Journal of Economics and Business Letters
E-ISSN 2686-6056
P-ISSN 2798-8651
https://doi.org/10.55942/jebl.v5i4.854

Volume 5
Issue 4
August Edition 2025

Credit control and interest-income reliability in a community microfinance cooperative: Evidence from a *kelurahan* - level PMK case

Ari Puryani

Master of Management, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Kusuma Negara, Jl. Raya Bogor KM No.24 Pasar Rebo, RT.3/RW.4, Cijantung, Jakarta Timur, Jakarta 13770, Indonesia
e-mail: ari@stiekusumanegara.ac.id

Received 16 June 2025
Revised 26 July 2025
Accepted 06 August 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines how credit control disciplines—process conformance, authorization limits, collection oversight, and accounting recognition—shape the stability of interest income in a kelurahan-level microfinance cooperative (Koperasi PMK). Using a descriptive–analytic, quantitative design with secondary financial statements, the analysis connects the cooperative's Standard Operating Procedures (Institutional and Education SOPs) to the full credit cycle (origination, appraisal, approval, disbursement, collection, remedial) and to recognition policies for performing and non-performing loans. Findings indicate a consistent execution gap: although approval hierarchies, 5C/7C screening, and periodic reviews are formally specified, field-intensive collections and limited information systems delay risk classification and accrual suspension. The absence of a dedicated accrued-interest ledger (PYMAD) and incomplete off-balance-sheet treatment for NPLs create a bias toward overstated interest income during stress, followed by reversals. The study argues that hardening execution—not redesigning policy—yields the highest payoff: enforce status-based recognition (accrual for performing, cash basis for deteriorated), stand up PYMAD and provisioning by collectibility bucket, implement maker–checker and daily receipt–ledger reconciliations in collections, and institutionalize monthly early-warning reviews under board and supervisory oversight. These steps trade short-term reported income for durable, decision-useful interest earnings, aligning sustainability with the cooperative's outreach mandate.

Keywords: microfinance cooperative, credit control, interest income, accrual suspension, non-performing loans.

1. INTRODUCTION

Koperasi Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Kelurahan (PMK) is a community-based microfinance cooperative designed to expand financial access for low-income, neighborhood-level members. As with any financial intermediation entity, its viability depends on institutional clarity and disciplined operations. Two Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are pivotal to that discipline: the Institutional SOP and the Education (Member Development) SOP. The Institutional SOP sets out governance arrangements, roles, workflow, authorization lines, and membership rules. The Education SOP structures member learning via group-based activities that build financial capability, self-reliance, and social capital across individuals, groups, and their surrounding communities. In practice, these two SOPs must function as an integrated control system that guides planning, organizing, actuating, and monitoring-evaluation across the cooperative's credit cycle (application, appraisal, approval, disbursement, collection, and remedial) to protect portfolio quality and ensure mission delivery.

This operational imperative sits within a clear legal framework. The Indonesian Constitution (UUD 1945) Article 33 anchors the cooperative's identity as a people-centered enterprise. The core cooperative statute (Law No. 25, 1992) codifies cooperative identity, capital, and supervision; Government Regulation No. 9/1995 details the conduct of savings-and-loans business by cooperatives; a ministerial decree (Kepmen Koperasi dan UKM No. 91/Kep/M.KUKM/IX/2004) provides guidance for Sharia financial cooperative operations; and Jakarta's Pergub No. 96/2008 regulates revolving funds for community economic empowerment. Together, these instruments define permissible activities, member primacy, and prudential norms that make SOP compliance not merely good practice but a regulatory expectation (Law 25, 1992; PP 9, 1995; Kepmen 91, 2004; Pergub DKI 96, 2008)

From a financial management standpoint, the cooperative's "main business" is intermediation: transforming members' savings and revolving funds into loans that generate interest income. Sustained interest income depends on two tightly linked levers: (1) effective credit control that prevents and cures arrears/non-performing loans (NPLs), and (2) judicious pricing that covers funding, operating, and risk costs without undermining outreach. The literature is clear that poor credit risk management erodes profitability through higher impairment losses and collection costs; conversely, stronger control systems improve financial performance by stabilizing the portfolio at risk (PAR) and NPLs (Fakhrunnas, 2022; Churchill, 2020).

Microfinance pricing and portfolio quality are structurally intertwined. MFIs and credit cooperatives face higher per-dollar operating costs than banks (small loan sizes, intensive monitoring), pushing up sustainable interest rates unless process efficiency improves (Uddin, 2024). Dynamic panel evidence across 897 MFIs in 106 countries shows long-term MFI interest rates move with anticipated loan loss rates, profitability, inflation, and current short-term rates (Rauf et al., 2022). These studies underscore the operational reality confronting PMK cooperatives: if credit control falters and loss expectations rise, pricing must adjust or margins compress—either way, sustainability is at risk (Rauf et al., 2022; Uddin, 2024).

At the same time, cooperatives must balance sustainability with mission. A robust body of research documents the tension (and conditional complementarities) between financial performance and social outreach in microfinance—often described as the "trade-off" debate (Cull et al., 2007; Churchill, 2020). While breadth of outreach can coexist with sustainability, deep outreach (serving poorer members with smaller loans and higher risk/monitoring costs) is frequently associated with tighter margins unless efficiency and credit discipline improve (Cull et al., 2007; Churchill, 2020). For PMK cooperatives, this means that disciplined SOPs—especially around underwriting, authorization, education, and collection—are not bureaucratic overhead but the mechanism that enables pro-poor lending to remain viable.

SOPs matter because they formalize the "how" of risk management—who does what, when, with what evidence, and subject to which checks. Empirical studies from Indonesia's public and private sectors consistently associate SOP quality and adherence with better performance and service consistency, as well as clearer accountability for results (The Effectiveness of SOPs in Government Services, 2019; Nazara, 2024). In a cooperative credit context, this linkage translates into more reliable screening,

verification, and approval; cleaner documentation and authorization trails; timelier collection; and more standardized remedial actions—all of which compress loss given default and reduce repeat delinquencies.

The urgency of this study is therefore practical and immediate. Cooperatives at the kelurahan level operate with thin operating margins and limited buffers; even modest increases in delinquency can materially reduce monthly interest income, destabilize cash flow for withdrawals, and undermine trust among members. Indonesian evidence shows NPL dynamics have macro- and micro-drivers; when risk management weakens, profitability deteriorates (Fakhrunnas, 2022). Recent Indonesian studies focused on MFIs and small banks similarly highlight the centrality of credit risk management to financial performance, especially during periods of stress (Atichasari et al., 2023). In cooperatives, where governance relies on member oversight and local social ties, formal SOPs combined with systematic member education are the frontline instruments for managing this risk.

Within this overall landscape, the Koperasi Lembaga Keuangan Mikro Kelurahan Kramat Jati provides a policy-relevant case. As a community-anchored savings-and-loans cooperative, it must comply with PP 9/1995 for credit operations, observe the ministerial guidance for cooperative financial services (including Sharia variants where relevant), and align local revolving-fund governance with the Jakarta provincial regulations. The cooperative's institutional SOP defines its governance and authorization (who can approve what and under which thresholds), while the education SOP defines structured member learning to strengthen repayment norms and credit use. If these SOPs function as intended, the cooperative should experience (a) lower delinquency/NPLs due to better screening and monitoring, and (b) more resilient interest income due to stabilized effective yields and reduced impairment. Conversely, SOP gaps—unclear roles, weak authorization, poor documentation, inconsistent education, lax collection—should manifest as higher NPLs and lower net interest income after provisions.

Against that backdrop, this study narrows the problem to what matters most for financial sustainability: how credit control affects interest income. From your diagnostic questions, three control points are critical. First, conformance of the credit process to standards: do screening, appraisal, and documentation follow the cooperative's SOP and applicable regulations? Second, quality of approval authorization: are credit decisions made by the right officers at the right limits with adequate segregation of duties? Third, effectiveness of remedial procedures: when arrears emerge, are remedial steps timely, graduated, and documented (e.g., reminders, restructuring criteria, collateral execution where applicable), and do they improve cure rates? These controls map directly to classic credit-risk pathways that determine expected loss (probability of default × exposure at default × loss given default) and, by extension, net interest income after impairment (Churchill, 2020; Rauf et al., 2022).

Finally, this study is urgent because small, community-level cooperatives have limited shock absorbers. A short spell of rising delinquencies can quickly impair monthly interest income and member withdrawals, creating negative feedback loops of distrust and further arrears. In cooperative finance—where members are both owners and clients—the reputational and liquidity consequences of weak credit control are amplified. By focusing tightly on the Kramat Jati case, the study aims to generate actionable diagnostics: where SOP adherence is strong/weak, whether authorization controls are binding, whether education efforts are improving repayment norms, and how these control points show up in the cooperative's interest-income line. This tight link from SOP → credit discipline → NPL/interest-income resilience is the practical core that makes the inquiry both academically relevant and managerially urgent (Rauf et al., 2022; Fakhrunnas, 2022; Atichasari et al., 2023).

2. METHOD

The descriptive component portrays the state of credit procedures, authorization, and remedial practices; the analytic–quantitative component tests the hypothesized association between credit control and interest income. Descriptive methods depict or analyze research results without extending to broader inferential generalizations (Sugiyono, 2010). The quantitative approach rests on positivist logic, employs instruments to collect data from a defined population/sample, and applies statistical techniques to test hypotheses (Sugiyono, 2010). The study's associative hypothesis posits that stronger credit control is

associated with higher interest income, while weaker control is associated with lower interest income (Sugiyono, 2010; Sarwono, 2006).

2.1 Variables and Operationalization

Two variables are specified. The independent variable (X) is "credit control" and, consistent with the file, is proxied via a profitability indicator—net profit margin (NPM)—as part of financial performance, reflecting the cooperative's ability to convert revenue into profit after accounting for credit processes and associated risks. The dependent variable (Y) is interest income from credit, operationalized as the average change in interest income before and after the issuance of audited financial statements. The operational table frames X as profitability (profit margin ratio) and Y as reported interest income at the close of the audited period, both on ratio scales. While using profitability as a proxy for credit control is an indirect measure, it aligns with the study's practical intent to capture the effect of credit discipline on the cooperative's income generation capacity.

2.2 Population, Sampling Frame, and Criteria

The population is the PMK cooperative itself (as the case), with observations drawn from its audited annual accounts. Population is defined as the generalization region comprising objects/subjects with specified characteristics to be studied for conclusions (Sugiyono, 2010). Given the focused context and the limited number of eligible financial statements, the study employs non-probability, purposive sampling—a technique that selects units based on pre-set criteria (Sugiyono, 2010). Inclusion criteria are: (i) registered cooperative; (ii) audited annual financial statements for 2009–2011; (iii) consistent reporting as of 31 December each year; (iv) no confounding corporate events (e.g., fundamental group changes) during the observation window; and (v) distribution of surplus (SHU) in 2009–2011. These criteria ensure measurement consistency and mitigate structural breaks that could bias estimates.

2.3 Data Sources and Collection

The study relies on secondary data—specifically, the balance sheet and income statement lines pertinent to interest income and profit margin. Fieldwork consists of documentation methods (collection and verification of financial records). A library research step assembles theoretical and methodological references to benchmark constructs, indicators, and statistical procedures. This combination is appropriate to the study's confirmatory aim and data availability (documentation suited to audited statements; literature to anchor constructs).

2.4 Analytical Strategy and Statistical Tests

Analysis proceeds in two linked stages: (1) Descriptive analytics to summarize the variables (levels and movements in interest income; profit margin as proxy for credit control), supported by tabular presentation and narrative interpretation; (2) Inferential analytics using simple linear regression and Pearson's product–moment correlation to test the associative hypothesis between X and Y.

Simple linear regression estimates the linear relationship Y = a + bX where Y is interest income and X is the credit-control proxy (profit margin). Parameters a and b are estimated with standard formulas, and the sign and magnitude of b indicate direction and strength of association (Sarwono, 2006). Pearson's correlation (r) measures the degree of linear association between X and Y, bounded in $[-1, +1]$, with interpretive bands from very low to very strong. The coefficient of determination (KD = $r^2 \times 100\%$) quantifies the share of variance in interest income explained by the proxy of credit control. Where relevant, descriptive and inferential outputs are presented in tables accompanied by interpretive discussion (Sugiyono, 2009).

2.5 Hypothesis Testing and Interpretation

The null hypothesis (H_0) states that effective credit control increases interest income as reflected in the cooperative's statements; the alternative (H_a) expects decreases in interest income when credit control is weak. Statistical decisions are based on estimated regression coefficients, correlation magnitude, and r^2, interpreted against conventional thresholds. Findings are read in light of the cooperative's SOP-governed credit process (screening, authorization, collection, remedial), acknowledging that, while profitability is an indirect proxy for credit control, audited interest-income lines provide a robust dependent measure for the cooperative's core intermediation function (Sarwono, 2006)

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The cooperative's business model is straightforward and demanding: it transforms member savings and program funds into short-tenor loans priced on a flat monthly rate, with interest income recognized systematically, and credit quality maintained through delegated approvals, standardized documentation, and periodic reviews. In practice, this model performed as expected when institutional discipline held, but it also exposed several control points where execution gaps translated directly into stress on the interest-income line and on the credibility of reported results. What follows integrates the operative policies, observed practices, and their accounting consequences into a single causal narrative, tying each link of the chain—origination, authorization, monitoring, collection, recognition, and remedial action—to the cooperative's ability to sustain interest income over time.

At origination, the cooperative relies on a tiered decision architecture. Approval authority is delegated in writing; each credit must carry a written memorandum that identifies the authorized officer and states the maximum decision limit. The approving officer is explicitly responsible for ensuring that the loan aligns with cooperative policy, rests on honest and careful appraisal, and is likely to be repaid on time. Even with lean staffing, the organization attempts to keep the approval function distinct from day-to-day operations to preserve the separation of duties that prevents error and misconduct (especially where a single manager might otherwise dominate the process). Screening itself follows recognized principles—nine credit principles in the guideline set—operationalized through 5C/7C analysis and, where appropriate, a feasibility study. In short: the design is conservative and text-book sound.

The pricing framework complements that process. Lending rates are constructed from a base lending rate augmented by a risk premium; the base is reviewed regularly and is built up from cost of funds, overhead, and a profit margin. The risk premium component flexes with borrower quality, collateral sufficiency, and loan purpose. In principle, such pricing embeds a feedback loop from risk assessment to revenue, ensuring that higher expected loss is compensated by higher yield and that shifts in funding or operating costs are passed into the rate. Operationally, this means the cooperative should be able to preserve its interest margin so long as its risk assessment is timely and its classification rules are enforced.

On recognition, policy again looks robust. Performing loans are to recognize interest on an accrual basis once the first month of loan life has elapsed, with accrued interest posted to the asset side as "pendapatan yang masih akan diterima" (PYMAD) and released to profit and loss as cash is received. When a borrower's status deteriorates below "special mention," accruals should stop and recognition should switch to cash basis. Non-performing loans (NPLs) should be removed from the balance sheet and tracked as off-balance-sheet commitments, with a restructuring program applied where feasible. This architecture is precisely what insulates the interest-income line from optimistic accounting in the face of rising risk.

However, the files reveal that practice diverged from policy in precisely the areas that matter for interest-income stability. The key warning is unequivocal: the short balance sheet reviewed by the author shows no PYMAD account, and off-balance-sheet treatment for NPLs has not been implemented. The author therefore concludes that the cooperative's reported interest income carries an "over-statement" bias, because accruals appear to be recognized (or not reversed) without the corresponding asset-side

control account and without a reliable switch to cash-basis recognition upon collectibility downgrades. This single accounting breach is not a technical footnote; it is the transmission channel through which weak credit control flows into fragile or inflated interest-income figures and, ultimately, into an unstable surplus.

Why did this gap open? Two operational realities, documented in the text, raise the probability of delayed detection and misclassification. First, the cooperative's collection model leans heavily on a field-intensive "jemput bola" approach that depends on payroll treasurers and unit managers. The system is efficient for outreach, but it is explicitly described as "rawan terhadap penyimpangan" (prone to irregularities) unless special controls and tighter job descriptions for collectors and analysts are enforced. Second, information and IT constraints limit timely access to borrower performance data and slow analytical review. The combination of manual field collection and slow data weakens early-warning capabilities, making it more likely that accrual suspension lags the borrower's actual deterioration. That lag is enough to generate apparent interest growth in the short run while setting up future reversals or write-offs that compress the cooperative's surplus later.

The product menu and documentation flow, while simple, also create room for slippage if controls are not applied uniformly. In addition to working-capital loans, the cooperative offers consumer credit and a "special" lump-sum product. Applications require standard identity, family, and income documentation, and credits syndicated with a partner bank add another layer of authorization and a formal loan contract. In principle, this multi-step chain—application, internal approval, external approval (where applicable), and contract signing—should reduce origination risk. In practice, the effectiveness of this chain depends on consistent enforcement of delegation limits and on an audit trail that links collector actions, cash/receipt flows, and ledger postings back to each authorization. Where staffing is thin and multiple roles accumulate on a single person, the control environment can look strong on paper but remain brittle in day-to-day operations.

A structural feature of the balance sheet magnifies all of these risks: receivables dominate the asset base. The cooperative openly acknowledges that accounts receivable are its largest asset class—unsurprising for an entity built around savings-and-loans. To reduce default risk on these receivables, management cooperates with the local government office's payroll treasurer for member deductions, an institutional arrangement designed to stabilize collection. The logic is sound, but its success depends on governance over hand-offs, reconciliation of receipts to ledgers, and independent verification when exceptions arise. The heavier the receivable concentration, the more any classification or recognition delay flows straight into the interest-income line.

At the organizational level, the cooperative's compliance with cooperative law reinforces the formal scaffolding for control. The governance structure—member meeting (rapat anggota), board (pengurus), supervisory body (pengawas), and manager—mirrors statutory expectations, and the documented duties emphasize financial oversight, authorization discipline, asset safeguarding, and regular reporting. The supervisory body is empowered to examine records and obtain necessary information, while the manager is tasked with maintaining solvency and liquidity, coordinating operations, and authorizing disbursements within limits. In principle, this design supplies both ex-ante control (clear delegation, policy alignment) and ex-post assurance (independent oversight and reporting). The persistent accounting and collection frictions therefore point not to the absence of structure, but to the need for tighter execution and monitoring within that structure.

Bringing these threads together, the results support a set of clear causal statements about how control quality drives interest income:

First, margin preservation hinges on timely classification. The pricing algorithm—base rate plus risk premium—only protects the margin if risk grades and collectibility statuses are accurate now, not months later. The files state that collectibility assessment is a shared responsibility of branch heads, credit analysts, and collectors and must be performed "secara konsekuen" and reviewed periodically. Where information is limited and the collection model is manual, that cadence weakens; risk grades lag reality; accrual suspension is delayed; and the apparent interest trajectory becomes flatter or rising precisely when

the cash engine is faltering. Correcting this timing—through more frequent status reviews and hard stops on accrual—is the single most powerful lever for stabilizing the interest-income line.

Second, separation of duties is not optional in a lean team. The documents are explicit that, even with limited human resources, the approval and decision function must be separated across process stages "agar tercermin pemisahan fungsi" to detect both intentional and unintentional irregularities. In real-world conditions—where one manager can accumulate oversight, origination, and authorization—this separation can collapse. When it does, two things happen: (i) screening quality degrades (loans that should have been priced higher or declined are approved), and (ii) exceptions proliferate in documentation and ledger posting. Both raise expected loss and, unless immediately captured in provisions and suspended accruals, both contaminate the interest-income line with optimism.

Third, the field-collection model must be paired with hard controls. The "jemput bola" approach increases convenience and can lift outreach, but the text describes it as a control hotspot that needs "pengendalian khusus" over collectors and analysts. Minimal viable reinforcements include maker–checker at cash hand-off, serialized receipts reconciled daily to ledger entries, and a weekly arrears dashboard by collector and product. These steps cost little and specifically target the leakage points that convert operational friction into interest-income volatility.

Fourth, accounting recognition is the transmission channel—fix it and much else will follow. The files explain the correct treatment—accrual into PYMAD for performing accounts, cash-basis for deteriorated ones, off-balance presentation for NPLs—then document that PYMAD is absent and off-balance treatment not applied. The direct implication is that reported interest income is overstated in periods when risk builds. Instituting the missing ledgers, enforcing status-based recognition, and back-casting the portfolio under the correct rules would reduce reported income in the short term but would also halt the cycle of future write-backs that flatten or reverse results. Stability, not short-run maximization, is the optimal target for member trust and cooperative solvency.

Fifth, governance is already aligned—what is needed is measurement and follow-through. The roles and duties spelled out for member meetings, the board, supervisors, and the manager provide the right venues to institutionalize these corrections. Supervisors can mandate a cadence for collectibility reviews and require a monthly reconciliation between receipt serials, bank statements, and ledger postings. Management can implement decision-limit logs and exception registers for any approval outside standard policy, with quarterly reporting to members. These routines convert structural "rights" into operational "checks," closing the execution gap that the documents repeatedly note.

From an outcomes perspective, the narrative explains why reported surplus thinned despite apparently steady pricing and continued member demand. Rising operating frictions, manual collection costs, and classification/recognition lags squeeze the spread between set rates and realized interest. Because receivables dominate assets, even small deteriorations in cure rates or small delays in accrual suspension scale into material effects on monthly income. When those effects are not immediately recognized via PYMAD control and cash-basis rules, they present as healthy interest accruals now and as painful adjustments later. The files' caution about "over-statement" is therefore a statement about timing: recognition that is too optimistic in period t becomes the drag in period t+1.

The member side of the story reinforces both the opportunity and the risk. The savings function is active; contributions are systematically deducted through the payroll channel; and the credit product is highly valued by members for immediate household and working-capital needs. This is the cooperative's comparative advantage and its social mandate. But precisely because demand is strong, governance must assume that the portfolio will continue to be large relative to cash and fixed assets. That receivable intensity requires an equally intense discipline on authorization, collection, and recognition. Otherwise, the cooperative risks turning its greatest asset into its greatest vulnerability.

What, then, does the evidence imply for the research questions? On process conformance, the cooperative's credit process adheres to policy in design—documented requirements, clear delegation, and principle-based analysis—but exhibits execution weaknesses stemming from field-collection dependency and limited information systems. On authorization discipline, written limits and memorandum requirements are in place, yet lean staffing can blur separations, calling for stronger logs, exception

reports, and independent reviews. On remedial actions, the framework exists (periodic review, restructuring), but the accounting presentation for deteriorated loans is incomplete, reducing the visibility of risk and delaying corrective measures. And on the impact of credit control on interest income, the accounting narrative is decisive: where control and recognition are strict, interest income is smaller but durable; where they are weak, interest income may look larger for a while but becomes volatile and prone to reversal. These findings substantiate the central hypothesis that more effective credit control leads, not merely to higher reported interest, but to more reliable interest-income generation that sustains the cooperative's mission over time.

In closing, it is worth stressing that none of the recommended adjustments require wholesale redesign. The policies are largely right. The task is to harden execution: (i) enforce status-based recognition with full PYMAD and off-balance-sheet NPL treatment; (ii) install simple but strict maker–checker and reconciliation routines around the field-collection flow; (iii) formalize monthly collectibility reviews with immediate accrual suspension rules; and (iv) embed decision-limit logs and exception tracking under board and supervisor oversight. These four steps target the exact seams where operational reality has been leaking into accounting optimism. Repair those seams, and the cooperative's interest-income line will become less dramatic but more truthful—exactly what members and managers need to plan, price, and grow responsibly.

Bottom line: the evidence shows a coherent mechanism from SOP design to portfolio behavior to accounting outcomes. When delegation, documentation, collection control, and recognition disciplines work in concert, interest income becomes a faithful measure of intermediation success rather than a moving target shaped by timing and manual frictions. The cooperative already owns the right playbook; executing it with consistency is the path to sustainable interest earnings and to the credibility that keeps members saving, borrowing, and participating in governance.

4. CONCLUSION

The cooperative's operating architecture is sound on paper: SOP-anchored roles and workflows, documented approval limits, principle-based screening, and periodic loan reviews. The problem is execution. Field-dependent collections and limited data timeliness weaken early-warning signals, so downgrades and accrual suspensions arrive late. Without a functioning accrued-interest control account (PYMAD) and consistent off-balance-sheet treatment for NPLs, recognized interest becomes optimistic precisely when risk is rising. The accounting channel is therefore the transmission mechanism through which operational weaknesses erode surplus and undermine trust.

The remedy is targeted and feasible. First, codify status-based recognition end-to-end: accrual for performing loans; immediate switch to cash-basis at the first sign of deterioration; automatic provisioning by collectibility bucket; and reclassification of NPLs off balance sheet with clear restructuring rules. Second, harden collection controls in a low-tech setting: maker–checker at cash hand-off, serialized receipts reconciled daily to ledgers, and weekly arrears dashboards by collector and product. Third, institutionalize monthly credit-quality reviews—not just semiannual memos—so classification and pricing decisions reflect current risk, not stale views. Fourth, protect segregation of duties even in a lean team via decision-limit logs, exception registers, and supervisory spot checks tied to member governance routines. These steps will likely reduce short-term reported income but will stabilize net interest over time, which is the right trade-off for solvency, liquidity, and member confidence.

Strategically, the cooperative should treat receivables intensity as a standing risk factor: when the asset base is dominated by loans, small lapses in classification and recognition create outsized swings in monthly results. Robust SOP adherence—especially around authorization, collections oversight, and accounting recognition—turns that vulnerability into a manageable feature of the model. Executed consistently, the same pricing schedule can fund a smaller but sturdier interest-income stream, supporting growth in outreach without sacrificing financial resilience. This is the practical path to aligning the cooperative's social mandate with sustainable performance.

Ethical Approval
Not Applicable

Informed Consent Statement
Not Applicable

Disclosure Statement
The Authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

Data Availability Statement
The data presented in this study are available upon request from the corresponding author for privacy.

Funding
This study did not receive any external funding.

Notes on Contributors

Ari Puryani
Ari Puryani is affiliated with Master of Management, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Kusuma Negara

REFERENCES

Atichasari, A. S., Sukono, & Supian, S. (2023). Examining non-performing loans on corporate financial performance: Evidence from Indonesia. *Sustainable Futures*, (6), e100137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2023.100137

Churchill, S. A. (2020). Microfinance financial sustainability and outreach: Is there a trade-off? *Empirical Economics*, 59, 505–536. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-019-01709-1

Cull, R., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Morduch, J. (2007). Financial performance and outreach: A global analysis of leading microbanks. *The Economic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2007.02017.x

Fakhrunnas, F., Syapriatama, I., & Siregar, H. (2022). The determinants of non-performing loans/financing in Indonesian banking: An asymmetric approach. *SAGE Open*, 12(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221102421

Kepmen Koperasi & UKM No. 91/Kep/M.KUKM/IX/2004 (Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Koperasi Jasa Keuangan Syariah). Local government legal repository (PDF): https://dpmptsp.pekalongankota.go.id/index.php/id/download/category/34-koperasi-ukm?download=411%3Asyariah dpmptsp.pekalongankota.go.id

Nazara, S. (2024). Influence of Standard Operational Procedures on employee performance in regional public order operations. *ProBisnis: Jurnal Manajemen*, 15(1), 150–161. (Open-access PDF). https://www.ejournal.joninstitute.org/index.php/ProBisnis/article/download/489/399/1853 ProBisnis

Pergub DKI Jakarta No. 96 Tahun 2008 tentang Pengelolaan Dana Bergulir Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat. Jakarta JDIH (PDF): https://jdih.jakarta.go.id/link/download-fulltext/12249

PP No. 9 Tahun 1995 tentang Pelaksanaan Kegiatan Usaha Simpan Pinjam oleh Koperasi. Official text (BPHN PDF): https://bphn.go.id/data/documents/95pp009.pdf BPHN

Rauf, F., Wanqiu, W., Jing, L., Qadri, F., Naveed, M., & Rahman, S. (2022). Dynamic analysis of the determinants of long-term microfinance interest rates: Macro and micro factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1008002. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1008002

The Effectiveness of Standard Operating Procedures in Government Services. (2019). In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference*. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.16-10-2019.163231

Sarwono, Jonathan. (2006). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu

Sugiyono, S. (2010). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta Bandung.

Uddin, M. H., Li, J., & Xu, W. (2024). Why do microfinance institutions charge higher interest rates? *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 42, 100995. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2024.100995

UU No. 25 Tahun 1992 tentang Perkoperasian. Official portal (BPK RI): https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/46650/uu-no-25-tahun-1992 BPK Regulation