0 (11.54)       | 0 34.62 (61.54)      |
| (2) - Consumer Interest                  | (3.85) (46.15)  | 0 38.46 (50)         |
| (3) - Product Distinctiveness            | (38.46) (42.31) | 0 34.62 (19.23)      |
| (4) - Market Coverage                    | (19.23) (46.15) | 0 26.92 (34.62)      |
| (5) - Official Support                   | (15.38) (73.08) | 0 30.77 (11.54)      |
| (6) - Government Regulation              | 0 (23.08)       | 0 50 (61.54)         |
| (7) - Investor Support                   | (69.23) (26.92) | 0 69.23 (3.85)       |
| (8) - Education by University            | (7.69) (65.38)  | 0 11.54 (23.08)      |
| (9) - Citizen Support                    | (3.85) (61.54)  | 0 3.85 (34.62)       |
| (10) - Cooperation between SMEs          | (50) (30.77)    | 0 26.92 (11.54)      |
| (11) - Prospect of Kampoeng Tahu         | 0 (34.62)       | 0 7.69 (19.23)       |
| (12) - Waste Processed Products          | (61.54) (15.38) | 0 42.31 (23.08)      |
| (13) - COVID-19 Pandemic Situation       | (23.08) (50)    | 0 53.85 (19.23)      |
| Mean Score                               | (21.30) (33.43) | 0 20.41 (35.50)      |

Figure 3: The distribution of the assessment of O-T's internal factors for MSMEs.

Productivity and sustainability of MSME businesses in Kampoeng Tahu. In addition, there is a probability that the MSMEs (O-T margin ≤ 1) are in categories of O2, O5, O6, and O8. Although this margin value is lower, this opportunity can be utilized and developed to support MSMEs for the development, and use of Kampoeng Tahu Tourism for product promotion, forging closer relationships with the government and related agencies to develop Tour Kampoeng Tahu and MSMEs. This also establishes closer relationships.
with universities as MSME companions in order to obtain education and applications related to business development, product innovation, and solutions to problems.

However, on the other hand, the majority of MSMEs tend to significantly threaten T7, with a high assessment margin value (margin T-O ≥ (2)). Another big threat that haunts MSMEs (margin T-O ≥ (1)) is in the aspects of T10, T12, and T13. This shows that the MSMEs in the Kampoeng Tahu has not won investors’ trust in investing more in the tofu producer of MSMEs. In Kampoeng Tahu there is still great competition between MSMEs, even from the results of interviews from several respondents as indications that others need to drop the image and trust of consumers. Environmental pollution is also a serious problem, considering that tofu waste is acidic with a pH of 2-3, corrosive, and dangerous to health [14]. The COVID-19 pandemic situation also had an impact on the sales of MSME products, due to the drastic decrease in market interest. Another threat is a low valuation margin (margin T-O ≤ (1)), which needs to be considered in order to make it easier for MSMEs to solve problems, such as those associated with the wider market. The low margin threats include T3, T4, and T9. Therefore, it is necessary to have further efforts to educate and develop the use of social media in the marketing and development of product variants that are more attractive to consumers. Furthermore, it is also important to collaborate with local residents for the support and existence of wider market penetration. These factors need to be considered to support MSMEs and tofu producers in Kampoeng Tahu to be more developed, supportive, and productive.
3.2. Overall SWOT Analysis

The overall factors of weakness and threat are more dominant by MSMEs as respondents. This is because the assessment on the internal factor of weakness is greater than the strength, with the reverse experienced in the external factor. Figure 5a shows that 92% of the respondents rated the internal factors of strength with the criteria being less-to-strong and ranging from values 1-3. Furthermore, 95% of the respondents rated the internal factor from moderate-to-very weak in the range values of 2-4. On one of the external factors, namely opportunity, 95% of the respondents rated it as less-to-opportunities in ranges of 1-3. Meanwhile, for external factors of threat, 90% of the respondents rated it from moderate-to-very threatening in ranges of 2-4.

In Figure 5b, a mapping of the overall condition of the tofu producers in the Kampoeng Tahu is presented based on the SWOT analysis results. The mapping shows that the conditions of tofu producers in the Kampoeng Tahu are in quadrant III, namely the WT deficit strategy, because the area of the right triangle area of the WT factor is higher than others. (III) W-T = 3.60; (IV) S-T = 3.17; (II) W-O = 3.12; (I) S-O = 2.74, respectively). This mapping shows that the deficit strategy is more appropriate to be applied to tofu producers by minimizing internal weaknesses to avoid and overcome external threats. To minimize weaknesses, MSMEs need to compile regular financial bookkeeping (W10), strengthen business legality (W1), implement a quality assurance system in the production process and product control (W9), improvise promotional and sales methods (W11), as well as educate and apply waste handling from the production process to avoid polluting the environment (W17). Furthermore, to anticipate external
threats, MSMEs need to make further efforts to gain the investors’ trust (T7), carry out more harmonious and synergic cooperation (T10), educate and apply the hazardous waste treatment (T12), and apply new marketing methods during a pandemic such as COVID-19 (T13).

4. Conclusions

In conclusion, the MSMEs tofu producers in Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan comprise high, efficient, and continuous production capacity and affordable product prices. However, there are weaknesses associated with the operation of these MSMEs in the aspects of financial management, business legality, quality assurance systems, promotion and sales, and waste management. Irrespective of these weaknesses, the tofu producers in Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan have good opportunities in quality soybean supplier channels, good tourism prospects, obtain support from the government and related agencies, with educational assistance from the University. The evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic also overshadowed the MSMEs, with a lack of investor confidence, unhealthy competition, environmental pollution, thereby hampering productivity and sustainability. Therefore, the deficit strategy (W-T) is more suitable for tofu producers in Kampoeng Tahu Tinalan, where this strategy is implemented by minimizing the internal weaknesses of MSMEs to avoid and overcome external threats. Furthermore, the implementation of this strategy also needs to pay attention to various aspects of particular concern to be followed up, which refers to a structured study of all aspects through this preliminary SWOT analysis.
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